RESOLUTION NO. 7193

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDLANDS CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, FINDINGS, AND OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND A MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, FOR THE PROPOSED FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 945 AND MINOR SUBDIVISION NO. 330 (TENATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 19060); (ALSO KNOWN AS THE REDLANDS CROSSING PROJECT)

WHEREAS, Walmart Stores, Inc. proposes to develop the Redlands Crossing Center project which is a regional shopping center consisting of approximately 275,500 square feet of commercial uses on approximately 23.9 acres, and for which applications for Conditional Use Permit No. 945 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 19060 have been filed with the City of Redlands; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, the City of Redlands prepared an Environmental Impact Report in connection with the City's Condition of the application for Conditinoal Use Permit No. 945 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 19060; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on April 24, 2012, and adopted motions recommending to the City Council of the City of Redland (the "City Council") approval of the Environmental Impact Report and the applications for Conditional Use Permit No. 945 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 19060; and

WHEREAS, on July 18, 2012, the City Council held a duly noticed public hearing on the applications for Conditional Use Permit No. 945 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 19060 at which time the City Council heard verbal and written testimony presented by City staff and members of the public regarding the application for Conditional Use Permit No. 945 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 19060 and the associated Environmental Impact Report for those applications;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Redlands as follows:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Redlands hereby certifies the final Environmental Impact Report and adopts the following statement of environmental effects, mitigation measures, findings, and overriding considerations, and a mitigation monitoring program, for the proposed Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") for Conditional Use Permit No. 945 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 19060 (Minor Subdivision No. 330); also known as the Redlands Crossing Project:

I. INTRODUCTION

The City of Redlands (the "City"), in approving Conditional Use Permit No. 945 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 19060 (Minor Subdivision No. 330) for the Redlands Crossing Project (the "Project"), which requires approval of a number of discretionary approvals as discussed within the Project Summary of the Final EIR, makes the Findings described below and adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations presented at the end of the Findings. The Final EIR was prepared by the City acting as lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). Hereafter, the Notice of Preparation, Notice of Availability, Notice of Completion, the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") (circulated from November 21, 2011 through January 18, 2012), Technical Studies attached as Appendices to the Draft EIR, the Final EIR, containing Responses to Comments and textual revisions to the Draft EIR, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be referred to collectively

herein as the "EIR." These Findings are based on the entire record before the City, including the EIR. The City adopts the facts and analyses in the EIR, which are summarized below for convenience. The omission of some detail or aspect of the EIR does not mean that the same has been rejected by the City.

II. PROJECT SUMMARY

A. Project Description

1. Site Location and Existing Conditions

The Project is located south of San Bernardino Avenue, and east of the State Route (SR) 210 Freeway in the City of Redlands. Specifically, the Project site is located at the southeast intersection of the Tennessee Street and San Bernardino Avenue. References to pages of the Draft EIR in this Resolution are hereafter identified as "DEIR p__." (DEIR p. 2-1.)

The Project site is primarily vacant land previously tended as an orchard and consists of fallow agricultural land. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (see Appendix F of the Draft EIR), indicated that the Project site contained an orchard from the 1930s until the early 2000s. Three residences occupied the site from the 1930s until the 1990s. Two of the residences were removed in the early 1990s, while the remaining residence was removed in 2002. (DEIR p. 2-1.)

Tennessee Street, an existing two-lane road forms the western boundary of the Project site. West of Tennessee Street is SR-210. The Citrus Plaza shopping center is located across SR-210 Freeway, west of the Project. (DEIR p. 2-1.) San Bernardino Avenue, an existing two-lane road, serves as the northern boundary of the Project site. North of San Bernardino Avenue is the extension of Tennessee Avenue, consisting of orchards and fallow lands. (DEIR p. 2-2.)

The Project site will be bounded on the East by the future extension of New York Avenue. East of the future extension of New York Avenue and west of Karon Street is a vacant and undeveloped area under common ownership with the Project site that will include limited offsite improvements that will be provided to support development of the Project (see discussion below under Subsection 2.2.1 of the Draft EIR). (DEIR p. 2-2.) A landscape buffer will be located on the west side of Karon Street, which is part of the off-site improvements as proposed by the Project. This landscape buffer is a requirement of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan and Concept Plan No. 4 (CP4), in order to buffer the Project from the residences on the east side of Karon Street. East of Karon Avenue is an existing single-family residential subdivision. (*Ibid*.)

The future extension of Pennsylvania Avenue is planned for a two-lane roadway, which will be located on the southern boundary of the Project site. South of the future extension is fallow agricultural land. (DEIR p. 2-2.)

The Project site is designated Commercial (C) per the City of Redlands General Plan Land Use Map (November 2010). This commercial designation allows for a variety of commercial activities ranging from shopping centers to business parks. The Project site is also within the boundaries of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan, and Cities Pavilion Concept Plan. The Cities Pavilion Concept Plan functions as a development suitability analysis and land use plan, which identifies development opportunities and constraints, including physical characteristics, public services and facilities, capacity of the circulation system, and existing or planned uses for adjacent properties. The intent of the Concept Plan is to establish limits, parameters, and planning objectives to guide development based on the identified development constraints and opportunities. According to the City of Redlands Zoning Map (November 2010), the Project site is zoned as East Valley Corridor Specific Plan and Concept Plan No.

4 (CP4). Allowable uses within CP4 Zoning use include General Commercial District (GC) and Administrative Professional (AP). (DEIR p. 2-2.)

2. Project Description

The Project proposes to develop a regional shopping center that consists of approximately 275,500 square feet of commercial retail uses on approximately 32.9 acres. The Project includes 215,000 square feet for the proposed Redlands Crossing Walmart (Parcel 10) and 60,500 square feet (Parcels 1 to 9) consisting of three (3) fast food with drive-thru spaces, three (3) retail spaces, a fast food without drive-thru and retail, a retail with drive-thru space and a restaurant. In addition, Lot A of the Project will consist of an approximately 0.52 acre surface level infiltration basin. Further, approximately 1,349 parking spaces will be provided for the 275,500 square feet of commercial retail space. (DEIR p. 2-9.)

The proposed Redlands Crossing Walmart would consist of an approximate area of 215,000 square feet. The Redlands Crossing Walmart is proposed for build-out at the northwest corner of the extension of New York Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue in Redlands. Access to the Redlands Crossing Center and the Walmart store will be located off San Bernardino Avenue, Tennessee Street, New York Street, and Pennsylvania Avenue. The Redlands Crossing Walmart will offer groceries and general retail merchandise including, but not limited to, alcohol for off-site consumption, pool chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides, and paint products. The Redlands Crossing Walmart will operate 24 hours per day seven days a week. The Redlands Crossing Walmart may have outdoor seasonal sales and storage. In addition, a garden center with an exterior customer pick-up facility for pre-paid bagged, garden supplies, such as potting soil, mulch, and manure is included. The garden center will operate 24 hours per day. The exterior pick-up facility will have an attendant to assist customer loading. The exterior pick-up facility will not accommodate direct sales. The exterior pick-up facility will operate the same hours as the Redlands Crossing Walmart and garden center. (DEIR p. 2-9.)

The Redlands Crossing Walmart will also include a Tire & Lube Express, which will provide routine servicing and preventive maintenance of vehicles. (DEIR p. 2-9.) The tire and lube facility will have limited hours of operation (Monday through Sunday 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.). (DEIR pp. 2-9 to 2-10.) In addition, the Redlands Crossing Walmart will also include a pharmacy and possibly a vision, hearing and medical care center, food service, a photo studio and photo finishing center, a banking center and an arcade, and other similar services inside the store. (DEIR p. 2-10.) The store building will include, without limitation, truck doors, trash compactors, recycling area, and loading facilities. Table 2-1 of the Draft EIR summarizes the approximate Redlands Crossing Walmart square footage. (Ibid.)

Implementation of the Project will also increase the amount of impervious surfaces on-site, which could affect groundwater recharge due to the loss of soil infiltration. To facilitate groundwater recharge, the permeable areas on-site have been maximized through site design considerations, including vegetated swales, a nutrient separating baffle box and inlet inserts before discharging into one of five infiltration basins. The design feature allows the majority of drainage from impervious surface to flow to permeable areas for on-site infiltration. One surface level infiltration basin and four underground infiltration basins have been incorporated into the site plan to maximize on-site infiltration. (DEIR p. 2-10.)

Parcels 1 to 9 will consist of approximately 60,500 square feet of building area, and will be located west and north of the Redlands Crossing Walmart along Tennessee Street and San Bernardino Avenue. (DEIR p. 2-13.) These Parcels will be entitled for various commercial/retail uses including three drive-thru fast-food facilities and one retail facility with a drive-thru lane. Implementation of the Project will

also incorporate, as previously described, one surface level infiltration basin and four (4) underground infiltration basins. (Ibid.)

Parcel 1 will be entitled for retail and a gas station, which will be located at the southwest corner of the Project site, near the intersection of Tennessee Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. The gas station will include six pumps (12 dispensers), 3,000 square feet of retail uses with a drive-thru component, and a self-service car wash. Parcels 1 to 9 will be graded and constructed at the same time the Redlands Crossing Walmart is graded and constructed (See Table 2-2: Site Summary of the Draft EIR). Generally, the color scheme, landscaping, etc. of Parcels 1 to 9 will be of similar design as the Redlands Crossing Walmart design (i.e. California contemporary retail). See discussion under Design and Appearance, below, for additional information in this regard. In addition, Lot A of the Project will consist of an approximately 0.52 acre surface level infiltration basin. See Table 2-2 of the Draft EIR for a site summary of proposed uses within the Project site. (DEIR p. 2-13.)

Parcel 11 (totaling 9.16 acres), is located between the extension of New York Street and Karon Avenue. (DEIR p. 2-14.) Activities in Parcel 11 will consist of off-site mass-grading and infrastructure improvements provided to support development of the Project site. Off-site improvements within this area include storm drain facility improvements related to the construction of New York Street, a block wall immediately to the West of Karon Street and mass-grading to "match" grade elevations between Karon Street and future New York Street. (Ibid.) In addition, a landscape buffer will be located on the west side of Karon Street, which is part of the off-site improvements as proposed by the Project. (DEIR pp. 2-14 to 2-15.) This landscape buffer is a requirement of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan and Concept Plan No. 4 (CP4), in order to buffer the Project from the residences on the east side of Karon Street. (DEIR p. 2-15.) Development of Parcel 11, beyond the activities described above, is not part of this Project, and is outside of the scope of this EIR. (Ibid.)

There is an existing operational 126,000 square-foot Walmart discount store (Store No. 1693) located at 2050 West Redlands Boulevard, approximately 1.25 miles southwest of the Project site, which, like the proposed store, includes a grocery component. Although likely to close once the new store opens since both stores service similar geographic areas, the timing of the closure of the existing Walmart store is unknown. Although Walmart is seeking to re-tenant the store once it vacates, the timing of the establishment of a new tenant(s) is also unknown. Therefore, upon development of the Project, the existing Walmart could be either vacant (due to no replacement tenants) or could be re-tenanted upon Opening Year 2013. Consequently, the Draft EIR analyzed potential "worst-case" impacts with respect to the existing Walmart store. For example, analysis of Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases, Noise, and Traffic will assume the existing Walmart to be re-tenanted upon Opening Year 2013. In this case, impacts will be worst-case in that both stores will be occupied and will emit greater air and greenhouse gas emissions and increased noise and traffic levels. In contrast, the analysis of Urban Decay estimates the scenario that the existing Walmart site will be vacant upon Opening Year 2013. In this case, impacts would be worst-case in that the existing store could potentially be closed long-term and potentially create urban decay for the surrounding area. (DEIR p. 2-15.)

3. Actions Covered by the EIR

The EIR supports the following discretionary approvals:

- Conditional Use Permit (CUP) of the Development Plan for the entire Project, including the Redlands Crossing Walmart (tire and lube facility, drive-thru garden center, and arcade) (Parcel 10);
- Individual CUP for future development of the following Parcels:

Convenience store with drive-thru, gas station, alcohol sales, and car wash (Parcel 1);
Three fast-food restaurants with drive-thru (Parcels 2, 8, and 9); and
One retail with drive-thru (Parcel 6).

- Planning Commission Review and Approval (CRA) for future development of the following Parcels:
  Retail with no drive-thru (Parcels 3, 4, 5, and 7);
- Tentative and Final Parcel Map;
- Sign Plan Approval of a uniform sign program for the entire Project;
- Building and Grading Permits;
- Encroachment Permits (Sewer, Water, etc); and
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Order No. 99-08-DWQ National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No. CAS000002 waste Discharge Requirements (WDRS) for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction Activity.

(DEIR pp. 2-26 through 2-27.)

B. Project Goals and Objectives

The Project goals and objectives include the following:

1. Maximize retail commercial property and sales tax revenues that would be accrued to the various agencies within the City of Redlands from the development of the Project site.
2. Facilitate customer convenience by providing a full range of goods and services (including grocery, gardening, dry goods, automotive, and other uses) within a single store.
3. Develop the Project site with a high-quality mix of retail, grocery, restaurant, and commercial uses that will complement each other and encourage one stop shopping thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled and vehicle trips in the community.
4. Provide convenient and affordable shopping opportunities to the residents of the City of Redlands and surrounding areas for a wide range of retail goods and services, including the provision of such goods and services on a 24-hour basis.
5. Provide the Redlands Crossing Center with a nationally recognized general-merchandise anchor to attract consumers and other businesses to the Project.
6. Provide an additional grocery outlet in the North Redlands Community to minimize travel, as well as provide convenient shopping opportunities for City residents.
7. Develop a new major retail and commercial center along Major Arterial streets and in close proximity to the 210 Freeway/San Bernardino Avenue Interchange in order to facilitate regional public access and promote the Project as a regional shopping destination.
8. Develop the vacant unused parcels comprising the Project site for retail-commercial uses in a manner that fully utilizes their development potential.

(DEIR p. 2-26.)

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The City conducted an extensive review of this Project that included a Draft EIR and a Final EIR, including technical reports, along with a public review and comment period. The City initially issues a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on August 20, 2007. However, after transmittal the project as proposed at that time was revised. Therefore, a revised NOP was issues on February 27, 2009. The City circulated the NOP to responsible and trustee state agencies, local organizations, and interested individuals to identify any issues to be addressed in the EIR. The 30-day circulation and review period for the NOP

concluded on March 31, 2009. Additionally, the City held a scoping meeting on March 16, 2009. Copies of the letters to the revised NOP were included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. An Initial Study was not completed for this Project and instead all potential environmental impacts were discussed within the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR was circulated for public review from November 21, 2011 through January 18, 2012. The Draft EIR and technical appendices were made available for public review during normal business hours both at the City of Redlands Development Services Department, Planning Division, located at 210 East Citrus Avenue and the A. K. Smiley Public Library at 125 W. Vine Street in the City of Redlands, California. The Draft EIR received a number of comments, responses of which were provided in writing and incorporated within the Final EIR as Responses to Comments and textual revisions to the Draft EIR. The EIR was considered by the City of Redlands Planning Commission on March 27, 2012.

IV. GENERAL FINDING ON MITIGATION MEASURES

In preparing the Conditions of Approval for this Project, City staff incorporated the mitigation measures recommended in the EIR as applicable to the Project. In the event that the Conditions of Approval do not use the exact wording of the mitigation measures recommended in the EIR, in each such instance, the adopted Conditions of Approval are intended to be identical or substantially similar to the recommended mitigation measures. Any minor revisions are to improve clarity or to better define the intended purpose of the mitigation and are not designed to substantively alter the purpose of such mitigation.

Finding: Unless specifically stated to the contrary in these Findings, it is the City's intent to adopt all mitigation measures recommended by the EIR which are applicable to the Project. If a measure has, through error, been omitted from the Conditions of Approval or from these Findings, and that measure is not specifically reflected in these Findings, that measure shall be deemed to be adopted pursuant to this paragraph. In addition, unless specifically stated to the contrary in these Findings, all Conditions of Approval repeating or rewording mitigation measures recommended in the EIR are intended to be substantially similar to the mitigation measures recommended in the EIR and are found to be equally effective in avoiding or lessening the identified environmental impact. In each instance, the Conditions of Approval contain the final wording for the mitigation measures.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND FINDINGS

City staff reports, the EIR, written and oral testimony at public meetings or hearings, these facts, findings and statement of overriding considerations, and other information in the administrative record, serve as the basis for the City's environmental determination.

The detailed analysis of potentially significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures for the Project is presented in the Draft and Final EIR, as well as the responses to comments from the public and from other government agencies on the Draft EIR which are provided in the Final EIR.

The EIR evaluated eighteen major environmental categories for potential impacts including: Aesthetics; Agricultural Resources; Air Quality; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology and Soils; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use and Planning; Mineral Resources; Noise; Population, Housing, and SCAG Consistency; Public Services; Recreation; Transportation; Utilities and Service Systems; Greenhouse Gases; and Urban Decay. Both Project-specific and cumulative impacts were evaluated. Of these environmental categories, the City concurs with the conclusions in the EIR that the issues and sub-issues discussed in subsections A, B, and D

below are either less than significant without mitigation or can be mitigated below a level of significance. For the remaining potential environmental impacts that cannot feasibly be mitigated below a level of significance discussed in subsection C, the City must evaluate the overriding considerations and Project benefits and balance them against the significant impacts of the proposed Project.

A. Impacts Identified As Less Than Significant Requiring No Mitigation

The following issues were found in the EIR as having no potential to cause significant impacts and therefore require no Project-specific mitigation. In the following presentation, each resource issue is identified and the potential for significant adverse environmental effects is discussed.

As stated previously, the following issues were found in the EIR as having no potential to cause significant impacts and therefore require no Project-specific mitigation. In the following presentation, each resource issue is identified and the potential for significant adverse environmental effects is discussed.

1. Aesthetics

Impact AES-1: Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Aesthetics are discussed in detail in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that the Project will have a less than significant impact related to an adverse effect on a scenic vista, and no mitigation is required. (DEIR pp. 3.1-21 to 3.1-22.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: According to the City of Redlands General Plan, there are no designated scenic vistas on or adjacent to the Project site. During the construction phase, various equipment, vehicles, building materials, stockpiles, disposal receptacles, and related activities could be potentially visible from several different vantage points near the Project site. Once, completed, all equipment, vehicles, building materials, stockpiles, disposal receptacles, and all other general construction activities will cease, along with any construction-related impacts. (DEIR p. 3.1-21.)

The Redlands Crossing Center includes a 215,000 square foot proposed Redlands Crossing Walmart approximately 23 feet in height with architectural roof projections approximately 50 feet in height from the proposed pad elevation and 60,500 square feet for three (3) fast food with drive-thru spaces, three (3) retail spaces, a fast food without drive-thru and retail, a retail with drive-thru space and a restaurant. In addition, the Project proposes to develop a decorative masonry wall located adjacent to Karon Street, from Pennsylvania Avenue to Elise Drive. (DEIR p. 3.1-21.)

The residences most likely affected by the Project are located directly east of the Project site, near Karon Street. Their view of the San Bernardino Mountains (if any) would be oriented to the north, across the Project site. However, the Project will be developed below the Karon Street grade. Consequently, views of the Project site will only be of the upper portion of the Walmart structure, and will be shielded by landscaping. The Project would maintain the block wall and the landscaping. (DEIR p. 3.1-21.)

Additionally, according to Section EV4.0225, of the EVCSP (Compatibility Standards), developments adjacent to residential uses are subject to conditions. Where a development abuts a residential district, an orderly transition of uses and building types should be established consistent with Section EV4.0225 and other applicable policies. Permitted uses at Parcel 11 consist of Administrative Professional.

Except for limited off-site improvements on Parcel 11 necessary to support development of the Project site, this Project does not involve development of Parcel 11. Any future development within Parcel 11 will be required to be consistent with the EVCSP Compatibility Standards for Administrative Professional (AP) Zone. (DEIR pp. 3.1-21 to 3.1-22.)

In addition, as outlined within EVCSP Compatibility Standards, smaller buildings shall be located near residential uses with larger buildings further away. These potential future office buildings will serve as a transition from the less intensive existing residential uses to the east and southeast to the more intensive Walmart. In addition, a landscape buffer will be located on the west side of Karon Street, which is part of the off-site improvements as proposed by the Project. This landscape buffer is a requirement of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan and Concept Plan No. 4 (CP4), in order to buffer the Project from the residences on the east side of Karon Street (see EVCSP CP4 for additional information in this regard). Further, landscaping along the Pennsylvania Avenue extension and parking will also serve as a transition area between future commercial land uses and the proposed Walmart. Thus, the proposed land uses and site plan design for the Project will comply with Section EV4.0225 and other applicable policies and will have a less than significant impact to views of the San Bernardino Mountains and other scenic views within the Project area. (DEIR p. 3.1-22.)

As supported by the preceding discussion, the potential for the Project to result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or cause any short or long-term visual impacts is less than significant and no mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.1-22.)

Impact AES-2: Would the proposed Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Aesthetics are discussed in detail in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds no significant impact related to the damage of scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway. No mitigation is required. (DEIR pp. 3.1-22 to 3.1-23.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Refer to the discussion under Impact AES-1 and AES-3 for additional details regarding short and long-term visual impacts. There are no significant scenic resources known to exist in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. Designated Scenic roadways within the City's General Plan are south of the I-10 Freeway and are not within the vicinity of the Project. The site is located directly adjacent to the SR-210 Freeway and approximately 0.55 mile north of the I-10 Freeway. Both Freeways are designated as eligible State Scenic Highways; however, their designation is not officially designated as a State Scenic Highway. Therefore, the Project will have a less than significant impact on scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a State Scenic Highway and no mitigation is required. (DEIR pp. 3.1-22 to 3.1-23.)

