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

Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts

Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	Implementation of the project would intensify uses within the Planning Area in a manner that would reduce the feasibility of agricultural production. Therefore, the project would potentially result in indirect conversion of potential farmland resources to non-agricultural uses, which would be considered a significant impact.	The project, like the 2006 General Plan, does not propose any permanent preservation of agricultural land, but allows agriculture as an interim use prior to development. Thus, preservation of agricultural resources would not be feasible as it would be inconsistent with General Plan goals and EIR project objectives.	**Significant and Unavoidable**
4.3 Air Quality			
Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	The project would not exceed the assumptions used to develop the AQMP, and the project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air 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.	N/A	**Less than Significant**

Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards?	Construction
	
	The scale and extent of construction activities associated with buildout of the Planning Area could exceed the relevant SCAQMD thresholds for some projects. Construction impacts would be potentially significant.
	
	Operation
	
	The project would not conflict with implementation of the AQMP, and emissions associated with project buildout would be less than emissions associated with buildout of the existing 2006 General Plan. Therefore, the operation of the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions, and impacts would be less than significant.
		AQ-1: Applications for future development, wherein the Director of Community Development or his or her designee has determined a potential for air quality impacts associated with construction, shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts to the City for review and approval. The Director of Community Development or his or her designee shall make this determination based on the size of the project, whether the project would require a transportation impact analysis, or other criteria. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD's adopted thresholds of significance, the City shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City. Mitigation measures to reduce construction-related emissions could include, but are not limited to:
		• Require fugitive-dust control measures that exceed SCAQMD's Rule 403 requirements, such as:
		  ○ Use of nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion.
		  ○ Apply water every four hours to active soil-disturbing activities.
		  ○ 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.
			Construction Emissions - **Significant and Unavoidable.** Implementation of mitigation measure AQ-1 would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions from construction-related activities; however, construction time frames and equipment for site-specific development projects are not available at this time, multiple development projects constructed at the same time could result in significant construction-related emissions.
			
			Operational Emissions – **Less than Significant.**

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts			
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			
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?	Buildout of the GPU would have the potential to directly or indirectly impact 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.	**BIO-1:** Applications for future development of vacant properties (and 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 survey to identify the presence of any sensitive 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	**Significant and Unavoidable.** 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 Summary of Environmental Impacts			
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		recommend appropriate mitigation to reduce the impacts to below a level of 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 establishing baseline acceptable noise.	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	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 archaeological resources. Step 1: An 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. The evaluation	**Significant and Unavoidable**

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts			
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		program 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 (36 CFR 79 of the Federal Register) and that allows access to artifact collections.	
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.	**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**

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts			
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American?			
4.6 Energy			
Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	Energy conservation measures required by applicable energy conservation regulations (e.g., CALGreen, Title 24) and energy conservation policies included in the proposed 2021 GPU and the CAP would support the minimization of energy consumption from operations associated with future development. VMT and building energy use associated with buildout of the project would be less than the VMT and building energy use associated with buildout of the existing 2006 General Plan. Therefore, the project would not result in a wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Future development allowed under the project would implement applicable regulation that would ensure development would be energy efficient. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of CALGreen and the California Energy Code, or with SCE and MVU's implementation of RPS, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
4.7 Geology/Soils			
Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: • Rupture of a known earthquake fault, • Strong seismic ground shaking, • Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, • Landslides?	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 faults, seismic ground shaking, ground failure and landslides would be less than significant.	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 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/A	**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			
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**

Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts

Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Would the project Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	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 reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	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 an accidental release of hazardous materials or emissions of hazardous substance near existing or proposed schools, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	Adherence to applicable clean-up and/or remediation requirements and regulations would ensure that the project would not create a significant hazard associated with known hazardous materials sites, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
Would the project be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.	Development within the AICUZ is subject to development standards and restrictions as set forth in Municipal Code Section 9.07.060. Future development that would be located within the city's special zone and/or within the ALUC compatibility zones would be required to adhere to all special regulations, including Municipal Code development standards and specific land use regulations regarding FAA notification imaginary surfaces, aircraft noise, and building heights. Consequently, the project would be consistent with adopted ALUCPs, as future development would be required to show compatibility with the requirements of the ALUCPs, the Municipal Code, and associated FAA requirements. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
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, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**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.	Compliance with MVFD 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 involving wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
4.10 Hydrology/Water Quality			
Would the project violate any water quality 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 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. 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 future development would not violate any water quality standards or	N/A	**Less than Significant**

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.	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 ensure that future development would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite, and impacts 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 not create or contribute substantial additional sources of polluted runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, and impacts would be 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.	N/A	**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, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation.	The Pacific Ocean is located more than 40 miles from the city. Therefore, there is no potential for tsunamis to impact the Planning Area. Future development would be 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.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.	future development would be required to comply with the SAR Basin Water Quality Control Program, which includes the requirement to complete and submit of a SWPPP for construction-related activities. Future development would also be required to 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.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
4.11 Land Use and Planning			
Would the project physically divide an established community.	Implementation of the project would not include new major infrastructure, such as a 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. Therefore, the project would not physically divide the community, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	The project would implement various City planning initiatives, identifies housing sites necessary to meet RHNA goals and ensure consistency with the state housing targets, and would facilitate implementation of the CAP. Furthermore, the project would not generate growth that would exceed 2040 SCAG projections. Therefore, the project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable plans, policies, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
4.12 Mineral Resources			
Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the stat?	The majority of land within the Planning Area is designated as MRZ-3, land for which the significance of mineral resources cannot be determined, or MRZ-1, land for which adequate geologic information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are 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.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	There are no active mineral resource extraction facilities within the Planning Area. The existing 2006 General Plan land use map, as well as the proposed GPU land use map do not delineate any mineral resource recovery sites, or designate any land for mineral resource production. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in the loss of a designated mineral recovery site and no impact would occur.	N/A	**No Impact**

Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts

Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
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-sensitive receptors and noise disturbances may occur. Therefore, construction noise impacts would be considered potentially significant.	Traffic Noise Impacts associated with the increase in ambient noise would be significant without mitigation. For existing noise sensitive land uses, possible noise-reduction measures would include retrofitting older structures with acoustically rated windows and doors featuring higher Sound Transmission Class ratings, which is a measure of exterior noise reduction performance. However, there is no mechanism in place for implementing such a retrofit program. Because the significant noise impacts would be to existing homes and other noise-sensitive uses in an already urbanized area, there is no feasible mitigation. Therefore, impacts to existing sensitive land uses would remain significant and unavoidable. Construction Noise **NOS-1:** The Director of Community Development or his or her designee shall require applicants to demonstrate whether the project has the potential to exceed noise standards contained in Sections 8.14.040(E) and 11.80.030(D)(7) of the Municipal Code. If a project may exceed standards or is located adjacent to sensitive receptors, the City may require the applicant to prepare a Noise Analysis that estimates construction noise and identifies noise reduction measures that would ensure compliance with Municipal Code standards. Construction plans submitted to the City shall identify applicable measures on demolition, grading, and construction plans submitted to the City. Noise reduction measures can include, but are not limited to, the following: 1. Demolition, construction, site preparation, and related activities that would generate noise perceptible at the property line of the subject property are limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. from Monday through Friday excluding holidays and from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Saturdays. The building inspector may issue an exception to this limitation on hours in cases of urgent necessity where the public health and safety will not be substantially impaired. 2. Idling times for noise-generating equipment used in demolition, construction, site preparation, and related activities shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes. 3. Demolition, construction, site preparation, and related activities within 70 feet from the edge of properties with existing, occupied noise-sensitive uses shall incorporate all feasible strategies to reduce noise exposure for noise-sensitive uses, including: a. Provide written notice to all known occupied noise-sensitive uses within 400 feet of the edge of the project site boundary at least 2 weeks prior to the start of each construction phase of the construction schedule; b. Ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained and equipped with noise control components, such as mufflers, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications;	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 Summary of Environmental Impacts			
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		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 low-noise technique.	
Would the project generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	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.	**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 analysis to assess and mitigate 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.	**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**
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.	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 unplanned population growth in an area, either directly ((for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	The project would exceed the state RHNA requirements, would reduce future population and household growth compared to 2040 SCAG projections, and would locate future infrastructure along major transit corridors that are already served by essential roads, utilities, and public services. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	The project would exceed the state RHNA requirements, which would provide additional housing that would accommodate residents displaced by future redevelopment projects, and ensure no net loss of housing. Furthermore, the project 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.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
4.15 Public Services and Recreation			
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: • Fire Protection; • Police Protection; • Schools; • Parks/Recreational Facilities • Other Public Facilities?	Fire Protection Future fire protection 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 provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities to a level less than significant. Police Protection Future police protection 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 provision of new or physically altered police facilities to a 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 framework established in this EIR, which would reduce impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered libraries to a level less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Future parks 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. Therefore, the project would develop future park facilities that would compensate that would address substantial increase in the use of parks that would occur under project buildout.	N/A	**Less than Significant**

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts			
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Implementation of the mitigation framework established in this EIR would reduce impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks to a level less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
4.16 Transportation			
Would the project conflict with a plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	The project would implement roadway and circulation improvements, new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, as well as the polices and actions listed under goals C-1 through C-3 in order to improve the circulation network through project buildout in 2040. Therefore, the project would not conflict with a plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Compared to the existing 2006 General Plan, implementation of the project would result in lower VMT using several metrics, demonstrating a land use plan that would increase per capita VMT efficiency. However, some metrics showed an increase in VMT based on several metrics (shown in bold in Table 4.16-5). As a result of some metrics 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 CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b). This would be considered a significant impact.	The project has incorporated VMT reducing goals and policies to the extent feasible. No additional mitigation was identified that could reduce VMT impacts. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	**Significant and Unavoidable**
Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	The 2021 GPU includes policies and actions described above that would ensure future transportation facilities would not introduce hazards onto the circulation network, and future development and redevelopment would also be designed consistent with all safety requirements pertaining ingress and egress onto the circulation network. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase hazards, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**Less Than Significant**
Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	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 result in inadequate emergency access, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	**Less than Significant**
4.17 Utilities/Service Systems			
Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Water Future water 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 water facilities to a level less than significant. 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.	N/A	**Less than Significant**

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