Impact AES-3: Would the proposed Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Aesthetics are discussed in detail in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project will have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. (DEIR pp. 3.1-23 to 3.1-25.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: See the previous discussion under Impact AES-1 regarding short-term construction activities. As discussed, during the construction phase various equipment, vehicles,

building materials, stockpiles, disposal receptacles, and related activities could be potentially visible from several different vantage points near the Project site. However, construction-related activities will be short-term and are expected to last approximately twelve (12) months. Once, completed, all equipment, vehicles, building materials, stockpiles, disposal receptacles, and all other general construction activities will cease, along with any construction-related impacts. Therefore, due to the temporary nature of construction-related activities, potential impacts the visual character of the Project site would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.1-23.)

Development of the Project would convert predominantly urban vacant land to commercial, retail and restaurant uses, substantially changing the aesthetic nature of the Project site. However, much of the site is disked on a regular basis and in a blighted condition from illegal dumping activities, and thus would not be considered scenic in nature. Therefore, the architectural features and landscaping designed for the Project are intended to provide a visually appealing commercial retail development that attracts potential customers. As such, it would be expected to enhance the aesthetics of the Project site. (DEIR p. 3.1-23.)

Specifically, the Walmart store and surrounding outparcel design is characterized as "California contemporary retail." Landscaping will be incorporated into the overall design that will comply with the standards set forth in the EVCSP. The architectural features and landscaping design are intended to provide a visually appealing commercial retail development that would attract potential customers. Thus, the Project will produce a mixture of urban delights within the City. (DEIR pp. 3.1-23 to 3.1-24.)

Additionally, development of the proposed Redlands Crossing Center will be of similar land uses, height and scale as the local commercial and retail centers located in close proximity to SR-210 and the Project site (i.e. Citrus Plaza and Home Depot Center). Less intensive uses (i.e., office) are designated within the 9.16 acres directly east of the Project site. According to Section EV4.0225 of the EVCSP (Compatibility Standards), permitted uses at Parcel 11 consist of Administrative Professional. Any future office buildings on the Parcel 11 are speculative at this time and are not part of the Project. However, future development within Parcel 11 will be required to be consistent with the EVCSP Compatibility Standards for Administrative Professional (AP) Zone. Given the presence of the existing commercial and retail centers, and the strategic placement of buildings on the Project site, the Project would not constitute a substantial change in the visual character of the Project area. (DEIR p. 3.1-24.)

The Project also proposes to construct curbs and gutters with street lighting around the site. Construction of curbs and gutters will be consistent with the surrounding commercial uses and the policies found in the City's General Plan. According to the EVCSP Section EV3.0720 Development Standards, the Project abuts a Special Landscape Street (San Bernardino Avenue). The Project has been designed in conformance with setback and landscape requirements as outlined in Section EV4.0115 (a). Therefore, the Project will not result in a significant impact in this regard. (DEIR p. 3.1-24.)

The surrounding land uses of most concern from a visual character perspective are the existing residential uses to the east and southeast, the residentially zoned property to the south, and the SR-210 Freeway. (DEIR p. 3.1-24.)

The existing single-family residential uses are located directly east of the Project site along Karon Street north of Pennsylvania Ave. These units are slightly elevated and a mound exists between the residential uses and the eastern portion of the Project site, which partially blocks views of the proposed site area. Implementation of the Project will provide adequate setbacks from nearby residential units. This includes an approximate 510-foot distance from the existing residential properties along Karon Street and an approximate 230-foot distance from commercially zoned property south of the Pennsylvania

Avenue extension. A landscape buffer will also be located on the west side of Karon Street, which is part of the off-site improvements as proposed by the Project. This landscape buffer is a requirement of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan and Concept Plan No. 4 (CP4), in order to buffer the Project from the residences on the east side of Karon Street. In addition, the Project would include a continuous visual screen of a maximum height of six (6) feet decorative masonry wall (per Section EV4.0225 of the EVCSP) and landscaping along the eastern portion of the property boundary, between Pennsylvania Avenue and Elise Drive. The Project would maintain the block wall and the landscaping. Views of the Project site may be partially obstructed by the decorative wall to most of the residences to the east. Accordingly, the visual character of the residential uses would be degraded by the Project. However, according to Section EV4.0225 of the EVCSP, developments adjacent to residential uses are subject to compatibility standards. Where a development abuts a residential district, an orderly transition of uses and building types should be established in consistency with Section EV4.0225 and other applicable policies. As previously mentioned, permitted uses at Parcel 11 consist of Administrative Professional. Any future office buildings on the Parcel 11 are speculative at this time and are not part of the Project. However, any future development within Parcel 11 will be required to be consistent with the EVCSP Compatibility Standards for Administrative Professional (AP) Zone.. Landscaping along the Pennsylvania Avenue extension and parking will also serve as a transition between commercially zoned property and the Walmart. Thus, the Project's proposed land uses will comply with Section EV4.0225 and other applicable policies and will have a less than significant impact to visual character in this regard. (DEIR pp. 3.1-24 to 3.1-25.)

The segment of the SR-210 Freeway overlooking the Project site is positioned approximately 165 feet west of the Project site. The SR-210 Freeway is located on a raised embankment. Views looking down on the Project site are relatively obstructed and consist of disturbed vacant land or views of vegetation and fallow trees. Given the presence of the existing commercial and retail centers, the Project would not be considered a substantial change in the visual character of the Project site. Moreover, the architectural features and landscaping designed for the Project are intended to provide a visually appealing commercial retail development that attracts potential customers. As such, it would be expected to enhance the aesthetics of the Project site. For these reasons, the Project would not substantially degrade the visual character of the site. (DEIR p. 3.1-25.)

Other surrounding land uses either have no views or are primarily vacant. Moreover, most of these land uses are located more than 125 feet away from the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not have the potential to degrade the visual character of these land uses. (DEIR p. 3.1-25.)

2. Agricultural Resources

Impact AG-1: Would the proposed 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?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Agricultural Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project will have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to convert Farmland, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. (DEIR pp. 3.2-9 to 3.2-10.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Historically, the Project site has been utilized primarily for agricultural purposes as an orchard from approximately 1938 until approximately 2002 (KA 2006). Three single-family residential structures occupied the northeast corners of Parcels 01 and 02 and the

northern boundary of Parcel 04 from at least 1938 until the demolition of the dwellings on Parcels 01 and 04 in the early 1990s. Currently, the Project site is primarily vacant, occupied by a fallow orchard on Parcel 02 located in the west-central portion of the Project site. Since the 1970s, the general vicinity of the Project site has been increasingly developed with residential and commercial uses. (DEIR pp. 3.2-9 to 3.2-10.)

According to the City of Redlands General Plan, the Project site is not located in an agricultural preserve or currently used for agricultural production. However, according to the State's FMMP, the Project site is classified as having approximately 9.70 acres of prime farmland, 0.15 acre of farmland of statewide importance, 35.68 acres of grazing land, and 0.10 acre of urban built-up land. However, the FMMP requires that the land be irrigated and used for agricultural production within the past four (4) years to be considered prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance. The Project site has not been irrigated or in agricultural production for over nine (9) years. Consequently, the Project does not fall within prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance as per FMMP requirements. (DEIR p. 3.2-10.)

In addition, the Project site is zoned as CP-4 (Concept Plan - 4) per the EVCSP and has a Land Use Designation of Commercial, which is consistent with the Projects proposed uses. Consequently, the Project site has been planned for urban development as part of the EVCSP. Furthermore, the City of Redlands retains substantial areas of agricultural lands within the City. Specifically, substantial agricultural preserves exist in the City's Canyon areas; concentrated areas of agricultural lands remain in the northern areas of the City; and the City maintains broad areas for Citrus production throughout the City. This is further confirmed by the City's General Plan, which demonstrates that many agricultural lands remain within the City (see Redlands Planning Area MEA Figure 5.2, Agricultural Lands). Implementation of the Project will therefore have a less than significant impact to the conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. (DEIR p. 3.2-10.)

Impact AG-2: Would the proposed Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Agricultural Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project's will have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. (DEIR pp. 3.2-10 to 3.2-11.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site's underlying zoning is EV/SD (Special Development), of the EVSP. Concept Plan No. 4 was thereafter applied to development of the Project site, which is consistent with the Projects proposed uses. Additionally, according to the City of Redlands General Plan, the Project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. (DEIR pp. 3.2-10 to 3.2-11.)

In addition, a growth control zoning ordinance within the City of Redlands known as Proposition R, as amended by Measure N, purports to allow no more than 2800 residential units (excluding congregate and single room occupancy units) to be built within the City and 1,050 units provided with service connections located in the County and later to be annexed into the City. The Project does not propose to develop residential uses within the Project site. Therefore, the City's Proposition R and Measure N are not applicable to this Project. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, nor would it affect any Williamson Act contract. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.2-11.)

Impact AG-3: Would the proposed 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))?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Agricultural Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds no significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to 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)). (DEIR pp. 3.2-11 to 3.2-12.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: While the Project will remove the existing Eucalyptus trees located along the northern property boundary, just south of San Bernardino Avenue, the Project site does not contain any forestland or timberland as defined within Threshold 2(c). In addition, according to Public Resources Code sections 12220(g) and 4526, "Forest land" is land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. The Project site is regularly disked and is highly disturbed from past agricultural and human activities, and non-native ruderal forbs and grasses dominate the site. In addition, the Project site does not contain flowing water or standing pools, nor does the site support any vegetation or resources that serves as a habitat for the migratory fish or wildlife. Therefore, land use and development activities contemplated by the proposed Project are not considered a forest resource and would not impact these resources. No impacts would occur. (DEIR p. 3.2-11.)

Impact AG-4: Would the proposed Project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Agricultural Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds no significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. (DEIR p. 3.2-12.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site is designated as EV/SD (East Valley Specific Plan/ Special Development) District according to the City of Redlands Zoning Map, which is a non-forest zoning designation. In addition, according to Public Resources Code sections 12220(g) and 4526, "Forest land" is land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. The Project site is regularly disked and is highly disturbed from past agricultural and human activities, and non-native ruderal forbs and grasses dominate the site. In addition, the Project site does not contain flowing water or standing pools, nor does the site support any vegetation or resources that serves as a habitat for the migratory fish or wildlife. Therefore, land use and development activities contemplated by the proposed Project are not considered a forest resource and would not impact these resources. This condition precludes the possibility of the proposed Project conflicting with a forest zoning designation. No impacts would occur. (DEIR p. 3.2-12.)

Impact AG-5: Would the proposed 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?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Agricultural Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project will have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to involve changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use. (DEIR p. 3.2-13.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Previous uses of the Project site include agricultural production. Some of the land in the surrounding area has been farmed in the recent past, and some surrounding parcels are used on an infrequent basis for agriculture. It is possible that development of the Project site as a commercial use will incrementally increase pressure on surrounding agricultural land to convert to non-agricultural use. However, according to the City's General Plan land use map, the immediate area of the Project site allows for commercial uses similar to the Project site and low density residential uses similar to the existing residential uses along Karon Street located to the southeast of the Project site. Implementation of the Project would not interfere with such uses. Therefore, the impacts in this regard would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.2-13.)

3. Biological Resources

Impact BR-2: Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Biological Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project will have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS. (DEIR pp. 3.4-13 to 3.4-14.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site does not contain any riparian/riverine habitat. In addition, no vernal pools, vernal pool habitat, or fairy shrimp habitat occur on the Project site. The habitat assessment conducted for the Project determined that the Project site does not contain sensitive natural community as identified in local or State plans or by the CDFG or USFWS (MBA 2009). Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact to any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, and no mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.4-13.)

Impact BR-3: Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Biological Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds no significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. (DEIR p. 3.4-14.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: According to the jurisdictional delineation for the Project, there are no USACE or CDFG wetlands or riparian areas on the Project site; therefore, there would be no potential impacts to federally protected wetlands. (DEIR p. 3.4-14.)

Impact BR-4: Would the proposed 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 wildlife nursery sites?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Biological Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to 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 wildlife nursery sites. (DEIR pp. 3.4-14 to 3.4-15.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site does not contain flowing water or standing pools, nor does the site support any vegetation or resources that serves as a habitat for the migratory fish or wildlife. The site does not lie within any known wildlife corridors. In addition, the use of the Project site as a wildlife corridor is unlikely, given the close proximity of residential development to the east, the State Route 210 (SR-210) Freeway located immediately west of the site, and the I-10 Freeway located approximately one mile south of the Project site. Further, no regional wildlife corridor traverses, or is in proximity to the Project site. Therefore, implementation of the Project will have a less than significant impact on wildlife movement routes or result in habitat fragmentation. No mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.4-14.)

Impact BR-5: Would the proposed Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Biological Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project will have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. (DEIR pp. 3.4-15 to 3.4-16.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The following are the implementing policies related to biological resources within the City of Redlands General Plan applicable to the Project.

Policy 7.21h - Require a biological assessment of any project site where species or the habitat of species defined as sensitive or special status by the DFG or the USFWS might be present. A General Biological Resource and Habitat Assessment Report was prepared for the Project by LSA Associates, Inc. on August 1, 2005. The report was updated by MBA on March 5, 2009. The report determined that the Project site does not contain any species or habitat species defined as sensitive or special status by the DFG or the USFWS. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.4-15.)

Policy 7.21 - Evaluate the habitat value of agricultural fields and groves prior to conversion to other uses; if habitat value is significant, consider a development plan, which incorporates open space uses of similar value.

A General Biological Resource and Habitat Assessment Report prepared for the Project analyzed the habitat value of agricultural fields and citrus groves. The Project site has been historically utilized for agriculture purposes as an orchard. However, the updated report indicated that the previously mapped Citrus Grove has been changed. The citrus farming in the Project site has been discontinued and the orange trees have been destroyed, cut, and left in place (MBA 2009a). Therefore, at present, the Project site does not contain significant habitat value in regard to agricultural fields and grooves and therefore

conversion of the Project site to the Redlands Crossing Center would result in a less than significant impact, and mitigation is not required. (DEIR pp. 3.4-15 to 3.4-16.)

Impact BR-6: Would the proposed Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Biological Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds no significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. (DEIR p. 3.4-16.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: There are no local, regional or State approved conservation plans applicable to the Project. Therefore, the Project will not conflict with the provisions of any adopted habitat/natural community conservation plan and impacts would remain less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.4-16.)

4. Cultural Resources

Impact CR-1: Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA §15064.5?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Cultural Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA §15064.5. (DEIR pp. 3.5-14 to 3.5-18.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Assessment indicated that three known historical cultural resources are located within the Project site and 15 additional cultural resources are located within one mile of the Project site. Phase II significance testing was carried out for each of the individual cultural resources that are located in the Project site. To be significant, an historical resource would have to demonstrate one or more of the following criteria under the Public Resources Code (PRC) §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Chapter 11.5, Section 4852: 1. It is associated with the events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of California history and cultural heritage; 2. It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past; 3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic value; 4. or It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (DEIR p. 3.5-14.)

The three historic cultural resources that are located within the Project site (CA-SBR-7765H, CA-SBR-7766H and CA-SBR-7767H) are described and evaluated within the Phase II test chapter of the Assessment document. (DEIR p. 3.5-15.)

The historical resource CA-SBR-7765H was evaluated under the four criteria of the CR, which are outlined in Public Resources Code (PRC) §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Chapter 11.5, Section 4852. MBA (2009) determined that the resource does not meet the criteria for listing in the CR under the context of Redlands citrus history primarily because the data set is considered exhausted. The resource does not exhibit orchards, structures or complete historical irrigation systems that might tie the resource directly into the locally significant and fast disappearing historical citrus industry. (DEIR p. 3.5-15.)

Under Criterion 1, the Assessment analyzed the resource's potential for significance as a part of an historic trend that may have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. According to the Assessment, the resource does not contain enough evidence that substantive subsurface historic deposits are located within or near the resource, the original orchard complex has been compromised through abandonment and demolition, and it is unlikely additional information shall be obtained from other historic sources. Therefore, CA-SBR-7765H does not appear to qualify for the CR under Criterion 1. (DEIR p. 3.5-15.)

Under Criterion 2, the Assessment analyzed the resource's potential for its association with the lives of persons significant in our past. According to the Assessment, the remnants of the resource do not appear to be associated with individuals who were locally, regionally or nationally important. Therefore, the CA-SBR-7765H does not appear to qualify for the CR under Criterion 2. (DEIR p. 3.5-15.)

Under Criterion 3, the Assessment analyzed the resource's potential for embodying the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or representing the work of a master, possessing high artistic values, or representing a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction. According to the Assessment, the resource does not exhibit any of these qualities. Therefore, CA-SBR-7765H does not appear to qualify for the CR under Criterion 3. (DEIR p. 3.5-15.)

Under Criterion 4, the Assessment analyzed the resource's potential to yield information to prehistory or history. According to the Assessment, research has shown that it is very unlikely that additional intact historic data associated with this resource will be found during future earthmoving on the Project property. Therefore, CA-SBR-7765H does not appear to qualify for the CR under Criterion 4. (DEIR p. 3.5-15.)

Given the current design of the Project, CA-SBR-7765H will be directly impacted by construction. Since the site has been deemed not significant through a Phase II assessment and all information available about the resource has been exhausted, all Project-related impacts to this resource are considered less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.5-15.)

The historical site CA-SBR-7766H was evaluated under the four criteria of the CR, which is outlined in PRC §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Chapter 11.5, Section 4852. The Cultural Resource Assessment determined that the site does not meet the criteria for the CR under the context of Redlands citrus history primarily because the data set is considered exhausted. The site does not exhibit orchards, structures or complete historical irrigation systems that might tie into the locally significant and fast disappearing historical citrus industry. (DEIR p. 3.5-16.)

Under Criterion 1, the Assessment analyzed the resource's potential for significance as a part of an historic trend that may have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. According to the Assessment, the resource does not contain enough evidence that substantive subsurface historic deposits are located within or near the resource, the original orchard complex has been compromised through abandonment and demolition, and it is unlikely additional information shall be obtained from other historic sources. Therefore, CA-SBR-7766H does not appear to qualify for the CR under Criterion 1. (DEIR p. 3.5-16.)

Under Criterion 2, the Assessment analyzed the resource's potential for its association with the lives of persons significant in our past. According to the Assessment, the remnants of the resource do not appear to be associated with individuals who were locally, regionally or nationally important. Therefore, the CA-SBR-7766H does not appear to qualify for the CR under Criterion 2. (DEIR p. 3.5-16.)

Under Criterion 3, the Assessment analyzed the resource's potential for embodying the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or representing the work of a master, possessing high artistic values, or representing a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction. According to the Assessment, the resource does not exhibit any of these qualities. Therefore, CA-SBR-7766H does not appear to qualify for the CR under Criterion 3. (DEIR p. 3.5-16.)

Under Criterion 4, the Assessment analyzed the resource's potential to yield information to prehistory or history. According to the Assessment, research has shown that it is very unlikely that additional intact historic data associated with this resource will be found during future earthmoving on the Project property. Therefore, CA-SBR-7766H does not appear to qualify for the CR under Criterion 4. (DEIR p. 3.5-16.)

Given the current design of the Project, CA-SBR-7766H will be directly impacted by construction. Since the site has been deemed not significant through a Phase II assessment and all information available about the resource has been exhausted, all Project-related impacts to this resource are considered less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.5-16.)

The historical site CA-SBR-7767H was evaluated under the four criteria of the CR, which is outlined in PRC §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Chapter 11.5, Section 4852. The Cultural Resource Assessment determined that the site does not meet the criteria for the CR under the context of Redlands citrus history primarily because the data set is considered exhausted. The site does not exhibit orchards, structures or complete historical irrigation systems that might tie into the locally significant and fast disappearing historical citrus industry. (DEIR pp. 3.5-16 to 3.5-17.)

Under Criterion 1, the Assessment analyzed the resource's potential for significance as a part of an historic trend that may have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. According to the Assessment, the resource does not contain enough evidence that substantive subsurface historic deposits are located within or near the resource, the original orchard complex has been compromised through abandonment and demolition, and it is unlikely additional information shall be obtained from other historic sources. Therefore, CA-SBR-7767H does not appear to qualify for the CR under Criterion 1. (DEIR p. 3.5-17.)

Under Criterion 2, the Assessment analyzed the resource's potential for its association with the lives of persons significant in our past. According to the Assessment, the remnants of the resource do not appear to be associated with individuals who were locally, regionally or nationally important. Therefore, the CA-SBR-7767H does not appear to qualify for the CR under Criterion 2. (DEIR p. 3.5-17.)

Under Criterion 3, the Assessment analyzed the resource's potential for embodying the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or representing the work of a master, possessing high artistic values, or representing a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction. According to the Assessment, the resource does not exhibit any of these qualities. Therefore, CA-SBR-7767H does not appear to qualify for the CR under Criterion 3. (DEIR p. 3.5-17.)

Under Criterion 4, the Assessment analyzed the resource's potential to yield information to prehistory or history. According to the Assessment, research has shown that it is very unlikely that additional intact historic data associated with this resource will be found during future earthmoving on the Project property. Therefore, CA-SBR-7767H does not appear to qualify for the CR under Criterion 4. (DEIR p. 3.5-17.)

Given the current design of the Project, CA-SBR-7767H will be directly impacted by construction. Since the site has been deemed not significant through a Phase II assessment and all information available about the resource has been exhausted, all Project-related impacts to this resource are considered less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.5-17.)

In summary, the Phase II testing indicated that none of the above sites meets any of the following criteria established by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 to be considered "unique historic properties" (MBA 2009b). One new cultural resource site (P#36-013622) was identified during Phase II Survey. However, recordation of the feature exhausted the data set associated with historic cultural resources, thereby mitigating for impacts if the site is altered or destroyed by construction. Therefore, impacts to any historic resources on the Project site will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.5-17.)

5. Geology and Soils

Impact GS-1: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; strong seismic ground shaking; Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Geology and Soils are discussed in detail in Section 3.6 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; strong seismic ground shaking; Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides. (DEIR pp. 3.6-16 to 3.6-17.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site is located in an area of regular seismic activity and is prone to periodic earthquakes, as is all of southern California. Specifically, the Project is located between two of the most active faults, the San Jacinto and the San Andreas Fault Zones. The potential seismic hazards include fault rupture, strong ground shaking, ground failure, and landsliding. The geotechnical investigation report evaluated the potential for these seismic hazards; the results are summarized below. (DEIR p. 3.6-16.)

Fault Rupture - The site is not within any EFZ as created by the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone Act. The nearest "zoned" active fault is the San Jacinto Valley Segment of the San Jacinto Fault Zone (Type B fault), located approximately 4.6 miles from the Project site (Exhibit 3.6-2, Regional Faults). Therefore, the potential for fault-induced ground rupture on the site is less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.6-16.)

Seismic Ground Shaking - The surrounding area contains several regional faults, which have the potential to generate strong ground motions at the Project site. An earthquake occurring on the San Jacinto Valley Segment of the San Jacinto Fault Zone would cause the most severe shaking. This fault has the potential of generating peak horizontal ground accelerations of 0.49 g (approximately 49 percent of the force of gravity applied in the horizontal direction). Given the moderate horizontal accelerations that could occur at this site (0.49 g), the impact of strong seismic ground motion could be a potentially significant impact. However, the Project site is located at a significant distance from the identified fault zone and the Project site shows no mapped faults on-site according to Geotechnical Hazards Map (GP Figure 8.3) in Section 8.0 Health and Safety of the General Plan of the City. In addition, the City of

Redlands enforces a variety of codes to ensure the structural integrity of buildings constructed within the City. The City adopted revisions of the UBC that address the specific building conditions and structural requirements in California. CCR, Title 24, Part 2, the CBC, provides minimum standards for building design in California. The City has adopted the 2010 CBC, as the City's building code which incorporates the most current seismic design standards and hazard reduction measures recommended by the ATC the SEAOC, the EERI, the Seismic Safety Commission, and the Southern California Earthquake Center. Compliance with the State building code and building standards (i.e., Uniform Building Code/California Building Code for Zone 4), as well as the City's development review process, and the design guidelines outlined in the Project geotechnical studies should reduce ground shaking impacts to less than significant levels, and no mitigation is required. (DEIR pp. 3.6-16 to 3.6-17.)

Seismic-Related Ground Failure - The liquefaction potential of the Project site was evaluated based upon soil type, groundwater depth, relative density, initial confining pressure and the intensity and duration of ground shaking. Based on the findings on the geotechnical investigation, the potential for seismic induced soil liquefaction within the Project site is low due to underlying soil characteristics and absence of shallow groundwater. Therefore, the Project's impacts on seismic-related ground failure are less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.6-17.)

Landslides - A review of the "Slope Map," Figure 8.4 of City of Redlands General Plan, shows that the Project site is not located within an area prone to slope instability. The site reconnaissance does not show evidence of onsite landslides and the primary earth material at the site is resistant to landslides (KA 2005). In addition, the Project site area is a nearly leveled area and does not contain any unstable or steep slopes, which have a higher tendency for landslide activity. Therefore, based upon the existing topography and proposed design configurations, the occurrence of landslide due to seismic events is less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.6-17.)

Impact GS-4: Would the proposed Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-A of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Geology and Soils are discussed in detail in Section 3.6 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-A of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property. (DEIR pp. 3.6-19 to 3.6-20.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The laboratory tests indicate that on-site soils have very low expansion potential. The geotechnical report for the Project site indicate that on-site soils do not contain expansive clay materials and have low shrink-swell properties that may expose buildings to structural damage. In addition, subsidence within the building area is anticipated at less than 0.05 feet (KA 2005). Compliance with the recommendations set forth in the geotechnical report should render any risks associated with expansive soils to less than significant levels, and therefore no mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.6-19.)

Impact GS-5: Would the proposed Project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Geology and Soils are discussed in detail in Section 3.6 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project will gave a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to have soils incapable of adequately

supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. (DEIR p. 3.6-20.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project will connect to the City of Redlands sewer system. Accordingly, potential soil constraints for using septic or alternative wastewater disposal systems are not applicable and therefore, this is a less than significant impact. No mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.6-20.)

6. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact HHM-3: Would the proposed Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are discussed in detail in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project will have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (DEIR p. 3.7-15.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site is approximately 1,600 feet (0.30 mile) south from the closest school site (Citrus Valley High School, 800 West Pioneer Avenue), which is over the minimum 1,320 foot (one-quarter mile) significant threshold of CEQA. Therefore, impacts to school sites will be less than significant due to the distance from the Project site. No mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.7-15.)

Impact HHM-4: Would the proposed 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, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are discussed in detail in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project will have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. (DEIR pp. 3.7-15 to 3.7-16.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site is not listed on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. In addition, based on the site reconnaissance and a review of physiographic, historical, and regulatory information, there is no evidence of incidents or accidents involving hazardous materials on the Project site. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.7-15.)

Impact HHM-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the proposed Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working the project area?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are discussed in detail in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to 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, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working the project area. (DEIR p. 3.7-16.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site is located more than two miles from the Redlands Municipal Airport (east). Therefore, the Project site is not located within an applicable Airport Safety Area, respectively. The Project site is, however, located approximately 1.86 miles northwest of the SBD. The SBD Airport allows for Stage 2 aircraft and has over 60,000 annual flight operations comprised mainly of charter, corporate and general aviation users. The width of SBD Airport's northeast to southwest facing runway is 10,000' x 200' (3,408 x 61 meters) and approximately 11,000 feet in length. Additionally, the Airport has recently completed a redesigned Passenger Terminal Facility in anticipation of future passenger airlines services (SBD website 2009). (DEIR p. 3.7-16.)

Currently, the SBD Airport is in the process of updating their Airport Land Use Plan. As per conversation with Bill Ingraham (August 6, 2009), analysis of the Project should be compared to the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (January 2002) as a guideline for the Project's impacts to the SBD Airport. According to Figure 9K of the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, long general aviation runways with a length of 6,000 feet or more require a safety compatibility zone setback of 6,000 feet. The Project site is located approximately 9,800 feet from the northeast corner of SBD's runway. Therefore, the Project site is well over the minimum required safety compatibility zone setback of 6,000 feet and will not put people at significant risk related to a safety hazard for people residing or working the Project area. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.7-16.)

Impact HHM-6: For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the proposed Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are discussed in detail in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project due to its location within the vicinity of a private airstrip, to result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. (DEIR pp. 3.7-16 to 3.7-17.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site is not located within two miles of a private airstrip and is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip that would warrant any safety concerns related to aircraft uses. Therefore, the Project would not put people at a significant risk of safety hazard related to a nearby private airstrip. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.7-17.)

Impact HHM-7: Would the proposed Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are discussed in detail in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. (DEIR pp. 3.7-17 to 3.7-18.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The City of Redlands has an Emergency Disaster Plan that identifies specific evacuation routes within the City. In addition, the San Bernardino County General Plan

designates potential evacuation routes in the event of an emergency. Within the San Bernardino Valley, the major routes out of the County are Interstates 10, 15, and 215, along with State Highways 30 (now State Highway 210), 31, 60, 66, 71, and numerous major and secondary highways. (DEIR p. 3.7-17.)

Caltrans has identified a number of possible evacuation routes in the San Bernardino Valley. These roads have the least number of bridges, and may be among the safest roads to travel in the event of a major earthquake. In the East Valley, those roads, which connect with the Planning Area, include: Hospitality Drive from Tippecanoe Avenue to Waterman Avenue; Coulston Street from Mountain View Avenue to Tippecanoe Avenue; Lugonia Avenue from Orange Street to Mountain View Avenue; and Redlands Boulevard from Orange Street to Waterman Avenue. (DEIR p. 3.7-17.)

An increase in short-term construction traffic is anticipated and could temporarily affect traffic flow on nearby roadways used for evacuation routes. However, nearby roadways currently include wide paved lanes that could be used by vehicles to allow emergency vehicles to pass. Therefore, short-term construction related impacts in regards to evacuation routes would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.7-17.)

In addition, Project implementation would not hinder the City of Redlands ability to coordinate with San Bernardino County or Caltrans on its emergency response and emergency evacuation plans. As the primary north-south transportation corridor through the City, the adjacent SR-210 serves as an obvious route for both emergency response and emergency evacuation purposes. In addition, the Project would introduce on-site emergency response or evacuation plans, including employees who would be subject to emergency evacuation or response in the event of a major disaster. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact regarding emergency evacuation plans. (DEIR pp. 3.7-17 to 3.7-18.)

Impact HHM-8: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are discussed in detail in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. (DEIR pp. 3.7-17 to 3.7-18.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: According to California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the Project area is categorized as having a non-VHFHSZ (Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones) risk from fires. There are also City fire stations in the general Project area. The closest City fire station is located at 10 West Pennsylvania Avenue (Fire Station 263), approximately 0.8-mile east of the Project site at the intersection of Pennsylvania Avenue and Orange Street. In addition, the Redlands Fire Department (RFD) has a mutual aid agreement with the San Bernardino County Fire Department (SBCFD), which allows the SBCFD to provide fire services to areas within the City of Redlands and vice versa. The closest SBCFD fire station to the Project site is Station 9, located at 1300 Crafton Avenue, Mentone. The SBCFD provides complete fire protection, including fire, public service and emergency medical aid response, but County services do not include ambulance and transport services. In addition, The RFD has mutual aid agreements with the California Department of Forestry, and the Loma Linda Fire Department. Consistency with the mutual aid program will reduce impacts to the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with

wildlands. Therefore, the Project will have less than significant impacts related to wildland fire hazards. No mitigation is required. For more analysis regarding fire hazards, see Section 3.13, Public Services. (DEIR p. 3.7-17.)

7. Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact HWQ-4: Would the proposed Project 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?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Hydrology and Water Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to 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. (DEIR p. 3.8-23.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Implementation of the Project will increase the runoff flow due to the creation of additional impervious surfaces on the Project site. In order to mitigate the potential impact associated with such increased flows, the Project will be required to prepare and comply with various documents pertaining to stormwater runoff. Specifically, the Project will be required to complete a NPDES permit, which will require the preparation of a SWPPP for construction related activities. SWPPPs identify BMPs to mitigate construction related pollutants from reaching stormwater and products of erosion from moving off-site. Furthermore, the Project specific WQMP provide guidance for wastewater conservation after construction. (DEIR p. 3.8-23.)

The Project drainage plan allows the majority of drainage from impervious surface to permeable areas for on-site infiltration. One surface-level infiltration basin and four (4) underground infiltration basins have been incorporated into the site plan to reduce the runoff water (AE 2007). In addition, the drainage report indicates that the proposed drainage system (pond, sediment pond, and underground systems) will control the total peak flow volume of runoff to level similar to the pre-development runoff levels. (DEIR p. 3.8-23.)

Therefore, with the consideration of the Project design features and implementation of BMPs as discussed in Preliminary WQMP, the Project's runoff water would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainages systems. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.8-23.)

Impact HWQ-5: Would the proposed Project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Hydrology and Water Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. (DEIR p. 3.8-24.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: According to the FEMA, the Project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area (AE 2008). In addition, the Project does not propose to develop residential housing within the Project site. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in the construction of

housing improvements within the ascribed flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows, and the impact will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.8-24.)

Impact HWQ-6: Would the proposed Project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Hydrology and Water Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. (DEIR p. 3.8-24.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: According to the FEMA, the Project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area (AE 2008). Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in the construction of improvements within the ascribed flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows, and the impact will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.8-24.)

Impact HWQ-7: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Hydrology and Water Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds no significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. (DEIR p. 3.8-25.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site is not within a dam inundation zone as there are no dams near the site. The nearest dam to the Project site is the Seven Oaks Dam, located approximately 8.2 miles northeast to the Project site. Therefore, due to the distance to the nearest dam, there is no risk of significant loss, injury, or death as a result of flooding or inundation due to dam failure and there would be no impact in this regard. (DEIR p. 3.8-25.)

Impact HWQ-8: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Hydrology and Water Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (DEIR p. 3.8-25.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site is located approximately 50 miles from the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, tsunamis (seismic sea waves) are not a significant hazard to the site. Additionally, the site is not located close to any large bodies of water that could adversely affect the site in the event of seiche (seismic wave oscillations in an enclosed or semi-enclosed body of water). Further, the Project site and surrounding area are generally level and the potential impacts from mudflow are nil. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows. (DEIR p. 3.8-25.)

8. Land Use and Planning

Impact LUP-1: Would the proposed Project physically divide an established community?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Land Use and Planning are discussed in detail in Section 3.9 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to physically divide an established community. (DEIR p. 3.9-10.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project will be constructed on vacant and undeveloped land. The Project site does not consist of any established communities. A residential neighborhood exists along Karon Street, the eastern boundary of the Project site. However, the remaining areas adjacent to the Project site are undeveloped and vacant. Therefore, the Project does not have the potential to divide an established community so this impact is less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.9-10.)

Impact LUP-2: Would the proposed Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Land Use and Planning are discussed in detail in Section 3.9 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (DEIR pp. 3.9-10 to 3.9-11.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site is within the jurisdiction of City of Redlands and is therefore subject to the City's General Plan goals and policies. The Project site is also located within the EVCSP to refine the City's General Plan policies for the Project area. The purpose of the EVCSP is to plan for large undeveloped areas located along I-10 in the Redlands and Loma Linda area to provide guidance for future industrial, commercial, and residential development in an orderly and aesthetic manner. The objectives of the EVCSP are to provide a well-planned community that attracts major businesses into the area to provide a job base for the surrounding area and strengthen the local economy, while ensuring high-quality development through design guidelines and standards. Therefore, the Project is subject to both the City's General Plan and EVCSP goals and policies. Table 3.9-1 in the Draft EIR provides an analysis of consistency with policies in the City of Redlands General Plan that directly relates to the mix of land uses in the EVC. (DEIR p. 3.9-10.)

The Project is within the EVCSP, which serves as the principal land use planning document-guiding development within the EVCSP planning area of the City of Redlands. According to the EVCSP Final EIR (October 1988), land use was determined to have a significant and unavoidable impact due to the near total elimination of prime agricultural lands at EVCSP buildout. A statement of overriding considerations was determined in October 1988, regarding EVCSP land uses. Table 3.9-2 in the Draft EIR provides an analysis of consistency with policies in the EVCSP that directly relates to the Project. (DEIR pp. 3.9-11 to 3.9-12.)

The Project is consistent with existing applicable land use policies and designations of the Redlands General Plan and EVSCP. In addition, the proposed development would be in accordance with the land use designations identified in the City's General Plan and EVSCP. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations, and would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.9-12.)

Impact LUP-3: Would the proposed Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community's conservation plan?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Land Use and Planning are discussed in detail in Section 3.9 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities' conservation plan. (DEIR pp. 3.9-12 to 3.9-13.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans that apply to the Project site, therefore, the Project will have a less than significant impact associated with conflicts with applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. See Section 3.4, Biological Resources, in the Draft EIR for additional discussions in this regard. (DEIR p. 3.9-12.)

9. Mineral Resources

Impact MR-1: Would the proposed 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 state or 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?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Mineral Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.10 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state or 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. (DEIR pp. 3.10-10 to 3.10-11.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Data from the State indicates the Project site is within an MRZ-2 classification. MRZ-2 classification are areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists. Development of the Project could significantly impact 23.9 acres of prime mineral resources within the City of Redlands. (DEIR p. 3.10-10.)

Although the Project site contains significant aggregate resources, the Mentone Dam places flood control within the Project area, also known as Sector F, and puts a question on the future availability of much of the resource in this area. The MRZ-2 area designated as "F" is so large, that putting the Project site to use as commercial development will not result in the loss of availability of any resource or access to that resource. In addition, due to the water table and clay layers of this area, much of the younger sediments are not economical to mine for sand and gravel. Finally, as identified within Policy 7.42c of the City of Redlands General Plan, the City will reserve designated MRZ areas outside the Santa Ana Wash for agricultural or urban use. The Project is located outside of the Santa Ana Wash and will be consistent with designated land uses at the Project site (CP-4). Therefore, the City's General Plan designation and zoning classification do not permit mining activities on the Project site. Consequently, potential impacts to these resources are considered to be less than significant. (DEIR pp. 3.10-10 to 3.10-11.)

10. Noise

Impact N-1: Would the proposed Project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Noise are discussed in detail in Section 3.11 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. (DEIR pp. 3.11-19 to 3.11-47.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are the eight homes that front Karon Street which, are located approximately 75 feet east of the proposed area to be graded. In compliance with Section 8.06.090(F) of the City's Noise ordinance, all grading and construction-related activities will be undertaken in between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and will not be undertaken anytime on Sundays or holidays. Therefore, construction noise will not violate City ordinances standards or requirements. (DEIR p. 3.11-19.)

Please note that potential affects addressed under this impact statement consider only whether city requirements would be violated. The potential impacts of construction noise with respect to temporary substantial increases in ambient noise levels, in particular how they would affect the eight homes that front Karon Street, are addressed under impact N-4 in the Draft EIR and findings. (DEIR p. 3.11-19.)

The potential off-site noise impacts caused through the increase in vehicular traffic from the operations of the Project onto the Project study area roadways has been analyzed for existing with Project, year 2013 without Project, year 2013 with Project, year 2030 without Project, and year 2030 with Project scenarios. The analysis provided includes traffic noise conditions with and without Project conditions for Year 2013 and 2030. In addition, information for each Project condition includes separate information for weekday and Saturday traffic noise levels. These scenarios are consistent with those used in the traffic analysis dated September 14, 2011 for this Project and all distance referenced in the various tables are measured from street centerlines. (DEIR p. 3.11-19.)

In order for off-site roadway noise impacts created by the proposed Project's operations to be considered significant, the proposed Project would need to increase the noise levels for a noise sensitive land use by (1) 6 dBA CNEL, where the without Project noise level is less than 60 dBA CNEL; or (2) 4 dBA CNEL, where the without Project noise level is greater than 60 dBA CNEL. These criteria for significance have been previously discussed in Section 3.11.2, Regulatory Framework. The proposed Project's off-site traffic noise impacts have been analyzed for the existing, year 2013 and year 2030 weekday and Saturday conditions and are discussed below. (DEIR p. 3.11-35.)

The results shown in Table 3.11-16 of the Draft EIR shows that for the year 2013-weekday conditions, noise level contributions from the proposed Project onto the nearby roadways would range from 0.0 to 0.6 dBA CNEL. A 0.6 dBA noise increase would be below the thresholds of significance discussed above in Section 3.11.2, Regulatory Framework. Therefore, for the year 2013 weekday conditions a less than significant off-site noise impact from Project-related vehicle traffic noise would occur along the study area roadways. (DEIR p. 3.11-35.)

The results shown in Table 3.11-18 of the Draft EIR shows that for the year 2013 Saturday conditions, noise level contributions from the proposed Project onto the nearby roadways would range from 0.1 to

1.0 dBA CNEL. A 1.0 dBA noise increase would be below the thresholds of significance discussed above in Section 3.11.2, Regulatory Framework. Therefore, for the year 2013 Saturday conditions, a less than significant off-site noise impact from Project-related vehicle traffic noise would occur along the study area roadways. (DEIR p. 3.11-37.)

The results shown in Table 3.11-19 of the Draft EIR shows that for the year 2030-weekday conditions, noise level contributions from the proposed Project onto the nearby roadways would range from 0.0 to 0.6 dBA CNEL. A 0.6 dBA noise increase would be below the thresholds of significance discussed above in Section 3.11.2, Regulatory Framework. Therefore, for the year 2030 weekday conditions, a less than significant off-site noise impact from Project-related vehicle traffic noise would occur along the study area roadways. (DEIR p. 3.11-39.)

The results shown in Table 3.11-20 of the Draft EIR shows that for the year 2030 Saturday conditions, noise level contributions from the proposed Project onto the nearby roadways would range from 0.0 to 0.7 dBA CNEL. A 0.7 dBA noise increase would be below the thresholds of significance discussed above in Section 3.11.2, Regulatory Framework. Therefore, for the year 2030 Saturday conditions, a less than significant off-site noise impact from Project-related vehicle traffic noise would occur along the study area roadways. (DEIR p. 3.11-41.)

The Project would have potential stationary noise impacts to the nearby residences from the proposed rooftop HVAC units, truck loading areas, parking lot areas, drive-through speakers, car wash, and on-site vehicular traffic. In order to assess the Project's stationary noise impacts onto the nearby residences, the SoundPlan modeling software was utilized. The modeling methodology and input parameters used to assess stationary noise impacts is provided in Section 8.2.1 of the noise impact analysis, which can be found in Appendix H of this document. (DEIR p. 3.11-42.)

The stationary only noise levels created by the Project were calculated for the facades of the nearest sensitive receptors, the 8 homes located along Karon Street. The results, which are summarized in Table 3.11-21, shows that the proposed Project's combined stationary and transportation noise impacts would increase the noise levels at the nearby sensitive receivers from -1.0 to 0.4 dBA CNEL. The decrease in noise levels at Receivers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 is primarily due to the noise shielding the Project buildings would provide from SR-210, which is the primary noise source in the study area. Based on the threshold of significance defined above, a less than significant combined transportation and stationary noise impact would occur from the operations of the proposed Project. (DEIR pp. 3.11-42 to 3.11-43.)

Since the sensitive receptors located near the Project site may be impacted by both on-site stationary noise and off-site traffic noise from the Project, the potential noise impacts from the combined Project-related stationary and transportation noise sources have been analyzed. In order to determine the Project combined stationary and transportation impacts onto the nearby residences, a Year 2013 Saturday without Project scenario and a Year 2013 Saturday with Project scenario were analyzed using the SoundPlan model. Both scenarios were based on the SoundPlan modeling methodology used for the stationary only analysis. The Saturday scenario was selected over the weekday scenario since the Project is anticipated to generate more traffic on Saturdays and the Year 2013 was chosen over the Year 2030 since the percentage of Project vehicular traffic on the nearby roadways is greater in 2013. Detailed information on the modeling methodology and input parameters used to assess the combined noise impacts is provided in Section 8.3.1 of the noise impact analysis, which can be found in Appendix H of the EIR. Exhibit 3.11-2 shows the year 2013 Saturday without Project noise contours and Exhibit 3.11-3 shows the year 2013 Saturday with Project noise contours. (DEIR p. 3.11-43.)

Table 3.11-22 in the Draft EIR shows that the Project's combined stationary and transportation noise impacts would result in noise levels at the sensitive receivers ranging from -1.0 to 0.4 dBA CNEL compared to the Year 2013 no-Project conditions. The decrease in noise levels at Receivers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 is primarily due to the noise shielding the Project buildings would provide from the SR-210 Freeway, which is the primary noise source in the study area. Based on the threshold of significance defined above, a less than significant combined transportation and stationary noise impact would occur from the operations of the Project. (DEIR pp. 3.11-43 to 3.11-44.)

In addition, the loading areas for the proposed Walmart would be the nearest proposed loading areas to the existing off-site residences at approximately 500 feet. Receivers 1, 2, and 3 represent the nearest receivers to the proposed loading docks. Table 3.11-22 of the Draft EIR shows that the proposed Project would reduce the noise levels at these Receivers, primarily through additional noise protection that the proposed structures would provide from Interstate 210. Therefore, the with Project noise levels in Table 3.11-22 show that the loading areas would conform to Section 8.06.090(E) of the City of Redlands Municipal Code, since the proposed Project would not create a noise disturbance across a residential real property line from the loading areas. This analysis includes the noise emanating directly from stationary sources at the Project site. Therefore impacts would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.11-44.)

Impact N-2: Would the proposed Project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Noise are discussed in detail in Section 3.11 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. (DEIR p. 3.11-49.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are residential homes along Karon Street located approximately 75 feet east of the proposed area to be graded. Construction activities can produce vibration that may be felt by adjacent uses. The construction of the Project would not require the use of equipment such as jackhammers and pile drivers, which are known to generate substantial construction vibration levels. The primary sources of vibration during construction would be from bulldozers, backhoes, crawler tractors, and scrapers. According to the noise impact analysis prepared for the Project (MBA 2011), a large bulldozer would be the piece of equipment that would produce the largest amount of vibration on the Project site with a 0.089 Particle Peak Velocity (PPV) or 87 VdB at 25 feet. (DEIR p. 3.11-49.)

The closest vibration-sensitive land uses are the eight single-family residences to the east, with the nearest prefabricated residence located approximately 75 feet from the proposed area to be graded. It is anticipated that the vibration levels caused by a large bulldozer operating on the edge of the area to be graded during construction of the Project at the nearest structure will be around 0.0027 inches per second PPV, which is below City's threshold of 0.2 inch per second PPV. Therefore, construction-related vibration impacts will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.11-49.)

The Project would result in the development of approximately 275,500 square feet of commercial retail uses and would generate approximately 38 truck trips per day. The only potential source of vibration is from the operation of trucks on the Project site. According to the TIA (MBA 2011), a loaded truck would typically produce a vibration level of 0.076 inch per second PPV at 25 feet. The nearest existing residential home is located a minimum of 300 feet away from any of the proposed roadways. At this distance, this would result in a vibration level of 0.005 inch per second PPV at the nearest sensitive receptor to where the trucks would operate on-site. This vibration level would not exceed the 0.2 inch

per second PPV threshold. Therefore, vibration impacts from the ongoing operations of the Project would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.11-49.)

Impact N-3: Would the proposed Project create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Noise are discussed in detail in Section 3.11 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project. (DEIR pp. 3.11-50 to 3.11-51.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Substantial permanent increases in ambient noise levels would have the potential to occur if Project generated noise exceeds City standards and/or threshold requirements. Potential impacts are discussed below for Project generated traffic and stationary noise. (DEIR p. 3.11-50.)

As outlined within Impact N-1, the Project has potential for Long-Term off-site traffic noise impacts created from the ongoing operations of the Project. The Project's off-site noise impacts have been analyzed for the Year 2013 and Year 2030 weekday and Saturday conditions. In no instance did the Project related increase in traffic noise exceed the City's most stringent threshold standards for noise: increases in the noise levels for a noise sensitive land use by (1) 6 dBA CNEL, where the without-Project noise level is less than 60 dBA CNEL; or (2) 4 dBA CNEL, where the without Project noise level is greater than 60 dBA CNEL. The largest Project-generated increase in noise level that would occur for any of the scenarios analyzed is 1.0 dBA for the segment of San Bernardino Avenue West of Alabama Street under the 2013 Saturday conditions, resulting in an overall noise level of 66.5dBA CNEL when non- Project traffic noise is included. While the Project-generated level of increase is consistent with City threshold criteria for residential uses, it should also be noted that land adjoining this road segment is in an area that is designated for commercial land uses. The City's Land use Compatibility Matrix (Table 3.11-7 of the Draft EIR), indicates that a noise level of up to 75 dBA CNEL is clearly compatible with commercial retail uses. (DEIR p. 3.11-50.)

The Project has the potential to result in stationary noise impact to the nearby residences from the proposed rooftop HVAC units, truck loading areas, parking lot areas, drive through speakers, car wash, and on-site vehicular traffic. The stationary-only noise levels created by the Project were calculated for the facades of the same nearby sensitive receptors. The results are summarized in Table 3.11-21, which shows that for the stationary only scenario all receivers would be within the City's exterior stationary noise standard of 60 dBA Leq. Therefore, potential impact from stationary noise created by the Project would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.11-50.)

As identified under impact N-1 (Table 3.11-22 of the Draft EIR) the Project's combined stationary and transportation noise impacts would result in noise levels at the nearby sensitive receivers ranging from -1.0 to 0.4 dBA CNEL compared to the Year 2013 no- Project condition. The decrease in noise levels at Receivers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 is primarily due to the noise shielding the proposed structures would provide from the SR-210 Freeway, which is the primary noise source in the study area. Based on the threshold of significance defined above, a less than significant combined transportation and stationary noise impact would occur from the operations of the Project. (DEIR p. 3.11-51.)

Impact N-5: For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the proposed Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Noise are discussed in detail in Section 3.11 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels related to aircraft noise. (DEIR p. 3.11-54.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The nearest airports from the Project site are Redlands Municipal Airport (RMA), which is located approximately 2.5 miles northeast from the Project site and San Bernardino International Airport (SBIA), located approximately 1.8 miles northwest of the Project site. The Project site is not located within the noise impact or safety area zones for RMA or SBIA. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse aviation related impacts that the Project would expose people residing in the Project area to excessive noise levels. Impacts would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.11-54.)

Impact N-6: For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the proposed Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Noise are discussed in detail in Section 3.11 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels related to aircraft noise. (DEIR p. 3.11-54.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site is not located within two miles of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Project would not put people at a significant risk of noise hazard related to a nearby private airstrip. Impacts would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.11-54.)

11. Population and Housing

Impact PH-1: Would the proposed Project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Population and Housing are discussed in detail in Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure). (DEIR p. 3.12-5.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project is commercial in nature, including uses such as retail, commercial, fast-food/restaurant and administrative/office on approximately 23.9 acres at the southeast corner of San Bernardino Avenue and Tennessee Street. The Project does not propose any new housing on- or off-site. The Redlands Crossing Walmart would be expected to create approximately 206 new job positions. This includes the creation of 85 new job positions at the new Walmart store and approximately 121 new job positions for Parcels 1 to 9. In addition, 230 of the existing jobs at the existing Walmart store would be moved to the new Walmart store, from the potential closure of the existing Walmart store. Consequently, the Project would provide an overall of 436 jobs at the Project site. Most of the new employment opportunities created by the Project would be entry-level. The predicted growth of the City of Redlands from 2008 to 2010 is 71,807 to 73,441 residents, which

represents an increase in population by 1,634. Assuming as a worse case scenario that all employees will come from outside the City, the population influx from the Project represents approximately 26 percent of the City of Redlands predicted population growth. This increase in population induced by the Project is within the SCAG forecasted population for the City of Redlands from 2008 to 2010. (DEIR p. 3.12-5.)

The increased population will need approximately 160 housing units, given the assumption that all the employees do not already live in houses and the average household rate is 2.71 persons per household in the City of Redlands. Many of the positions will be filled with residents of the region so that the induced housing burden will be less than significant. According to SCAG estimates, the City of Redlands had 24,885 housing units in 2005. The 2010 estimate is 26,471 housing units, an increase of 1,586 units (or approximately a 6 percent increase in total inventory). The increase in number of housing units from the Project (160 units) represents approximately 10 percent of the total projected housing units increase (1,586 units) for the City of Redlands in 2010. Thus, the additional housing units necessary are insignificant compared to the available housing market, and there is sufficient housing supply to house the increase in employees. (DEIR p. 3.12-5.)

Impact PH-2: Would the proposed Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Population and Housing are discussed in detail in Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds no significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (DEIR p. 3.12-6.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site does not have existing housing units; therefore, the proposed development would not result in the displacement of housing. Moreover, implementation of the Project does not contemplate any off-site development activity that may eliminate or adversely affect existing housing supplies (or require the development of replacement housing). Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on existing housing. (DEIR p. 3.12-6.)

Impact PH-3: Would the proposed Project displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Population and Housing are discussed in detail in Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds no significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (DEIR p. 3.12-6.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: As discussed in Impact PH-2, implementation of the Project would not displace any existing houses or people. Therefore, the potential impact related to the displacement of an existing population or need to develop replacement housing is less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.12-6.)

Impact PH-4: Would the proposed Project conflict with regional growth policies established by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) as they relate to population, housing, and employment in the Project area?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project due to Population and Housing are discussed in detail in Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would

have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to conflict with regional growth policies established by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) as they relate to population, housing, and employment in the Project area. (DEIR pp. 3.12-7 to 3.12-10.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: SCAG provided a comment letter on the Project. The IGR section, part of the Environmental Planning division of SCAG's Planning and Policy, is responsible for performing consistency review of regionally significant local plans, projects, and programs with SCAG's adopted regional plans. According to SCAG's NOP comment letter (See Appendix A of the EIR for comment letter), SCAG determined that the Project is not regionally significant per SCAG IGR Criteria and CEQA Guidelines (Section 15206). In addition, SCAG's Regional Growth Principles are provided in comparison to the proposed Project. (DEIR p. 3.12-7.)

Therefore, implementation of the Project will is consistent with SCAG's Regional Growth Principles (See Table 3.12-3 in the Draft EIR) and will have a less than significant impact in regards to conflict with regional growth policies established by SCAG as they relate to population, housing, and employment in the Project area. (DEIR p. 3.12-10.)

12. Public Services

Impact PS-1: Would the proposed 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 Fire Protection?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Public Services are discussed in detail in Section 3.13 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to 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 Fire Protection. (DEIR pp. 3.13-7 to 3.13-8.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Station No. 263 of the RFD provides primary response for the Project site. Station No. 263 is located at 263 10 W. Pennsylvania Avenue, which is less than 0.8 mile east of the Project site. The estimated response time for Station No. 263 to the Project site would be approximately 1.4 minutes and will not exceed the four-minute RFD average response time (based on an average speed of 35 miles per hour). Access roads (driveways) are required per the California Fire Code when any portion of a facility or any portion of an exterior wall of the first story of the building is located more than 150 feet from fire apparatus access. Continuous fire access roadways and public hydrants will be provided throughout the Project site in order to allow adequate emergency access. (DEIR p. 3.13-7.)

The City's municipal code does not provide fire flow requirements or standards. Fire flow requirements within the City depend upon construction and design factors and are determined after Project plans are submitted. However, through conversation with the RFD, most projects require a minimum fire flow of 1,500 to 3,000 gallons per minute (GPM). Inadequate fire flow demands would be considered a significant impact, but are remedied through the proper design of water infrastructure on-site in coordination with the RFD requirements. In order to offset the incremental costs associated with fire protection in the City of Redlands, the proposed Project would be required to pay a fire suppression fee

equating to $0.50 per square foot for commercial developments, that would be utilized to fund various capital improvements and personnel additions. The applicant would pay payment of said fees at the time of building permit issuance. Further, the Project would contribute money toward ongoing fire facilities needs through the City's Development Impact Fee program. Therefore, the Project would not result in physical impacts on the environment from the construction or expansion of fire facilities. Impacts would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.13-7.)

Impact PS-3: Would the proposed 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 Schools?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Public Services are discussed in detail in Section 3.13 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to 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 Schools. (DEIR pp. 3.13-9 to 3.13-10.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project does not contain any residential uses and would not directly induce population growth. The new employment opportunities created by the Project would not induce substantial population growth into the Redlands area from outside areas. In addition, Senate Bill 50, dated August 27, 1998, allows that complete mitigation of school related impacts can be covered by lawful payment of required school impact fees. According to the Redlands Unified School District, development impact fees for commercial/industrial construction, total in the amount of $0.47 per square foot. Impact/mitigation fees are established by each district based on square foot measurements. The Redlands Unified School District assess construction impact fees at the time of development to assure each project contributes its equitable share of the cost of providing schools within the Planning Area. The Project will pay all applicable construction impact fees at the time of building permit issuance and would therefore not result in physical impacts associated with the provision of or the need for new or physically/altered governmental facilities. Impacts in this case will be less than significant. (DEIR pp. 3.13-9 to 3.13-10.)

13. Recreation

Impact R-1: Would the proposed 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?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Recreation are discussed in detail in Section 3.14 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to 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. (DEIR pp. 3.14-6 to 3.14-7.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project does not contain any residential uses and would not directly induce population growth. The development is expected to generate approximately 206 new jobs. This includes the creation of 85 new jobs at the new Walmart store (230 of the existing jobs at the existing Walmart store will be moved to the new Walmart store). In addition, Parcels 1-9 will create

approximately 121 job positions. Most of the new employment opportunities created by the Project would be entry-level. The new employment opportunities created by the Project would not induce substantial population growth into the Redlands area from outside areas. Any increase in population would be marginal at best as this is a relocation of an existing store and the new jobs created by the Project's outparcels should be filled by existing residents. Therefore, the potential for generating new residents and in turn impacting park space such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur is low. (DEIR pp. 3.14-6 to 3.14-7.)

Additionally, there are four recreational facilities located near the Project site, including the **Texonia Park (approximately** 0.18 mile south), the **Community Park (**approximately 1.06 miles east), the **Jennie Davis Park (**approximately 1.1 miles south) and the **Ed Hales Park** (approximately 1.4 miles southeast). However, employees are unlikely to frequent parks in close proximity to the Project site during work hours, and are much more likely to visit parks near their homes on weekends and days off, which does not constitute a new impact. Furthermore, Ordinance No. 2661 of the Redlands Municipal Code establishes park and open space fees for new developments within the City of Redlands. In order to offset the incremental costs associated with recreational facilities in the City of Redlands, the proposed Project would be required to pay an opens pace/park fee equating to $0.62 per square foot for commercial developments, that would be utilized to fund exiting or new facility improvements. The applicant would pay payment of said fees at the time of building permit issuance. Implementation of the Project will pay all applicable park and open space fees. Accordingly, physical impacts related to increased use of parks will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.14-7.)

Impact R-2: Would the proposed Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Recreation are discussed in detail in Section 3.14 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. (DEIR pp. 3.14-7 to 3.14-8.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project would not include any residential uses and, therefore, would not result in direct population growth. The new employment opportunities created by the Project would not induce substantial population growth into the Redlands area from outside areas. Because the Project would not cause direct or indirect population growth, physical deterioration of recreational facilities (including local and regional trails) would not occur as a result of Project implementation. Accordingly, impacts associated with recreational facilities and physical effect on the environment will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.14-7.)

14. Transportation

Impact T-2: Would the proposed Project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Transportation are discussed in detail in Section 3.15 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. (DEIR pp. 3.15-113 to 3.15-114.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project site is located approximately 1.8 miles southeast of San Bernardino International Airport and is not located within the approach or takeoff pattern areas of the airport. The proposed building height will be approximately 40 feet above grade and will not include any characteristics considered potentially hazardous to aviation (e.g., intense, distracting lighting; major sources of dust, steam, or electrical interference; or features that attract birds). Therefore, no changes to air traffic patterns would occur and impacts will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.15-113.)

Impact T-3: Would the proposed Project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Transportation are discussed in detail in Section 3.15 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). (DEIR pp. 3.15-114 to 3.15-131.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: According to the TIA (UC 2011), the Project would implement five (5) access points serving the Project site. The Project is proposed to have access on Tennessee Street via Driveway 1, San Bernardino Avenue via Driveway 3, Pennsylvania Avenue via Driveways 2 and 4 and New York Avenue via Driveway 5. All Project driveways are proposed to have full access and clear lines of sight. As part of the development, the Project plans to construct a minimum of one-travel lane in each direction on Pennsylvania Avenue and New York Avenue in addition to half-section roadway improvements on the Project adjacent roads of San Bernardino Avenue and Tennessee Street. It should be noted that the construction of Pennsylvania Avenue along the Project frontage will not connect to the existing Pennsylvania Avenue east of Karon Street. Roadway improvements necessary to provide site access and onsite circulation are assumed to be constructed in conjunction with site development and are described below. These improvements will be completed concurrently with occupancy of the Project. In addition, the Project does not propose any circulation features that may create hazards (e.g., roundabout, hairpin turns, etc.). Street improvement plans will be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to construction. In addition, all street improvements are required to be consistent with all applicable City design standards. Therefore, the Project would not create any roadway hazards. Impacts would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.15-114.)

However, traffic conditions during construction of the Project will generate traffic related to construction employees and equipment, and hauling fill and construction material to and from the site. The highest volumes of construction traffic will occur during the period when the Project site is graded and the hauling of import and export soil or construction material will occur. Typically, weekday construction activities would occur between 7:00 a.m. and end around 3:00 p.m., which typically consists of construction workforce trips arriving at the Project. Construction activities are temporary and these trips would cease once the Project is completed. As such, ,due to the temporary nature of the construction, construction traffic would not represent a significant impact to intersection, roadway segment, or queuing impacts on local roadways. (DEIR p. 3.15-114.)

In addition, although truck radii is part of a design feature for this Project and is not a hazard, which includes sharp curves or dangerous intersections, none the less, the Project could have potential impacts to hazardous from delivery truck access to the site and circulation behind the proposed Walmart store. Consequently, the TIA analyzed potential impacts from delivery truck access to the Project site and circulation behind the proposed Walmart store. Exhibit 3.15-9 of the Draft EIR illustrates delivery truck access for the site and circulation for each of the proposed Project driveways. Due to the typical wide turning radii of these large delivery trucks, a truck turning template has been overlaid on the proposed

site plan at each Project driveway anticipated to have heavy trucks in order to determine appropriate curb radii and to verify that delivery trucks will have sufficient space to execute turning maneuvers to pull into and out of loading docks. Typically, Walmart stores receive their deliveries from Walmart distribution centers which utilize large delivery trucks, such as the WB-67 class (Semitrailer truck, overall wheelbase of 67 ft), which is the largest semi-trailer rig. The deliveries for outparcels typically originate from local distribution centers and are traditionally served by WB-50 class (Semitrailer truck, overall wheelbase of 50 ft) or smaller box trucks. As such, it is anticipated that deliveries made to the other outparcels in the Redlands Crossings Center would be made via WB-50 trucks (to be most conservative). Each Project access point is discussed below, identifying the necessary curb radii to accommodate either a WB-50 or WB-67 delivery truck. (DEIR pp. 3.15-114 to 3.15-115.)

Exhibit 3.15-10 of the Draft EIR illustrates the truck access circulation at Driveway 1 on Tennessee Street. It is anticipated that this driveway would be utilized by WB-50 trucks (or smaller) making deliveries to outparcels within the Redlands Crossings Center. A curb radius of 35-feet on the northeast and southeast corners appears to be sufficient to accommodate the ingress and egress of a WB-50 truck. In addition, both Tennessee Street and Driveway 1 would provide sufficient roadway width to accommodate the wide turns. (DEIR p. 3.15-115.)

Exhibit 3.15-11 of the Draft EIR illustrates the truck access circulation at Driveway 2 on Pennsylvania Avenue. It is anticipated that this driveway would be utilized by WB-50 trucks (or smaller) making deliveries to outparcels within the Redlands Crossings Center. The curb radius of 35-feet on the northwest corner would be sufficient to accommodate the egress of a WB-50 truck. In addition, both Pennsylvania Avenue and Driveway 2 provide sufficient roadway width to accommodate the wide turns, with the exception of the inbound trucks. As shown on Exhibit 3.15-11 of the Draft EIR the trailer for eastbound left-turning trucks entering the site would cross over the southbound left turning lane. However, it is anticipated that this would not significantly impact exiting vehicles as this driveway is a secondary access point with nominal Project traffic. (DEIR p. 3.15-115.)

Exhibit 3.15-12 of the Draft EIR illustrates the truck access circulation at Driveway 3 on San Bernardino Avenue. It is anticipated that this driveway would be utilized by WB-50 trucks (or smaller) making deliveries to outparcels within the Redlands Crossings Center. The curb radius of 35-feet on the southwest and southeast corners would be sufficient to accommodate the ingress and egress of a WB-50 truck. In addition, both San Bernardino Avenue and Driveway 3 provide sufficient roadway width to accommodate the wide turns. (DEIR p. 3.15-115.)

Exhibit 3.15-13 of the Draft EIR illustrates the truck access circulation at Driveway 4 on Pennsylvania Avenue. Driveway 4 on Pennsylvania Avenue has been assumed to be utilized for deliveries to the proposed Walmart as it provides direct access to the proposed Walmart store and would minimize these large trucks from having to navigate through the site. As such, this driveway should be designed with appropriate curb cuts to allow for the ingress and egress of large delivery trucks. Due to the typical wide turning radius of these large delivery trucks, a turning template for a WB-67 truck has been overlaid on the site plan at Driveway 4 on Pennsylvania Avenue in order to determine appropriate curb radii and to verify that Walmart delivery trucks will have sufficient space to execute turning maneuvers to pull into and out of loading docks. As shown, the curb radius of 35-feet on the northwest corner would be sufficient to accommodate the egress of both a WB-67 and WB-50 truck. In addition, both Pennsylvania Avenue and Driveway 4 provide sufficient roadway width to accommodate the wide turns, with the exception of the inbound trucks. As shown on Exhibit 3.15-13 of the Draft EIR the trailer for eastbound left-turning trucks entering the site would cross over the southbound left turning lane. However, it is anticipated that this would not significantly impact exiting vehicles as this driveway is a secondary

access point with nominal Project traffic. The curb radii at the drive aisle east of Driveway 4 would also be adequate to accommodate WB-67 trucks accessing the loading docks behind the proposed Walmart. (DEIR p. 3.15-116.)

Exhibit 3.15-14 of the Draft EIR illustrates the truck access circulation at New York Avenue on San Bernardino Avenue. It is anticipated that WB-67 trucks would travel through this intersection to get to and from Driveway 5 on New York Avenue. As such, this intersection would be designed with appropriate curb cuts to allow for the ingress and egress of large delivery trucks. As shown a curb radius of 50-feet on the southwest corner would have sufficient to accommodate the ingress of a WB-67 truck. (DEIR p. 3.15-116.)

Exhibit 3.15-15 of the Draft EIR illustrates the truck access circulation at Driveway 5 on New York Avenue. Driveway 5 on New York Avenue has been assumed to be utilized for deliveries to the proposed Walmart as it provides direct access to the proposed Walmart store and would minimize these large trucks from having to navigate through the site. As such, this driveway would be designed with appropriate curb cuts to allow for the ingress and egress of large delivery trucks. Due to the typical wide turning radius of these large delivery trucks, a turning template for a WB-67 truck has been overlaid on the site plan at Driveway 5 on New York Avenue in order to determine appropriate curb radii and to verify that Walmart delivery trucks will have sufficient space to execute turning maneuvers to pull into and out of loading docks. The curb radius of 50-feet on the northwest corner would be sufficient to accommodate the ingress of a WB-67 truck. In addition, both New York Avenue and Driveway 5 provide sufficient roadway width to accommodate the wide turns. The curb radii at the drive aisle south of Driveway 5 would also be adequate to accommodate WB-67 trucks accessing the loading docks behind the proposed Walmart. (DEIR p. 3.15-116.)

Therefore, impacts in regards to delivery truck accessing the Project site and circulation behind the proposed Walmart store will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.15-131.)

Impact T-4: Would the proposed Project result in inadequate emergency access?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Transportation are discussed in detail in Section 3.15 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to result in inadequate emergency access. (DEIR p. 3.15-131.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: I-10 and SR-210 provide regional access to the Project area while various roadways near the Project site provide local access and primarily serve the existing area. As part of Project development, roadways and signals will be improved in the Project area and the Project will provide adequate emergency access in all phases of development as indicated in the conceptual site plan. In addition, the Project applicant will comply with applicable Fire Department and Department of Building and Safety regulations relating to emergency access. Therefore, impacts in this regard will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.15-131.)

15. Utilities and Service Systems

Impact U-1: Would the proposed Project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Utilities and Service Systems are discussed in detail in Section 3.16 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to exceed wastewater

treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. (DEIR pp. 3.16-10 to 3.16-11.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Short-term construction and operation of the Project would marginally increase demands on wastewater treatment services within the City. The Redlands Municipal Utilities and Engineering Department (RMUED) treats wastewater treatment for the City of Redlands. The Project will tie in to the nearest wastewater line, which is located immediately adjacent to the site. The RMUED operates approximately 5.6 million gallons per day of wastewater treatment and has a capacity of 9.5 million gallons per day. Development of the Project will involve an on-site system for the collection of wastewater for conveyance to off-site public wastewater facilities. Wastewater conveyed from the site, totaling 4,910 gallons per day (see Impact U-2 for additional information in this regard) would ultimately reach RMUED's wastewater treatment facility, located south of the Santa Ana River and north of Nevada Street (Specifically located at 1950 N Nevada Street), where it would undergo treatment in accordance with applicable regulations, including the requirements of the Water Quality Control Plan, for Santa Ana Region 5. The Regional Board's regulatory tools include National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits, Waste Discharge Requirements, Water Reclamation Requirements, Water Quality Certification, and Waste Discharge Prohibitions. Implementation of the Project will be consistency with the aforementioned regulatory tools, ensuring that implementation of the Project will be consistent with the Santa Ana Region 5 Water Quality Control Plan and will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Board. Therefore, impacts in this regard will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.16-10.)

Impact U-2: Would the proposed Project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Utilities and Service Systems are discussed in detail in Section 3.16 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (DEIR pp. 3.16-11 to 3.16-12.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project's water consumption estimate is provided in Table 3.16-4 of the Draft EIR. As shown, the Project is anticipated to demand 14,817 gallons of water on a daily basis. The 2010 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan concluded that sufficient water supply is available between 2010 and 2030 to serve all customers within the City of Redlands; refer to Table 3.16-2 (See Section 3.16.2, Existing Conditions, for Table 3.16-2) of the Draft EIR. The Project is consistent with the Land Use and Zoning designations for the Project site and will therefore be served with adequate long-term water supply. In addition, as previously outlined within Table 3.16-2, the current and planned water supplies for the City of Redlands includes 31,479-acre feet per year for the year 2010 and 43,120-acre feet per year for the year 2030. Consequently, implementation of the Project will consume approximately 0.00000014 to 0.00000011 percent of the available water supply for the year 2010 and 2030, respectively. Therefore, implementation of the Project will not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of the existing facility. (DEIR p. 3.16-11.)

As the Project site is currently undeveloped, implementation of the proposed Project would require wastewater treatment over and above the pre-developed condition. No project specific wastewater generation rates were available for the proposed project. Typically, wastewater generation can be up to 70 to 90 percent of consumption. Using a conservative estimate of 90 percent, the Project's daily

wastewater generation estimate is provided in Tale 3.16-5 of the Draft EIR. As shown, the Project is anticipated to generate 4,910 gallons of water on a daily basis. This figure is based on the assumption that wastewater represents 90 percent of domestic water use, which is consistent with industry standards and based on the applicant's submittal materials. (DEIR pp. 3.16-11 to 3.16-12.)

The proposed development will include an on-site system for the collection of wastewater and conveyance to off-site existing WRP. The existing wastewater flows for the City's WRP are approximately 5.6 mgd. The overall capacity of the WRP is 9.5 mgd. Consequently, implementation of the Project will increase wastewater generation by approximately 0.001 percent over the existing 5.6 mgd, which is well below the 9.5 mgd overall capacity of the WRP. Therefore, implementation of the Project will not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of the existing facility. Impacts will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.16-12.)

Impact U-3: Would the proposed Project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Utilities and Service Systems are discussed in detail in Section 3.16 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (DEIR pp. 3.16-12 to 3.16-13.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The proposed development of the site will result in an incremental increase in stormwater. The infiltration of the presently undeveloped site will be decreased by construction of the Project, which will be covered by impervious surfaces. Currently, the Project site does not have any stormwater drainage facilities and so will require the expansion of the existing local storm water drainage system. The Project design include various features (underground infiltration basins, several vegetated swales, vegetative buffers and surface level infiltration basin) which will reduce the potential storm water runoff and/or the velocity of such runoff from the Project site. Development will also require coverage under SWRCB NPDES permit, General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity (Construction Activity General Permit), since the Project will disturb more than one acre of the land. (DEIR p. 3.16-13.)

Therefore, compliance with all applicable stormwater regulations and incorporation of appropriate storm water control features in the Project design will reduce the impacts related to capital improvements of stormwater facilities to less than significant level. (DEIR p. 3.16-13.)

Impact U-4: Would the proposed Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Utilities and Service Systems are discussed in detail in Section 3.16 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. (DEIR pp. 3.16-13 to 3.16-14.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: California Water Code Section 10910 through 10915 requires that a Water Supply Assessment be prepared for any project containing a shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor

space. The Project proposes to develop 215,000 square feet for the proposed Walmart, 60,500 square feet for outparcels 1-9, totaling 275,500 square feet. In addition, implementation of the Project will generate approximately 436 new jobs. Therefore, the Project is below the 500,000 square feet of floor use, 1,000-employee and is not required to provide a Water Supply Assessment. (DEIR p. 3.16-13.)

Water consumption would be consumed from short-term construction activities and long-term operational activities. Short-term construction water consumption from development of the proposed Project would be spread out over the length of construction activities and would not occur all at once. The actual volume of water consumption of at any one time is not expected to pose a significant impact to water supply. (DEIR pp. 3.16-13 to 3.16-14.)

The Project will tie in to the nearest water line, which is located immediately adjacent to the site. The Project's water consumption estimate is provided in Table 3.16-4 (see Impact Analysis U-2). As shown in the Table 3.16-4 of the Draft EIR, the Project is anticipated to demand 14,817 gallons of water on a daily basis. As previously described, the 2010 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan concluded that sufficient water supply is available between 2010 and 2030 to serve all customers within the City of Redlands; refer to Table 3.16-2 of the Draft EIR. The Project is consistent with the Land Use and Zoning designations for the Project site and will therefore be served with adequate long-term water supply. In addition, as previously outlined within Table 3.16-2, the current and planned water supplies for the City of Redlands includes 31,479-acre feet per year for the year 2010 and 43,120-acre feet per year for the year 2030. Consequently, implementation of the Project will consume approximately 0.00000014 to 0.00000011 percent of the available water supply for the year 2010 and 2030, respectively. (DEIR p. 3.16-14.)

In addition, the Project would reduce its demand on water supply through the implementation of various indoor and outdoor water conservation measures detailed in the Project's sustainability features discussed in detail in Section 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. Specifically, water conservation measures recommended by the California Department of Water Resources, as well as the City's landscape ordinance, will be incorporated into the Project as appropriate, including but not limited to: a) low flush toilets of no greater than 1.6 gallons per flush and b) keeping water pressure at 55 pounds per inch or less. Some portion of the landscaping, especially shrubs and trees, may be native species or species that are adapted to drought conditions. However, the commercial nature of the project means that a good portion of each lot will likely be asphalt, concrete, and minimal turf, which will have a "low" water consumption. (DEIR p. 3.16-14.)

Additionally, while not required to reduce this impact to less than significant, mitigation measure MM HWQ-2a through HWQ-2c requires the applicant to install outdoor irrigation and indoor domestic water conservation measures and practices and plumb landscaped areas with "purple pipe" prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the Walmart store to allow for recycled water irrigation. These measures would reduce overall Project demand for potable water and further ensure that long-term water supply impacts are less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.16-14.)

Impact U-5: Would the proposed 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?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Utilities and Service Systems are discussed in detail in Section 3.16 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to 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. (DEIR p. 3.16-15.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project's daily wastewater generation estimate is provided in Tale 3.16-5 of the Draft EIR (see Impact Analysis U-2). As shown, the Project is anticipated to generate 4,910 gallons of water on a daily basis. This figure is based on the assumption that wastewater represents 90 percent of domestic water use, which is consistent with industry standards and based on the applicant's submittal materials. The Proposed development will include an on-site system for the collection of wastewater and conveyance to off-site existing WRP. The existing wastewater flows for the City's WRP are 5.6 mgd. The overall capacity of the WRP is 9.5 mgd. Consequently, implementation of the Project will increase wastewater generation by approximately 0.001 percent over the existing 5.6 mgd, which is well below the 9.5 mgd overall capacity of the WRP. Therefore, the City of Redlands WRP will have adequate capacity to serve the Project and impacts in this regard will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.16-15.)

Impact U-6: Would the proposed Project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Utilities and Service Systems are discussed in detail in Section 3.16 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs. (DEIR pp. 3.16-15 to 3.16-17.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The City of Redlands Quality of Life Department will provide solid waste service to the Project site. According to the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan EIR (October 1988), buildout of the Specific Plan would contribute to a significant and unavoidable impact towards solid waste. However, since 1988, solid waste from Redlands is primarily disposed of at the California Street Landfill and the San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill. (DEIR p. 3.16-15.)

Solid waste would be generated by short-term construction activities and long-term operational activities. Short-term construction waste generation from development of the proposed Project would be spread out over the length of construction activities and would not occur all at once. The actual volumes of construction waste disposed of at any one time is not expected to be more than 1 or 2 tons of debris and would not pose a significant impact to landfill capacity. (DEIR p. 3.16-15.)

California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB 2011) provides the estimates for a standard commercial/retail waste generation rate to be 4.8 pounds per square foot per year. Based on CWIMB solid waste generation rate, the Project would generate roughly 661 tons of solid waste per annum (4.8 pounds by 275,500 square feet). California Street Landfill and San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill have a combined remaining capacity of more than 16 million cubic yards. The potential impact associated with the solid waste generated from the Project is less than significant in light of the total remaining capacity of landfill sites. (DEIR p. 3.16-16.)

In addition, actual solid waste generation would be expected to be less than 661 tons per annum as Walmart stores are equipped with recycling facilities and are designed to limit waste of recyclable material by implementing innovative strategies. (DEIR p. 3.16-16.)

Walmart stores are equipped to recycle the following materials: Aluminum; Plastic (including bottles, bags, garment bags, shrink wrap, and bubble pack); Glass; Cardboard; Vegetable oil; Single-use cameras; Electronic waste; and Silver (from photo processing). (DEIR p. 3.16-16.)

Similarly, followings are some of the innovative strategies implemented to limit waste as standard features: All cardboard generated from delivery packages is segregated and sent to a recycling center; Each new store has an indoor tank used to collect oil from cooking processes for recycling; All Walmart photo processing centers recycle single-use cameras after photo processing; Walmart collects and segregates all recyclable bottles and cans; Walmart currently implements a chain wide program for "sandwich bale" recycling of plastics, e.g., bags, garment bags, shrink wrap, bubble pack, etc.; Walmart photo labs capture silver from the photo processing. (DEIR p. 3.16-16.)

Therefore, as discussed above the landfill sites serving the Project has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal need and impacts in this regard will be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.16-16.)

Impact U-7: Would the proposed Project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Utilities and Service Systems are discussed in detail in Section 3.16 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project in regards to not complying with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (DEIR pp. 3.16-17 to 3.16-18.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project will be required to abide by all federal, state and local statues and regulations regarding solid waste. The Project does not contemplate or anticipate short-term construction or long-term operational activities/uses that would exceed or otherwise require special consideration in relation to compliance with relevant solid waste handling/disposal statues and regulations. In addition, on January 12, 2010, the State Building Standards Commission unanimously adopted updates to the California Green Building Standards Code, which went into effect on January 1, 2011. The Code is a comprehensive and uniform regulatory code for all residential, commercial and school buildings. The California Green Building Standards Code requires a minimum 50-percent diversion of construction and demolition waste from landfills, increasing voluntarily to 65 and-75 percent for new homes and 80-percent for commercial projects. Most of the Walmart would be constructed using recycled steel. In addition, all of the plastic baseboards, and much of the plastic shelving, are manufactured from recycled material. The Walmart store would also be equipped to accept the following materials for recycling: aluminum; plastic (including bottles, bags, garment bags, shrink wrap, and bubble pack); glass; cardboard; vegetable oil; motor oil; tires; auto batteries; single-use cameras; electronic waste; silver (from photo processing). Therefore, impacts in this regard will be less than significant and no mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 3.16-17; FEIR p. 4-5.)

Furthermore, a Phase II ESA was conducted at the Project site located on the 20-acre portion of land at the west corner of the Project site, adjacent to Tennessee Street and San Bernardino Avenue. The purpose of the Phase II ESA was to collect and analyze soil samples in selected areas of the Project site to identify the presence or confirm the absence of pesticides contamination at those locations and screen any detected chemicals for potential risk. The Phase II ESA concluded that with exception of two soil samples, all soil samples contained detectable concentrations of (Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene) DDE. In addition, with exception to four soil samples, all analyzed soil samples contained detectable concentrations of (Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane) DDT. However, according to the Phase II ESA, all

detected pesticide concentrations (DDE and DDT) are well below their respective residential soil (1.7 mg/kg) and industrial soil (7 mg/kg) EPA Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRG). Therefore, the reported pesticide concentrations are significantly below the PRGs established by the EPA and may likely represent ambient "background" concentrations. Therefore, development of the Project will not include the transfer of soils to an off-site location eligible to accept contaminated soils. Impacts will be less than significant. (DEIR pp. 3.16-17 to 3.16-18.)

16. Greenhouse Gases

Impact GHG-2: Would the proposed Project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Greenhouse Gases are discussed in detail in Section 3.17 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds the Project would have a less than significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. (DEIR pp. 3.17-33 to 3.17-34.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Although it does not contain specific requirements for regulations for new or existing developments, the Sustainability Plan has applicable targets and actions as shown in Table 3.17-15, City of Redlands Sustainability Plan Targets and Actions. These are items that the City will develop implementing regulations and requirements over time. Many of the Walmart design features highlighted on Table 3.17-15 of the Draft EIR are in accord the purposes of the sustainability plan include numerous efforts to conserve energy, conserve water and reduce waste. (DEIR pp. 3.17-33 to 3.17-34.)

The California State Legislature adopted AB 32 in 2006. AB 32 focuses on reducing greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride) to 1990 levels by the year 2020. Pursuant to the requirements in AB 32, the ARB adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) in 2008, which outlines actions recommended to obtain that goal. The Scoping Plan contains a variety of strategies to reduce the State's emissions, which are not applicable to the Project, as shown in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report (Appendix B). One of the Scoping Plan measures, #6 Regional Transportation-Related Greenhouse Gas Targets, refers to SB 375. The Project is consistent with the intent of SB 375 to reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled by locating a regional shopping center adjacent to existing transportation corridors and will include pedestrian walkways, bicycle parking, and a new bus station. (DEIR p. 3.17-34.) Therefore, the Project will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation pertaining to GHG emissions, and impacts will be less than significant.

17. Urban Decay

Impact UD-1: Would the proposed Project create long-term store vacancies or result in the abandonment of buildings within the retail market served by the Project?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Urban Decay are discussed in detail in Section 3.18 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds no significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to create long-term store vacancies or result in the abandonment of buildings within the retail market served by the Project. (DEIR pp. 3.18-13 to 3.18-19.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: This impact area assesses the Project's potential affects on urban decay with respect to competing retailers within the defined trade areas. Each of the various components of the Project is addressed individually below. (DEIR p. 3.18-13.)

Impact of Walmart Grocery Component - The proposed Walmart store is estimated to include up to 43,373 square feet of grocery space. Based on the size and configuration of the proposed store, TNDG projected that the grocery component of the store would generate sales of approximately $614 per square foot of building space, or approximately $26.6 million in annual grocery sales. (DEIR p. 3.18-13.)

By evaluating the trade area demographic characteristics and the typical portion of household income spent on supermarket goods, TNDG estimated that the year 2010 sales potential for existing supermarkets within the CRTA was $480 per square foot. In comparison, the median sales performance measures for supermarkets in the U.S. and the Western U.S. are approximately $473 and $418 per square foot, respectively. (DEIR p. 3.18-13.)

Total demand for supermarket sales in the trade area is projected to increase from approximately $324.2 million in 2010 to approximately $337.0 million in 2013, the assumed opening date of the Project. By 2020, total demand for supermarket sales in the trade area is projected to reach approximately $369.0 million (all projections are given in 2010 constant dollars). Table 3.18-3 of the Draft EIR evaluates the impact of the Walmart's grocery sales in terms of the potential reduction in the sales per square foot volume at the 18 existing supermarkets. (DEIR p. 3.18-13.)

The current potential sales volumes of the existing stores is estimated to be slightly above the industry median (for supermarkets in the U.S.) of about $473, suggesting that the existing stores are – on average – performing in line with the typical sales volumes of supermarkets nationwide. Thus, it is likely that the supermarket component of the Project would result in reduced sales volumes at the existing stores. Assuming the supermarket component of the Walmart store opens in 2013, a significant portion of its initial sales would be derived from sales diversions from existing stores in the CRTA. TNDG Projects that, with the opening of the Project in 2013, the potential sales volumes at the existing supermarkets in the CRTA would decrease to an average of $459 per square foot, representing a reduction of 4.3 percent from the existing sales per square foot average of $480 (see Table 3.18-3 in the Draft EIR). However, projected growth in trade area demand would be sufficient for the sales volumes at the existing supermarkets to recover to approximately 97 percent of existing levels by 2014 (i.e., one year after the Project's first full year of operation). (DEIR p. 3.18-14.)

The development of the Walmart supermarket component is unlikely to cause any existing supermarkets in the trade area to close, given that average sales volumes at the existing supermarkets in the trade area would never drop below 95 percent of the 2010 level. Moreover, sales volumes are projected to recover to 97 percent of existing levels within one year of the Project's first full year of operations, and to 100 percent in 2016 (i.e., within three years of the Project's first full year of operation). Since the estimated short term, (pre 2016) reduction in sales for the existing stores is not expected to result in store closure over either the short or long term; potential adverse impacts for the grocery component of the Project with respect to urban decay would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.18-14.)

Impact of Project on General Merchandise and Other Retail Sales - The Project would result in a net increase of 74,327 square feet of retail space devoted to GAFO (General Merchandise, Apparel, Furniture/Appliances and Other/Specialty). Although the proposed Walmart's general merchandise space would total approximately 171,627 square feet, a full 126,000 square feet of this amount would just be a replacement of the existing Walmart on 2050 West Redlands Boulevard. In addition, the

Project would include 28,700 square feet of Other/Specialty space (separate from Walmart). (DEIR p. 3.18-15.)

TNDG provided an analysis of GAFO existing supply and demand which indicated a year 2009 market support for $478.4 million in GAFO retail sales in the City of Redlands. Existing sales in these retail categories in the City are estimated at $429.8 million, suggesting that approximately 10 percent of potential GAFO sales in the City are currently being lost to other jurisdictions. In other words, there is currently an estimated $48.6 million ($478.4 million – $429.8 million) in unrealized GAFO demand in the City – demand that could be recaptured with the development of additional retail facilities. The $48.6 million in unrealized demand translates into approximately 137,100 square feet of additional GAFO retail space that could be currently supported in the City. TNDG also estimated projected growth in demand within the Primary Market Area (the corporate boundaries of Redlands) indicating that potential demand for new retail space in the GAFO retail categories is projected to grow to approximately 413,900 square feet by 2013 (the Project's assumed opening date). Net demand for new GAFO space is projected to grow to approximately 484,900 square feet by 2016. See Table 3.18-4 below, for a breakdown of supportable square feet within the GAFO retail categories from 2013 to 2025. (DEIR p. 3.18-15.)

The Project will result in a net increase of 74,327 square feet of GAFO retail space, which will absorb approximately 18 percent of the residual market support for GAFO space in the trade area in 2013 (the Project's assumed opening date). Since this represents a relatively small portion of the residual market support, TNDG indicated that it is unlikely that the GAFO retail components of the Project will result in severe economic impacts to existing stores in the trade area. Therefore, it is unlikely that any existing retail stores will be forced to close due to the Project. Since the affects of the Project are not expected to result in store closures, which could, in turn if occurring over the long term, cause urban decay, the impact of the GAFO retail components of the Project would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.18-16.)

Impact of Proposed Restaurant Space - The Project would include 31,800 square feet of fast food and sit-down restaurant space. TNDG's demand analysis indicates existing (year 2009) potential market support for approximately $125.6 million in restaurant sales in the PMA. Existing restaurant sales in the PMA are estimated at $117.4 million, suggesting that there is currently $8.2 million ($125.6 million – $117.4 million) in unrealized restaurant demand in the PMA. This translates into approximately 20,500 square feet of additional restaurant space that could currently be supported in the PMA. (DEIR p. 3.18-16.)

Potential demand for new restaurant space in the PMA is projected to grow to approximately 66,700 square feet by 2013 (the Project's planned opening date). Net demand for new restaurant space is projected to reach approximately 78,000 square feet by 2016. The Project will result in a net increase of 31,800 square feet of restaurant space. Given that residual market support for restaurant space in 2013 (the Project's planned completion date) is more than the twice the amount of planned square fee, the TNDG report indicates that it is unlikely that the restaurant component of the Project will result in severe economic impacts to existing restaurants in the trade area. Therefore, it is unlikely that any existing restaurants will be forced to close due to the Project. Since closure of existing restaurants in the PMA is not expected to be caused by the Project's introduction of new restaurant space, the potential for the Project to result in urban decay related to restaurants would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.18-16.)

Impacts of Proposed Fuel Facility - TNDG concluded in their study that the proposed fuel facility with convenience store and single user self-serve carwash would not have significant impacts on existing businesses. It is estimated that the service/gas station within the Project would generate sales of

approximately $4.2 million per year. TNDG's analysis indicates existing market support for $78.0 million in annual service station sales in 2009. Service station sales in 2009 were $74.2 million, suggesting that the supply and demand for gasoline sales in the market is roughly in equilibrium, even if the service station proposed by the Project were in operation today. Due to growth in the market, residual demand for service station sales in 2013 would equal approximately $9.9 million, which is more than sufficient to support the projected service station sales at the Project. Thus, potential sales impacts to existing service stations are not expected to be significant with respect to urban decay, given that the Project's service station sales would fit within the available "envelop" of residual or unmet demand. (DEIR pp. 3.18-16 to 3.18-17.)

Potential for Reuse of Existing Walmart Site - Given that the Project will result in the relocation of the existing Walmart store located at 2050 West Redlands Boulevard, it is necessary to evaluate the potential for the existing Walmart building to remain vacant for an extended period of time and thus becoming subject to physical blighting. The Project will add approximately 232,100 square feet of non-grocery retail space that will be needed to be absorbed in the PMA. This total includes the following: The existing Walmart building – 126,000 square feet; The net increase in GAFO space proposed for the new Walmart – 45,627 square feet; The Project's specialty merchandise space – 28,700 square feet; and The Project's fast food and restaurant space – 31,800 square feet. (DEIR p. 3.18-17.)

Based on the numbers, as shown on Table 3.18-5 in the Draft EIR, TNDG Projects that demand would be more than sufficient by 2013 (i.e., the assumed opening date of the Project) to fully absorb all the retail (non-supermarket) space added by the Project and the existing Walmart. The total available retail space created by the Project, combining the new space from the Project (approximately 106,127 square feet) with the space in the existing Walmart building (126,000 square feet) sums to approximately 232,127 square feet, while the projected demand (GAFO subtotal) is 372,529 square feet. (DEIR pp. 3.18-17 to 3.18-18.)

Potential Impacts to Redlands Downtown Area - According to the TNDG report, impacts of big box retailers on small, independent merchants throughout southern and central California may vary widely depending on the context. Clearly, there are examples of small businesses that have been unable to compete with big box stores. There are also prominent examples of traditional downtown areas that have been able to carve out specialized "niches" and continue to thrive despite the entry of big box competitors. Generally, the difference in results can be explained by three factors: 1. The amount of resident demand for retail sales in the market area (i.e., whether the big box stores derive their sales from residual demand or "leakage" versus diverting sales from existing local merchants); 2. The degree to which trends in the traditional downtown areas were on a positive or negative path prior to the entry of the big box competitors (i.e., if an established trend of decline is already in evidence, disinvestment from an area is likely to occur with or without new competition); 3. The degree to which tenants in a downtown are selling goods directly comparable to those available at competitor big box stores. (DEIR p. 3.18-18.)

In their analysis of the impacts of the Project and the specific conditions of the Redlands Downtown area, which is approximately one mile to the southeast of the Project site, TNDG concluded that, by itself, the Project will not have a significant impact on the Redlands Downtown area based on the following factors: Residual demand is anticipated to be sufficient to support the Project without diverting sales from existing GAFO stores or restaurants; Small merchants in the downtown already face big box competition from the Citrus Plaza shopping center and Redlands Town Center, and the Project, in and of itself, will not significantly increase the market draw of these established centers as it relates to Downtown businesses; The downtown's existing vacancy rate, at 8.2 percent, is within the "normal

vacancy" rate for relatively healthy retail markets (usually 5 percent-10 percent), and there are no visible indications of urban decay (i.e., dilapidated buildings or marginal uses); The downtown has a strong representation of boutique retail, eating and drinking establishments, and service-based businesses that offer a mix of merchandise and services that are not directly comparable to the type of goods available at the type of big box stores that would locate at the Project or, for that matter big box stores in the Citrus Plaza and Redlands Town Center shopping centers. (DEIR pp. 3.18-18 to 3.18-19.)

Although the new store will be larger than the existing store (primarily due to the supermarket component) and include some new specialty merchandise and restaurant space, the Project is largely a relocation of the existing Walmart store. Since the downtown area already faces competition from the existing Walmart, the potential net impact of the Project is much less than the development of a brand new Walmart store. (DEIR p. 3.18-19.)

Impact UD-2: Would the proposed Project result in the physical deterioration of properties or structures that impairs the proper utilization of the properties or structures, or health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding community?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project related to Urban Decay are discussed in detail in Section 3.18 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds no significant impact related to the potential for the proposed Project to result in the physical deterioration of properties or structures that impairs the proper utilization of the properties or structures, or health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding community. (DEIR pp. 3.18-19 to 3.18-32.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The purpose of this section is to analyze the potential for the Project to result in a cumulatively significant urban decay impact when considered in light of the development of other competitive retail developments within the trade areas of the Project. Consistent with the analyses provided above under Impact UD-1, this analysis evaluates the cumulative effects of the Project using the Community Retail Trade Area (CRTA) to evaluate impacts to the grocery (supermarket) market and the RRTA for the non-grocery market. The analysis takes into account other planned and pending grocery and non-grocery developments within the two respective trade areas. The first subsection below (Cumulative Setting and Market Impacts) assesses the impacts of these developments, combined with the Project, to assess the current and future balance (or imbalances) of supply and demand and the potential implications with respect to market pressures for the two respective market areas. The second subsection below (Cumulative Urban Decay Analysis) evaluates the implications of the market impacts discussed under the first section with respect to potential urban decay. (DEIR p. 3.18-19.)

Cumulative Setting and Market Impacts

Community Retail Trade Area - There are four known planned and/or pending supermarket Projects in the CRTA (including the supermarket component of the Project evaluated in this analysis). Table 3.18-6 in the Draft EIR provides the name, location, square feet, and status of each Project. Based on the known planned and pending tenants in the Food category, Table 3.18-7 in the Draft EIR provides an analysis of cumulative impacts of all known planned and pending supermarket Projects that would be developed by 2020. This cumulative analysis follows the same process described under Impact UD-1 above which address direct impacts, differing only in that it includes planned and pending Projects in addition to the proposed Redlands Walmart store supermarket component. As shown in this table, the combined sales impacts of the recently developed, approved, and proposed Projects would result in average supermarket sales volumes of $413 per square foot in the CRTA in 2013. Thus, using the benchmark median U.S. sales figure of $473 per square foot, the market would technically be overbuilt

by approximately 87,100 square feet of space. This suggests that up to two supermarkets could potentially close under cumulative conditions. However, the closing of two supermarkets represents worst-case conditions and is unlikely to occur. The following four key factors would mitigate against the potential closure of two supermarket stores. (DEIR p. 3.18-20.)

1. It is recognized that the median U.S. sales figure of $473 per square foot does not necessarily reflect a break-even threshold for all supermarkets. Since the $473 per square foot figure reflects the median sales figure, by definition half of all supermarkets are operating below this level, and it is known that some supermarket chains, nationally, operate at substantially lower sales levels than the median. In addition, the median regional (for the Western U.S.) sales figure is $418 per square foot. Based on this benchmark factor, the market would technically be overbuilt by approximately 7,700 square feet, with sales volumes fully recovering to the Western U.S. median figure in 2014 (i.e., one year after the Projects' first full year of operations). These facts indicate that it is unlikely for two supermarkets to close as a result of cumulative impacts. (DEIR pp. 3.18-20 to 3.18-21.)

   To evaluate the "typical" sales volumes of California supermarkets, the TNDG report utilized a proprietary database of chain-specific supermarket sales estimates provided by Trade Dimensions International, Inc., a market research firm of The Nielsen Company. The database, based on data for more than 3,100 individual stores, includes sales estimates for 50 supermarket chains operating in California along with aggregate sales estimates for independent supermarkets. According to this database, average sales per square foot by chain ranges from $212 to $801 per square foot. For all chains combined, the median and average sales per square foot measures are $385 and $412, respectively, with a standard deviation of $133 per square foot. As indicated in the sales per square foot estimates above, there is significant variability in sales volumes at individual supermarkets, and evidence indicating that a number of stores (and entire chains) are operating at well below the $473 threshold evaluated in this analysis. In fact, of the 50 grocery chains represented in the database (including the aggregated independent category), 35, or 70 percent of the total, generate average sales volumes below $473 per square foot. Further, more than half (54 percent) of the chains operate at sales volumes below $400 per square foot, while 20 percent operate below $300 per square foot. These data further suggest that the median U.S. sales figure is a relatively aggressive benchmark for estimating potential store closures. (DEIR p. 3.18-21.)

2. Considering the limited size (13,928 square feet) of the Loma Linda store, in many respects this store will likely not be a direct competitor with full-scale supermarkets, which are often 50,000 or more square feet and carry a wider range of grocery items. Markets of this size often focus on a specific product niche – e.g., convenience goods, specialty produce, vitamins and natural supplements, etc. – to differentiate themselves from full-scale supermarkets. Thus, potential impacts to the supermarket category may have been overestimated by including a potential more convenience- and specialty-oriented grocer in the cumulative analysis. (DEIR p. 3.18-21.)

3. The cumulative analysis implicitly assumes that the planned grocery markets' trade areas will be identical to the Project evaluated in this analysis simply because the planned Projects are located in the CRTA. More realistically, each planned grocery market will have its own unique trade area, which will only partially overlap with the CRTA. For instance, the planned San Bernardino Walmart expansion is located near the northern portion of the CRTA. According to the economic impact analysis prepared as part of the Draft EIR for that Project, the proposed expanded store's primary trade area would only partially overlap with the CRTA evaluated in

this analysis. The San Bernardino's store trade area would include areas well outside the CRTA to the west, east, and north. Thus, assuming all of the planned grocery Projects in the CRTA would be equally competitive likely overstates cumulative impacts. (DEIR p. 3.18-22.)

Regional Retail Trade Area - This subsection evaluates the cumulative impacts to the market based on all known pending, non-grocery, retail-development/reuse Projects (including the Project evaluated in this analysis) in the PMA of the RRTA (City of Redlands). Table 3.18-8 in the Draft EIR shows the total square feet of new retail space (non-grocery) that could potentially be developed in the PMA over the next five to ten years. (DEIR p. 3.18-24.)

The square feet of planned/pending Projects in the SMA-E and SMA-W is not included in the table since this analysis evaluates demand for new space in the City of Redlands. However, the planned/pending Projects were taken into account for purposes of estimating capture rates of the SMA's resident retail demand. Appendix F, Table F-1, of the TNDG report (located in Appendix J of the Draft EIR) provides a supplemental list of the planned/pending retail Projects in the SMA-E and SMA-W. (DEIR p. 3.18-24.)

As shown on Table 3.18-8 of the Draft EIR, there could potentially be approximately 1.0 million square feet of new retail (non-supermarket) space developed in the PMA sometime over the next five to ten years. Within the evaluated trade area, net demand for new retail space is projected to grow to approximately 903,200 square feet by 2022. Table 3.18-9 in the Draft EIR provides a breakdown of supportable square feet by retail category from 2013 to 2022. (DEIR p. 3.18-25.)

Based on the potential demand for new non-grocery retail space shown on Table 3.18-9, the total square feet of planned retail Projects in the RRTA would absorb all of the projected growth in retail demand through 2022. In addition, the market would likely be able to support the full 1.0 million square feet of planned and pending retail space by 2025. (DEIR p. 3.18-25.)

Tables 3.18-10 and 3.18-11 in the Draft EIR provide a range of the projected citywide vacancy rates assuming all of the pending Projects are developed by 2013. The "High Scenario" provided in Table 3.18-10, is based on the assumption that two supermarkets would become vacant, under "worst-case" conditions. The "Low Scenario" shown in Table 3.18-11, is based on the assumption that no supermarkets would become vacant, as shown on Table 3.18-11. The "High" scenario likely overestimates the amount of new vacant space as a result of potential supermarket closures. The worst-case scenario in which up to two supermarkets potentially close would not necessarily increase the amount of vacant supermarket square feet in the City of Redlands – as implicitly assumed on Table 3.18-10 because only 10 of the 20 total supermarkets in CRTA are located in the City. Thus, it is possible that potential supermarket closures in the CRTA, under the worst-case conditions, would be outside of the City of Redlands. (DEIR p. 3.18-26.)

In both scenarios, the vacancy rate would be over the "standard" acceptable vacancy rate range for retail commercial space of 5.0 percent to 10.0 percent if all of the pending Projects were developed in the next 12 years. These projected worst-case impacts, however, are not expected to result in Urban Decay, for the following reasons. (DEIR p. 3.18-26.)

Redlands Mall. The existing retail inventory includes the Redlands Mall, which has been shut down as a result of General Growth Properties (the mall's previous owner) recent bankruptcy filing. The mall is now controlled by the Howard Hughes Corp. – a new company formed as part of the bankruptcy process that has taken over the company's portfolio of master-planned communities along with potential redevelopment properties. Although General Growth Properties intended to redevelop the mall into a

mixed-use urban village - combining multi-family residential, office, and retail development – when it purchased the property in 2004, the Howard Hughes Corp. is currently evaluating the property to determine its "true potential." In any event, the mall is a functionally obsolete, aging ,1970s era development which is not suitable for contemporary retail uses. Given that retail reuse of the existing mall is probably not viable, and that it has been shut down by its current owner, a case can be made that the mall's space should be excluded from the retail inventory. Excluding the mall's space from the inventory, the projected 2022 vacancy rate under cumulative conditions would range from 9.6 percent (low scenario) to 11.6 percent (high scenario). (DEIR p. 3.18-26.)

The potential planned and pending competitive space includes the 595,000-square foot Mountain Grove shopping center, the second phase of the Citrus Plaza shopping center. Majestic Realty, the Project's developer, has postponed the Project indefinitely due to current market conditions and limited interest from potential tenants. Given that there are no current plans to develop this retail space, it somewhat speculative to include this Project in the new planned and pending competitive space. Removing this Project from the planned and pending competitive supply, the highest projected vacancy rate would range from 6.8 percent (low scenario) to 9.0 percent (high scenario) in 2013, and would steadily decrease for the remainder of the study period. In addition, if the Mountain Grove shopping center is ultimately developed, the combined center (along with the Citrus Plaza) would function as a super-regional shopping center with over 1 million square feet of regional retail space. This type of center would likely draw shoppers from beyond the trade area boundaries evaluated in this analysis, in addition to capturing a larger share of retail demand from the SMA-E and SMA-W sub-areas of the RRTA (see Section 3.18-2). Thus, the additional market support for this Project – which is not projected within this analysis – indicates that the vacancy rates projected in Tables 3.18-10 and 3.18-11 in the Draft EIR are relatively aggressive, even with the potential development of the Mountain Grove shopping center Project. (DEIR pp. 3.18-26 to3.18-27.)

Cumulative Urban Decay Analysis

Community Retail Trade Area - As discussed above, cumulative impacts resulting from planned and pending supermarket Projects could result, under a worst-case condition, in the closing of up to two supermarkets in the CRTA. However, this does not mean that the impacts would necessarily result in urban decay in the CRTA. While the phenomenon of urban decay is not defined under CEQA, it is assumed to be indicated by significant deterioration of structures and/or their surroundings. Such deterioration occurs when property owners reduce property maintenance activities below that required to keep their properties in good condition. A store closure, in and of itself, does not meet the above criteria. While the closure of a business is clearly a severe impact to the owners and employees of the firm, within the context of CEQA it is only significant if it results in sustained vacancies and related deterioration of the physical condition of the vacant building(s). (DEIR p. 3.18-30.)

With the recent consolidation in the supermarket industry, there are many examples of neighborhood shopping centers that have lost supermarket anchor tenants and have not suffered a significant deterioration of structures and/or their surroundings. Many of these centers have either attracted new (non-supermarket) anchor tenants, sub-divided the space for multiple retail users, or reconfigured the space for non-retail uses. Thus, losing a supermarket anchor tenant does not necessarily indicate that the shopping center will experience a downward spiral of store closures and long-term vacancies. (DEIR p. 3.18-30.)

Regional Retail Trade Area - With respect to the RRTA, it is possible – as described above – that the market could become overbuilt during the period from 2013 through 2022 if all of the aggregate retail development planned by the proponents comes on line during that period. If an overbuilt retail

environment does develop, there would be a potential for business failures with resulting closures of retail facilities in the trade area. However, most of the future tenants of the planned retail Projects have not yet been identified. As such, it is currently not possible to identify which retail categories might become overbuilt, or to identify existing businesses in those categories, which might be forced to close. Therefore, any attempt to identify specific vacancies, which might result, or to determine the potential for physical deterioration or urban decay, would be speculative in this context. For purposes of evaluating CEQA impacts, it is not required or valid to engage in speculative analysis. (DEIR p. 3.18-30.)

A more likely cumulative scenario is that retail market conditions would result in a more gradual buildout of planned retail development, such that the pace of retail development would more closely follow the growth in retail demand. Under this scenario, there is less potential for overbuilt conditions to occur, and consequently a reduced potential for building vacancies and urban decay to follow. In fact, this finding is consistent with the developer's plans for the planned Mountain Grove Project, which has been put on hold indefinitely due to current market conditions and limited interest from potential tenants. But again, any attempt to identify businesses which might be affected under this scenario, if any, and whose closure might ultimately result in urban decay would be speculative, and therefore would not be required under CEQA. (DEIR p. 3.18-30.)

Retail Reuse of Existing Walmart Store - Although the Project-specific analysis indicates there would be sufficient demand to support some type of retail reuse of the existing Walmart store, the cumulative analysis, as discussed above, indicates that the retail market has the potential to become slightly overbuilt if all of the planned and pending Projects are built by 2013. As indicated in the cumulative analysis, the planned and pending aggregate retail development would absorb all of the residual demand through 2022, which could delay the reuse of the existing Walmart store. (DEIR p. 3.18-31.)

Based on TNDG's knowledge, the relative success in reusing closed Walmart stores for other retail uses represents a "mixed bag" of sorts, with some successfully reconfigured for other retail stores and others which have remained vacant for two to three years. Specifically, TNDG has prepared urban decay studies in the following California cities, identified in Table 3.18-12 in the Draft EIR, which involved the simultaneous closing of an existing Walmart store and the development of a Walmart store combining general merchandise and grocery sales. (DEIR p. 3.18-31.)

Even if the property owners of an existing shopping center are unable to attract replacement tenant(s) for the Walmart store, the closure of the Walmart store would not necessarily result in long-term physical impacts to the shopping center. Without Walmart, the shopping center would still function as a well-tenanted neighborhood shopping center with the existing Food 4 Less as a strong anchor tenant. For example, in Hanford, CA, the similar-size Centennial Plaza experienced the closure of a Walmart store in 2006, but has remained viable without the re-tenanting of that store. Although vacancies have slightly increased, the center is still anchored by a Foods Co. Supermarket (which was remodeled in 2005, well after it was known that the existing Walmart store would be closing), a Pep Boys, and a Dollar or Less store. (DEIR p. 3.18-31.)

Impacts to Downtown Redlands - Although in the Project-specific analysis under impact UD-1, above, did not identify potential impacts to downtown retail tenants resulting from development of the Project, the existing and planned retail development near the Interstate 10/State Route 30 (I-10 / SR-30) interchange will potentially place additional competitive pressures on downtown retailers. This potential impact is also acknowledged in the Economic Development Strategy recently prepared for the City. However, in terms of potential cumulative impacts, the Project's impact is not expected to be cumulatively considerable, for two key reasons. First, although the new store will be larger than the

existing store (primarily due to the supermarket component) and include some new specialty merchandise and restaurant space, the Project is largely a relocation of the existing Walmart store. Since the downtown area already faces competition from the existing Walmart, the potential net impact of the Project is much less than the development of a brand new Walmart store. Second, given the downtown area already faces competition from the existing Walmart, any potential cumulative impacts to the downtown area resulting from the planned and pending projects would occur with or without the development of the Project. Such cumulative projects are not driven by the Walmart project, but would be expected to independently proceed whether or not the proposed Project occurs.

Moreover, the following factors are expected to lessen potential urban decay impacts in the downtown area. (DEIR p. 3.18-32.)

- There is an existing assessment district formed under the 1989 Parking and Business Improvement Area law that provides resource to the City and specific the Development Services Department, which actively works to preserve and promote the downtown area, including promoting public events, decorating public places, maintenance of existing facilities, etc. (DEIR p. 3.18-32.)
- General Growth Properties, a major real estate investment trust (REIT), was considering developing two key Projects in the downtown area – the Redlands Promenade and the redevelopment of the Redlands Mall. Due to the firm's recent bankruptcy filing and the current slowdown in the commercial and residential real estate markets, both Projects have been on hold. Although no application was filed with the City, General Growth Properties, which has recently been succeeded by Howard Hughes Corporation as owner or the property, extensively evaluated the potential to redevelop the Redlands Mall into a mixed-use (retail, office, and multi-family residential) development incorporating, as one component, an open-air shopping center. Thus, it is possible that a similar development proposal will emerge to redevelop the mall site once the residential and commercial real estate markets begin to recover. (DEIR p. 3.18-32.)

B. Potentially Significant Impacts Which Can Be Mitigated Below A Level Of Significance With Mitigation Measures

Public Resources Code section 21081 states that no public agency shall approve or carry out a Project for which an EIR has been completed which identifies one or more significant effects unless the public agency makes one or more of the following findings:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR, and overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the Project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.

The following issues from ten of the environmental categories analyzed in the EIR, including Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous

Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Public Services, and Greenhouse Gases were found to be potentially significant, but can be mitigated to a less than significant level with the imposition of mitigation measures. The City hereby finds pursuant to *Public Resources Code* section 21081 that all potentially significant impacts listed below can and will be mitigated to below a level of significance by imposition of the mitigation measures in the EIR; and that these mitigation measures are included as Conditions of Approval and set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program adopted by the City. Specific findings of the City for each category of such impacts are set forth in detail below.

1. Aesthetics

Impact AES-4: Would the proposed Project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Aesthetics are discussed in detail in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-4. (DEIR pp. 3.1-25 to 3.1-26.) This mitigation measures, enumerated below, is adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

MM AES-4: Prior to issuance of building permits, the Project applicant shall submit a photometric plan to the City of Redlands for review and approval. The photometric plan shall identify types of lighting fixtures and their locations on the Project site. All light fixtures shall be shielded, recessed, or directed downward to prevent unwanted illumination of neighboring properties. (DEIR p.3.1-26.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project accommodates 275,500 square feet of commercial, retail and restaurant uses. Development of the Project would require new lighting fixtures to be installed on-site, including on the building exterior, in landscape areas, in parking areas, and in loading areas. Vehicles associated with development of the Project may introduce a new light source to the area as well. The new sources of light associated with the Project could potentially impact nearby properties. Lighting in the southeastern portion of the Project area is of particular concern because of the proximity residences. (DEIR pp. 3.1-25 to 3.1-26.)

Currently, existing various uses within the Project area including the Citrus Plaza (directly west of SR-210 Freeway), the Home Depot Center and associated commercial uses (0.25 mile south) and residential uses located east and southeast of the Project site generate light sources. In addition, headlights from nearby traffic on Tennessee Street (east) and the SR-210 Freeway (east) generate additional light within the Project area. (DEIR p.3.1-26.)

City policy requires that lighting associated with new development Projects be arranged in a manner that prevents the direction or reflection of annoying light and glare onto residential areas (Section 28.96.210 of the Municipal Code). Therefore, mitigation is proposed that would require the Project applicant to submit a photometric plan to the City that identifies lighting fixtures and practices to be installed that will prevent spillage of light and glare onto neighboring properties. With the implementation of this mitigation, the Project would minimize the amount of the light and glare it would add to the ambient environment and, therefore, ensure that impacts are reduced to a level of less than significant. (DEIR p.3.1-26.)

2. Air Quality

Impact AQ-1: Would the proposed Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Air Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2. (DEIR pp. 3.3-18 to 3.3-21.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

MM AQ-1: During construction, one of the following scenarios shall be applied:

- *A maximum of 15,700 horsepower hours per day for the off-road equipment shall be used and the off-road equipment shall have Tier 2 engines or higher.*
- *A maximum of 12,100 horsepower hours per day for the off-road equipment shall be used.*

MM AQ-2 During construction, paving shall not occur during the building or grading phases. Paving can occur during architectural coating (painting).

(DEIR pp. 3.3-20 to 3.3-21.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: An AQMP describes air pollution control strategies to be taken by a city, county, or region classified as a non-attainment area. The 2007 AQMP prepared by the SCAQMD is designed to satisfy the State Implementation Plan submittal requirements of the federal Clean Air Act to demonstrate attainment of the new federal 8-hour ozone and $PM_{2.5}$ ambient air quality standards, the California Clean Air Act triennial update requirements, and fulfill the SCAQMD's commitment to update transportation emission budgets based on the latest approved motor vehicle emissions model and planning assumptions. CEQA requires that certain proposed projects be analyzed for consistency with the AQMP. (DEIR p. 3.3-18.)

According to the SCAQMD, the Project is consistent with the AQMP if the Project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP (South Coast Air Quality Management District 1993, page 12-3). (DEIR p. 3.3-18.)

Impact AQ-2 demonstrated that during construction the Project could violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation for nitrogen dioxide. See Table 3.3-9, which illustrates, without mitigation incorporated, an exceedance of nitrogen dioxide (0.205) over the identified significance threshold (0.180) for localized construction impacts. Therefore, without mitigation, the Project construction results in a potentially significant impact. During operation, localized onsite concentrations and impacts at Project impacted intersections are less than significant. (DEIR pp. 3.3-19 and 3.3-27.)

The second indicator of whether the Project could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air quality plan is by assessing the Project's compliance with the control measures in the 2003 and the 2007 AQMPs. (DEIR p. 3.3-19.)

The 2003 AQMP contains a number of land use and transportation control measures including the following: the District's Stationary and Mobile Source Control Measures; State Control Measures proposed by ARB; and Transportation Control Measures provided by Southern California Association of Governments. ARB's strategies for reducing mobile source emissions include the following approaches: new engine standards; reduce emissions from in-use fleet, require clean fuels, support alternative fuels and reduce petroleum dependency, work with EPA to reduce emissions from national and state sources, and pursue long-term advanced technology measures (AQMP 2003, page 4-25). Transportation control measures provided by Southern California Association of Governments include those contained in the Regional Transportation Plans, the most current version of which is the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan. The Regional Transportation Plan has control measures to reduce emissions from on-road sources by incorporating strategies such as high occupancy vehicle interventions, transit, and information-based technology interventions (AQMP 2003, page 4-19). The Project is in compliance with regional control measures and has incorporated means of encouraging alternative methods of transportation, and thus would indirectly comply with the control measures set by ARB and Southern California Association of Governments. (DEIR p. 3.3-19.)

The focus of the 2007 AQMP is to demonstrate attainment of the federal $PM_{2.5}$ ambient air quality standard by 2015 and the federal 8-hour ozone standard by 2024, while making expeditious progress toward attainment of state standards. The proposed strategy, however, does not attain the previous federal 1-hour ozone standard by 2010 as previously required prior to the recent change in federal regulations. This is to be accomplished by building upon improvements from the previous plans and incorporating all feasible control measures while balancing costs and socioeconomic impacts. The 2007 AQMP indicates that $PM_{2.5}$ is formed mainly by secondary reactions or sources. Therefore, instead of reducing fugitive dust, the strategy for reducing $PM_{2.5}$ focuses on reducing precursor emissions of SO_x, directly emitted $PM_{2.5}$, NO_x, and VOC. The Final 2007 AQMP control measures consist of four components. These components are discussed Impact AQ-1 in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report (around page 70). The Project is consistent with the components. (DEIR p. 3.3-19.)

Geographical areas in the state that exceed the federal air quality standards are called nonattainment areas. The Project area is in nonattainment for ozone, PM10, PM2.5, and nitrogen dioxide. State Implementation Plans (SIPs) show how each area will attain the federal standards. To do this, the SIPs identify the amount of pollutant emissions that must be reduced in each area to meet the standard and the emission controls needed to reduce the necessary emissions. On September 27, 2007, ARB adopted its State Strategy for the 2007 SIP. In 2009, the SIP was revised to account for emissions reductions from regulations adopted in 2007 and 2008 and clarifies ARB's legal commitment. There are currently proposed revisions and a 2011 Progress Report. The South Coast is currently 94 percent of the way towards achieving the 2014 emissions levels identified in its PM2.5 SIP. The SIP takes into account ARB rules and regulations. The Project will comply with applicable rules and regulations. (DEIR p. 3.3-20.) The Project would comply with all applicable rules and regulations. Therefore, the Project complies with this criterion. (DEIR p. 3.3-20.)

According to Chapter 12 of the SCAQMD, CEQA, Air Quality Handbook, the purpose of the consistency finding is to determine whether a project is inconsistent with the assumptions and objectives of the regional air quality plans, and thus whether it would interfere with the region's ability to comply with federal and State air quality standards. If a project is inconsistent, local governments need to consider project modifications or inclusion of mitigation to eliminate the inconsistency. Consistency with the AQMP implies that a project is consistent with the goals, objectives, and assumptions in the respective plan to achieve the national and State air quality standards. To assess the environmental

impacts of new or renovated developments accurately, environmental pollution and population growth are projected for future scenarios. (DEIR p. 3.3-20.)

Since the AQMP could be based on local general plans, projects that are deemed consistent with the general plan are found to be consistent with the AQMP. The City of Redlands General Plan has designated the Project area as "commercial" to accommodate business growth in the Project vicinity. Since the Project's intended land use is consistent with the current General Plan, implementation of the Project would not require any amendments to the City's zoning designations for the Project site. Therefore, the Project would be within the City's General Plan designation and is consistent with the adopted SCAQMD AQMP according to this criterion. (DEIR p. 3.3-20.)

As shown in Impact AQ-2 of the findings and Draft EIR, implementation of mitigation measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 would reduce localized impacts of nitrogen dioxide to less than significant. The measures reduce daily emissions of NOx thereby reducing the Project's localized contribution to air quality violations to less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.3-21.)

Impact AQ-2: Would the proposed Project violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Air Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 and AQ-2. (DEIR pp. 3.3-21 to 3.3-39.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

See MM AQ-1 and MM AQ-2 under Impact AQ-1 above.

(DEIR p. 3.3-38.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The potential for violation of ambient air quality standards was judged based on three criteria: Criterion 1: the localized significance analysis for the Project's construction; Criterion 2: the localized significance analysis for the Project's operational emissions; and Criterion 3: the CO hotspot assessment for operational emissions. (DEIR p. 3.3-21.)

Localized Analysis Methodology - The localized analysis assesses the impact of onsite Project emissions to sensitive receptors located within the vicinity of the Project. The SCAQMD, in its Localized Significance Threshold Methodology indicates that only onsite emissions are included in the localized analysis. In order to estimate the impact to sensitive receptors, the future concentration of pollutants must be calculated at the location of the sensitive receptors and compared with a standard or threshold. The onsite emissions are input into an air dispersion model, the U.S. EPA AERMOD Model, to simulate the transport and dispersion of Project-related emissions released from onsite construction and operational activities. These impacts were then compared to the applicable SCAQMD localized concentration thresholds and ambient air quality standards to assess the regulatory significance of these impacts. (DEIR p. 3.3-21.)

Note that the SCAQMD's localized methodology only applies to nitrogen dioxide, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Ozone and VOC are not included because it is not a localized pollutant and modeling for ozone is complex and speculative to occur at the Project level; ozone is addressed under the regional analysis (see Impact AQ-3). Sulfur dioxide, sulfates, visibility reducing particles, and hydrogen sulfide are not

modeled because the Basin is in attainment for those pollutants and the Project would not emit those pollutants in sufficient quantity (background concentrations are low). Diesel particulate matter and benzene are assessed in Impact AQ-4. (DEIR pp. 3.3-21 to 3.3-22.)

Criterion 1: Localized Significance Analysis - Construction

Localized construction emissions were estimated using the SCAQMD-recommended model, CalEEMod. Short-term construction impacts would include fugitive dust and other particulate matter generated during earthmoving activities and exhaust emissions from earthmoving, building construction, and paving equipment. Construction activities cause various types of air emissions consisting principally of criteria pollutant exhaust emissions (NO_x, SO_x, CO, VOC, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$) from heavy-duty construction equipment and fugitive dust (mainly PM_{10}) from disturbed soil. Construction-related activities include the following: Grading/clearing for the Project site and the detention areas; Building construction; Asphalt paving of roads and parking lots throughout the development; and Application of architectural coatings on surfaces such as exterior walls and interior painting. (DEIR p. 3.3-22.)

Construction equipment such as cranes, bulldozers, scrapers, forklifts, backhoes, and water trucks are expected to be used on the Project site and would result in exhaust emissions. During the finishing phase, paving operations and application of architectural coatings would release VOC emissions. In accordance with the SCAQMD methodology, only emissions of NO_x, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ generated from onsite construction activities are included in the assessment. Emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model Version 2011.1.1 (CalEEMod), which was released March 22, 2011. It was assumed that construction would occur in the year 2012 and would last approximately one year. This is based on the buildout date assumption of 2013. As shown in the Draft EIR, the Project would have an expedited construction schedule compared with the defaults. (DEIR p. 3.3-22.)

There would be 10 smaller buildings that would range between 3,000 and 12,300 square feet and the Walmart building at 215,000 square feet. As shown in Table 3.3-6 in the Draft EIR, building construction would only take 28 percent of the time and grading would only take 38 percent of the time compared with the CalEEMod default. The CalEEMod default construction equipment list is based on survey data based on the size of the sites (i.e., there is data for a 34 acre site). To account for the shortened phases, the following equipment were added to the default assumptions: Grading of main site: +1 rubber tired dozer, +2 tractors; Building: +2 welders, +3 generator sets, +1 crane. The construction equipment list used for the unmitigated scenario is shown in Table 3.3-6 of the Draft EIR. (DEIR p. 3.3-23.)

Paving - VOC emissions from paving is based on a total of 26.45 acres. This includes 17.35 acres of parking lots (from the site plan) and 9.1 acres of roads (San Bernardino Avenue 122 feet by 1,200 feet; Tennessee Street 88 feet by 1,200 feet; Pennsylvania Avenue 48 feet by 1,350 feet; New York Avenue 66 feet by 1,200 feet – values are approximate). The addition of the mitigation measures requiring roadway improvements may increase the days paving and related activities take place. However, since the air quality analysis is based on the daily emissions, these traffic related mitigation measures would not change the significance findings for the air quality analysis. The greenhouse gas analysis is based on the annual emissions; however, this increase is accounted for in the baseline emissions and is not substantial. (DEIR p. 3.3-24.)

Grading - The quantity of fugitive dust estimated by CalEEMod is based on the number of equipment used during grading. Tractors, graders, and dozers would impact 0.5 acres per 8-hour day and scrapers would impact 1 acre per 8-hour day. Excavators are not listed; however, for this analysis, it is assumed that they would impact 0.5 acres per day as well. Therefore, considering the equipment assumed during

grading, there would be 7 acres disturbed per day on the main site and 3.5 acres per day on Parcel 11. This analysis assumes that grading of the main site would last for 40 days; therefore, there would be 280 total acres disturbed during the phase (7 acres x 40 days). During grading of Parcel 11, there would be 35 total acres disturbed (3.5 acres x 10 days). The digging of the detention pond is included in the overall grading emissions from the use of onsite offroad equipment. It is assumed for purposes of this analysis that there would be no import or export of soil. (DEIR p. 3.3-24.)

SCAQMD Rule 403 requires fugitive dust generating activities follow best available control measures to reduce emissions of fugitive dust. These measures are accounted for in CalEEMod as mitigation because the model categorizes the measures as mitigation, even though they are technically not mitigation. The best available control measures and the associated measure in CalEEMod are displayed in Table 3.3-7 of the Draft EIR. (DEIR p. 3.3-24.)

The construction emissions for the localized assessment were extracted from the CalEEMod model considering only emissions generated from onsite construction activities such as from construction equipment exhaust (off-road diesel) and fugitive dust from earth-moving activities. A review of the CalEEMod model outputs indicated that the highest emissions generated from onsite construction activities are associated with the mass grading activities of the Project site. Therefore, grading emissions during this construction activity were evaluated in the localized assessment. The maximum daily grading emissions are provided in Table 3.3-8 of the Draft EIR. (DEIR pp. 3.3-25 to 3.3-26.)

The modeling assessment used the meteorological data for the year 2007 as provided by the SCAQMD for their Redlands monitoring station, which is located 2.5 miles southeast of the Project site. A construction area of 10.5 acres was assumed based on the extent of the area that could be disturbed in a day as derived from the CalEEMod model, which considers the amount of work that construction equipment can accomplish in a day. Two construction emission sources were evaluated: Onsite construction equipment exhaust emissions were represented by an area source distributed over the 10.5-acre construction area with a release height of five meters (16.5 feet); and An area source with a size of 10.5 acres and a ground-level release height was used to represent the onsite emissions of fugitive dust. (DEIR p. 3.3-26.)

The two onsite construction emission sources were located along the southeastern corner of the Project property line across from the closest residences along Karon Street. Construction was assumed to occur over an 8-hour day on weekdays. (DEIR p. 3.3-26.)

It should be noted that nitrogen dioxide present in the atmosphere is formed from two sources. One source is the direct emission of nitrogen dioxide from the combustion of fuel. The second source involves the formation of nitrogen dioxide in the atmosphere due to reactions of oxides of nitrogen emissions and ambient concentrations of ozone and reactive hydrocarbons. The concentrations of nitrogen dioxide increases as the distance from the emission source increases, but only to a certain point, since dispersion dilutes the concentrations. The Ozone Limiting Method (OLM) was used in the AERMOD model to convert the NO_X emissions to nitrogen dioxide based on the distance from the source to the receptor and background ozone concentrations. (DEIR p. 3.3-26.)

Table 3.3-9 in the Draft EIR provides a comparison of the Project's localized construction impacts with the SCAQMD's significance thresholds without mitigation.

Table 0-1: Localized Construction Impacts - Construction

Air Pollutant	Averaging Time, Units	Local Project Impact	Background Air Quality	Total	Standard/ Threshold	Significant Impact?
Carbon monoxide (CO)	1-hour, ppm	0.7	3	3.7	20.0	No
	8-hour, ppm	0.1	2.2	2.3	9.0	No
Nitrogen dioxide (NO_2)	1-hour, ppm	0.114	0.091	0.205	0.18	Yes
Particulate matter (PM_{10})	24-hour, g/m^3	10.2	NA	10.2	10.4	No
	Annual, g/m^3	0.7	NA	0.7	1.0	No
Particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	24-hour, g/m^3	8.6	NA	8.6	10.4	No

Notes:
NA = Not Applicable; background levels are not defined for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ for purposes of significance testing
ppm = parts per million (a unit of concentration); g/m^3 = micrograms per cubic meter (a unit of concentration)
Source: Michael Brandman Associates 2011.

Note that the impact estimates for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ include compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 regarding fugitive dust as discussed previously. The highest impacts were generally noted along the southeast corner of the Project's fence line along Pennsylvania Avenue. Concentrations from the Project during construction would exceed the SCAQMD's localized construction significance threshold for NO_2 but not exceed the significance thresholds for CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. As a result, the Project would result in a significant localized air quality impact during construction. As identified within Table 3.3-22, with incorporation of mitigation measures AQ-1 and AQ-2, the localized construction impacts for nitrogen dioxide would be reduced below the threshold of significance.

Table 0-2: Localized Construction Impacts – Construction (Mitigated)

Air Pollutant	Averaging Time, Units	Local Project Impact	Background Air Quality	Total	Standard/ Threshold	Significant Impact?
Nitrogen dioxide (NO_2)	1-hour, ppm	0.078	0.091	0.169	0.18	No

Source: Michael Brandman Associates 2011.

(DEIR pp. 3.3-27 and 3.3-39.)

Criteria 2: Localized Significance Analysis – Operation

Operational or long-term emissions occur over the life of the Project. The assessment of local operational impacts was accomplished for three scenario years: Scenario 2010 representing an existing condition in accordance with the Project's traffic impact study (Urban Crossroads 2011); although the Project would not be operational it is assumed for purposes of this analysis that the Project would be operational; Scenario 2013 representing the expected build out year when the Project would commence operations; Scenario 2030 representing a long-term future Horizon Year. (DEIR p. 3.3-27.)

Note that the Project impacts during the above three scenario years result from the changes in emissions that occur over time associated with the various Project emission sources such as motor vehicles and transport refrigeration units. These emission changes occur as a result of future vehicle turnover to newer and cleaner vehicle models and the implementation of regulatory mandated emission control technologies. The aforementioned Project impacts are incremental in nature and result from the changes in Project emissions. (DEIR pp. 3.3-27 to 3.3-28.)

The predominant sources of onsite operational emissions are the motor vehicles and trucks that access the Project site. Such emissions result from the delivery truck traffic that arrives, unloads, and departs daily from the various Project buildings and from the daily customer and worker traffic accessing the Project's parking lots. Additional operational emissions also arise from the combustion of natural gas for heating, landscape emissions, operation of the gasoline service station, and from the use of consumer products. In this assessment, four main emission sources were evaluated as to their localized operational impacts on air quality: Delivery truck exhaust emissions from traffic that would move onto the Project site from the entrances along San Bernardino Avenue, Tennessee Street, and the future Pennsylvania Avenue; Truck idling emissions at loading docks; Emissions associated with the use of TRUs, which are used in the transport of perishable food items; and Automobile traffic from workers and customers while traveling and idling within the parking lots. (DEIR p. 3.3-28.)

The estimation of the onsite mobile source emissions requires the specification of several key pieces of information including the number of vehicle trips by vehicle type, trip travel lengths, vehicle idling time, and emission factors that define the amount of emissions as a function of vehicle speed and distance traveled or amount of idling time per vehicle. (DEIR p. 3.3-28.)

Pollutant emissions from the various onsite mobile sources were calculated using information derived from the Project description, Project traffic study, truck delivery information for Walmart operations, and mobile source emission factors from the ARB EMFAC2007 emissions factor model. Vehicle trip distances were determined from the Project's site plan as the distance from the nearest Project entrance to the various Project buildings. The emission factors for the Project's mobile source operational emissions were based on the fleet years 2010, 2013, and 2030. Vehicle travel speeds while traveling onsite were assumed to be 10 miles per hour (mph) for both trucks and customer vehicles. Delivery trucks were assumed to idle for 15 minutes per day at the building loading areas pursuant to guidance from the SCAQMD while customer vehicles were assumed to idle for 1 minute per day while in the parking lots. (DEIR p. 3.3-28.)

The number of delivery trucks was estimated from the type of retail/commercial operation and information available from similar Walmart projects and from similar retail/commercial projects. (DEIR p. 3.3-28.)

The average trip distance for the Walmart delivery trucks was assumed to be 20 miles as the distance to the nearest Walmart distribution centers in Mira Loma and Fontana, California. The percentages of worker and customer trips are from CalEEMod defaults. The trip generation rates are from the Project's Traffic Impact Analysis (Urban Crossroads 2011). (DEIR p. 3.3-29.)

The Traffic Impact Analysis assumed that there would be an internal capture of 10 percent for all uses. Internal capture is a percent reduction attributed to trips internal to the site; trips may be made between individual retail uses onsite and can be made either by walking or using internal roadways without using external streets. Pass-by trips are intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are attracted from passing the site on an adjacent street or roadway that offers direct access to the generator. The high-turn over sit down restaurant and the fast food restaurant(s) without a drive-through would have a pass-by reduction of 43 percent. The fast food restaurant(s) with a drive-through would have a pass-by reduction of 50 percent. The gas station would have a pass-by reduction of 56 percent. (DEIR p. 3.3-30.)

CalEEMod assumes that "primary" trips travel 100 percent of the trip distance; "diverted" trips travel 25 percent of the trip length; and pass-by trips are 0.1 miles in length. Therefore, it is assumed for these purposes that the internal capture and pass-by trips are 0.1 miles in length (and are attributed in CalEEMod as pass-by trips). There are zero diverted trips and the rest of the percentage are primary trips. The percentages for customer, worker, and other trips are from the CalEEMod defaults. (DEIR p. 3.3-30.)

The vehicle mix for customer and worker trips is shown in Table 3.3-13 of the Draft EIR, as derived from the URBEMIS2007 model for the year 2013. Light-heavy duty trucks (1 and 2), medium duty trucks, and heavy-heavy duty trucks are taken out of the mix, as they are accounted for in the delivery truck mix. (DEIR p. 3.3-31.)

The trip lengths for the customer base are derived from the trade area in the Urban Decay Analysis prepared by the Natelson Dale Group. The trade area for the grocery components of the Project is 5 miles, based on Figure I-1 in the Urban Decay Analysis. The trade area for the non-grocery components of the Project includes the primary market area and the secondary market area (Figure I-2 in the Urban Decay Analysis) and is assumed to be 8.3 miles (the average of the distances to the edges of the east and west secondary market areas: 4, 4, 12, 12, 6, 4, 12, and 12 miles). The grocery sales and support component of Walmart is 43,809 square feet, 16 percent of the total square feet in the Project (272,500 square feet). Therefore, a weighted average of the two is 7.8 miles, which is used for the customer trips. The trip length for the worker trips is 9.5 miles, from CalEEMod. The non-work trips is 7.8 miles (increased from the CalEEMod default of 7.3). A summary of the trip lengths is as follows: Customer and Other: 7.8 miles per trip; Workers: 9.5 miles per trip. (DEIR p. 3.3-31.)

Each delivery truck will idle not more than 15 minutes per day while loading/unloading at the building loading docks. The SCAQMD in its comment letters recommends a 15-minute truck idling assumption (5 minutes while arriving at the loading dock, 5 minutes unloading/loading, and 5 minutes waiting to depart). This is a very conservative assumption, as California law has a 5-minute idling restriction. In addition, Walmart has an automatic shutoff on its heavy-duty trucks, which limits idling to 3 minutes. (DEIR p. 3.3-31.)

Another conservative assumption in this analysis is that the vehicle age applied the default truck distribution contained in the EMFAC mobile source emission model that includes a fleet of trucks spanning a 25-year time frame (i.e., a mix of vehicles from 1988 to 2013). (DEIR p. 3.3-32.)

Delivery truck traffic was assumed to access the Project site from three main driveways: From Tennessee Street; From Pennsylvania Avenue; and from San Bernardino Avenue. Delivery trucks servicing the Walmart store were assumed to operate over a 24-hour day while the delivery trucks servicing the remaining parcels were assumed to operate over a 12-hour schedule. (DEIR p. 3.3-32.)

Emissions are also associated with the customer and employee motor vehicles that would visit the various retail and commercial facilities as these vehicles travel and idle within the parking lots. The emission calculation for parking lot access was based on the number of vehicle trips expected to access the Project during a Saturday and also the Saturday peak traffic period. The parking lot usage assumed a 24-hour operation in keeping with the 24-hour operation of the large Walmart store. (DEIR p. 3.3-32.)

Appendix B in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report provides a detailed tabulation of the criteria pollutant mobile source emission factors assumed in this assessment. The emission factors were derived from the ARB EMFAC2007 mobile source emission model as a function of fleet year, vehicle class (axle number), vehicle speed, and pollutant. (DEIR p. 3.3-32.)

Small amounts of criteria pollutant emissions would also be released from the combustion of natural gas within the Project buildings for water and air heating. The natural gas emissions were estimated from CalEEMod and apportioned to each building according to building size. (DEIR p. 3.3-32.)

Each of the emission source types described above also requires geometrical and emission release specifications for use in the air dispersion model. Exhibit 5 in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report provides the location of the various Project facilities and emission source locations. By way of explanation, the following definitions are used in defining the emission source geometrical configurations referred to in Table 3.3-14 of the Draft EIR: Point source: a single identifiable local source of emissions; it is approximated in the AERMOD air dispersion model as a mathematical point in the modeling region with a location and emission characteristics such as height of release, temperature, etc. (Example: a stack or vent); Area source: a diffuse source of emissions released uniformly over a broad area (Example: a parking lot); Volume source: an area source with a third dimension (Example: construction area using off-road equipment with a height of release); and Line source: a series of volume sources along a path (Example: vehicular traffic along a street). (DEIR pp. 3.3-32 to 3.3-33.)

The assessment also requires that a network of receptors be specified such that the impacts can be computed at the various locations within the network. Exhibit 6 in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report shows the various receptor locations. For purposes of this assessment, the following receptor network was used: Lines of receptors spaced 70 meters (230 feet) along the Project boundary line then spaced out to 500 (1,640 feet) meters in increments of 100 meters (330 feet); Receptors located at nearby sensitive receptors such as at residences immediately to the east of the Project. (DEIR p. 3.3-34.)

The assessment of air quality and health risk impacts from pollutant emissions from this Project applied the U.S. EPA AERMOD Model which is the air dispersion model accepted by the SCAQMD for performing air quality impact analyses. AERMOD predicts pollutant concentrations from point, area, volume, line, and flare sources with variable emissions in terrain from flat to complex with the inclusion of building downwash effects from buildings on pollutant dispersion. It captures the essential atmospheric physical processes and provides reasonable estimates over a wide range of meteorological conditions and modeling scenarios. (DEIR p. 3.3-34.)

Account was taken of the effects of building downwash on the dispersion of emissions from the various sources located on the Project's property. Building downwash occurs when the aerodynamic turbulence,

induced by nearby buildings, causes pollutants emitted from an elevated source to be mixed rapidly toward the ground (downwash). This results in potentially higher ground-level concentrations than if the buildings were not present. The dispersion model contains algorithms to account for building downwash effects. The required information includes the location of the emission source, location of adjacent buildings, and the building geometry in terms of length, width, and height. For purposes of this analysis, the emission source and building locations were taken from the Project site plan. The building geometries assumed a building height of 10 meters (35 feet) for the Walmart store (Parcel 10) and the future buildings on Parcel 11 and 6 meters (20 feet) for all other buildings (Parcels 1 – 9). (DEIR pp. 3.3-34 to 3.3-35.)

Hourly meteorological data are also required to operate the AERMOD model to determine the direction and rate of dispersion of emissions released into the atmosphere. Meteorological data for use in the air dispersion model was obtained from the SCAQMD website for their Redlands Air Monitoring Station for the year 2007, the only period of valid data provided by the SCAQMD for performing air dispersion modeling assessments using the Redlands meteorological data. (DEIR p. 3.3-35.)

The Draft EIR (Table 3.3-16, -17, and -18) provide the results of the Project's localized operational impacts along with a comparison to the SCAQMD's localized thresholds for NO_2 CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ for the years 2010, 2013, and 2030, respectively. The residential receptors with the highest localized operational impacts were found to the east of the Project across Karon Street. The results contained in the tables indicates that operation of the Project would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds for any pollutant during any analysis year. Therefore, operation of the Project would not result in a significant localized air quality impact. (DEIR p. 3.3-35.)

Criterion 2: CO Hot Spot Assessment

Within an urban setting, motor vehicle exhaust is the primary source of CO emissions. Consequently, the highest ambient CO concentrations are generally found within close proximity to congested intersection locations. A CO hotspot analysis is the appropriate tool to determine if emissions of CO from the operation of the Project would exceed federal or State ambient air quality standards for CO. During typical meteorological conditions, CO concentrations tend to decrease as the distance from the emission source (congested intersection) increases. For purposes of providing a worst-case impact analysis, CO concentrations are typically analyzed at the most congested intersection locations, because if impacts were less than significant in close proximity to the most congested intersections, impacts would also be less than significant at less congested intersections. (DEIR pp. 3.3-36 to 3.3-37.)

To examine potential traffic impacts from the Project, a Traffic Impact Analysis was prepared by Urban Crossroads in 2011. This study examined the traffic volumes and Levels of Service (LOS) at intersections surrounding the Project both with and without the Project-generated traffic. Traffic projections were made for the Project in 2010, 2013, and 2030. The intersections forecasted for existing plus Project intersections to have the five highest traffic volumes and an LOS F (prior to any traffic mitigation) in both forecast years were identified from the traffic study and a CO hot spot assessment was performed for each intersection. This approach represents a worst-case analysis since these intersections will not operate at LOS F as a result of the implementation of mitigation measures when the Project is operational. The highest CO emissions would be expected at such intersections because these intersections exhibit the highest intersection traffic volumes and congestion. CO impacts would be expected to be less at all other intersections. In estimating traffic volumes, the traffic generated by the Project was added to traffic growth in the area as well as from traffic from projects that are in the process of or have been approved by the City of Redlands. (DEIR p. 3.3-37.)

The CO emission factors used to calculate vehicle emissions at the various intersections depend on vehicle speed and vehicle mix and were derived from the ARB EMFAC2007 mobile source emission model for the years 2010, 2013, and 2030. The results of the CO hot spot assessment are provided within the Draft EIR (Tables 3.3-19, -20, and -21). (DEIR p. 3.3-37.)

The CO hot spot analysis demonstrated that Project emissions of CO during operation at Project impacted intersections along with emissions from other foreseeable projects in the area would not result in an exceedance of the most stringent ambient air quality standards for CO. Therefore, according to this criterion, air pollutant emissions during operation would result in a less than significant impact. (DEIR p. 3.3-38.)

Reducing the hours of equipment operation per day and/or requiring that the engines are Tier 2 or higher would reduce NOx emissions (mitigation measure AQ-1). The mitigation is applied in CalEEMod by requiring Tier 2 engines and reducing the hours of the equipment. Similar to mitigation measure AQ-1, measure AQ-2 would reduce the equipment in operation at one time. The mitigated concentrations are shown in the Draft EIR (Table 3.3-22). As shown in the table, mitigation reduces impacts to less than significant. (DEIR pp. 3.3-38 to 3.3-39.)

Impact AQ-3: Would the proposed Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Air Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 through AQ-3 for construction related impacts. (DEIR pp. 3.3-39 to 3.3-49.) Mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein. *However, the operational related emissions impacts, while discussed below, were determined to remain significant and unavoidable* (See Impact AQ-3 under Section II(C)).

Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Measures

See MM AQ-1 and MM AQ-2 under Impact AQ-1 above

MM AQ-3 Paint used during construction of the Project shall have a volatile organic compound content less than 125 grams per liter.

Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Measures

Mitigation measure T-6a is also required. Note that there are a variety of mitigation measures in the Transportation section of the EIR that would improve motor vehicle traffic flow. However, no reduction is taken for those measures because they encourage motor vehicle use. Cities with limited motor vehicle lanes, abundant and safe bicycle lanes, and dedicated alternate transportation lanes will observe reductions in vehicle miles traveled. Increasing the ease for motor vehicles encourages motor vehicle use and not alternate transportation.

MM AQ-4 Electrical hookups shall be provided in all loading docks for transportation refrigeration units visiting the site.

MM AQ-5 The City of Redlands shall improve traffic flow by signal synchronization along San Bernardino Avenue, Tennessee Street, and Pennsylvania Avenue.

MM AQ-6 All dock and delivery areas shall be posted with signs informing truck drivers of the California Air Resources Board regulations including the following:

a) Truck drivers shall turn off engines when not in use;

b) All delivery trucks servicing the Project shall not idle for more than five minutes per truck trip per day; and

c) Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and the California Air Resources Board to report violations.

MM AQ-7 The following measures shall be implemented to improve pedestrian access on and off site.

a) The Project shall incorporate pedestrian pathways between onsite uses. Site design and building placement shall provide pedestrian connections between internal and external facilities. Physical barriers such as walls, berms, landscaping, merchandising, and slopes that impede bicycle or pedestrian circulation shall be eliminated. Sidewalks shall be a minimum of five feet wide.

b) The Project shall ensure that there is safe pedestrian access to the developments located at Lugonia Avenue and Tennessee Street and Lugonia Avenue and Frontage Road. The pedestrian facilities shall be designed in accordance with City of Redlands regulations and shall be installed prior to opening of the Project.

c) The Project shall ensure that there is safe pedestrian access on Tennessee Street between Pioneer Avenue and San Bernardino Avenue. The pedestrian facilities shall be designed in accordance with City of Redlands regulations and shall be installed prior to opening of the Project.

MM AQ-8 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program: A TDM program shall be instituted for the Project or the buildings shall join an existing program located within a quarter mile radius from the Project site. The TDM program shall do the following:

a) Publish ride-sharing information for ride sharing vehicles and provide a website or message board for coordinating rides.

b) Ensure that appropriate bus route information is placed in each building and at the onsite bus stop.

c) Advertise the TDM Program to the Project's employees.

d) Identify a grace period for which employees who use public transportation can avoid disciplinary action for arriving late to work.

MM AQ-9 Bicycle parking shall be provided in safe and convenient locations throughout the Project, within 30 feet from all main entrances. Secure employee bicycle parking shall also be provided that is separate from public areas.

MM AQ-10 In the Walmart building, there shall be at least one locker for each employee working during the peak day. A minimum of five percent of the lockers shall be at least 38 inches high by 12 inches wide by 15 inches deep and reserved for employees who bicycle to work. In addition, a minimum of one shower shall be provided onsite for employees who bicycle to work.

MM AQ-11 Class II bicycle lanes and pedestrian sidewalks shall be provided on the new sections of roadway constructed or sides of any roadways that are widened as part of this Project.

(DEIR pp. 3.3-47 to 3.3-48; FEIR pp. 4-1 to 4-2.)

Facts in Support of the Finding:

The following analysis includes both mitigated impacts and significant impacts. They are addressed together here and identified under the Significant and Unavoidable Impacts section due to the method of analysis discussed within the EIR.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines 15130(b), this analysis of cumulative impacts is based on a summary of projections analysis. This analysis considers the current CEQA Guidelines, which includes the recent amendments approved by the Natural Resources Agency and effective on March 18, 2010. This analysis is based on the 2003 and 2007 AQMPs. The South Coast Air Basin is in nonattainment for ozone, particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$), and nitrogen dioxide, which means that concentrations of those pollutants currently exceed the ambient air quality standards for those pollutants. When concentrations of ozone, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and nitrogen dioxide exceed the ambient air quality standard, then those sensitive to air pollution (i.e., children, elderly, sick) could experience health effects such as decrease of pulmonary function and localized lung edema in humans and animals, increased mortality risk, and risk to public health implied by altered connective tissue metabolism and altered pulmonary morphology in animals after long-term exposures and pulmonary function decrements in chronically exposed humans. (DEIR pp. 3.3-39 to 3.3-40.)

Under the amended CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts may be analyzed using other plans that evaluate relevant cumulative effects. The AQMPs describe and evaluate the future projected emissions sources in the South Coast Air Basin and sets forth a strategy to meet both state and federal Clear Air Act planning requirements and federal ambient air quality standards. Therefore, the AQMPs are relevant plans for a CEQA cumulative impacts analysis. The 2003 AQMP updates the attainment demonstration for the federal standards for ozone and PM_{10}; replaces the 1997 attainment demonstration for the federal CO standard and provides a basis for a maintenance plan for CO for the future; and updates the maintenance plan for the federal nitrogen dioxide standard that the South Coast Air Basin has met since 1992. The 2007 AQMP focuses on ozone and $PM_{2.5}$. The AQMP also incorporates significant new scientific data, emission inventories, ambient measurements, control strategies, and air quality modeling. (DEIR p. 3.3-40.)

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15064, subdivision (h)(3), a lead agency may determine that a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable if the Project will comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program. As

identified in Impact AQ-1, the Project complies with the control measures in the 2003 and the 2007 AQMP and all of the SCAQMD's applicable rules and regulations. Under the CEQA Guidelines Amendments, the lead agency should explain how implementing the particular requirements in the plan, regulation, or program ensures that the Project's incremental contribution to the cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable. To explain how implementing the requirements in the AQMPs ensures the Project's incremental contribution to the cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable, the following three-pronged analysis was performed. To result in a less than significant impact, the following criteria must be met:

1. Regional analysis: emissions of nonattainment pollutants must be below the regional significance thresholds. This is an approach recommended by the SCAQMD in its comment letters.
2. Summary of projections: the project must be consistent with current air quality attainment plans including control measures and regulations. This is an approach consistent with Section 15130(b) of the CEQA guidelines.
3. Cumulative health impacts: the project must result in less than significant cumulative health effects from the nonattainment pollutants. This approach correlates the significance of the regional analysis with health effects, consistent with the court decision, *Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 1184, 1219-20.

(DEIR pp. 3.3-40 to 3.3-41.)

The South Coast Air Quality Management District 1993 Handbook suggests three voluntary approaches to determine cumulative significance. The first approach is a 1-percent-per-year reduction (or 18 percent over 18 years to the year 2010) in Project emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, PM_{10}, and SO_x. This approach is not straightforward and operational reductions are not easy to quantify. The second approach is not applicable because it relies on SCAQMD Regulation XV, which was repealed in 1995 and therefore is not applicable. The third approach is to reduce the rate of growth in vehicle miles traveled and trips. In this approach, the rate of growth in vehicle miles traveled and trips "should be held to the rate of population or household growth." Data that was used by Southern California Association of Governments in the AQMP should be used in this approach; however, that data is not available. Therefore, the approaches in the 1993 SCAQMD Handbook pertaining to cumulative impacts are not used. (DEIR p. 3.3-41.)

Criterion 1: Regional Impact Analysis

If an area is in nonattainment for a criteria pollutant, then the background concentration of that pollutant has historically been over the ambient air quality standard. It follows that if a project exceeds the regional threshold for that nonattainment pollutant, then it would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of that pollutant and result in a significant cumulative impact. (DEIR p. 3.3-41.)

The Basin is in nonattainment for nitrogen dioxide, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and ozone. Therefore, if the project exceeds the regional thresholds for PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$, then it contributes to a cumulatively considerable impact for those pollutants. Additionally, if the Project exceeds the regional threshold for NO_x or VOC, which are precursors to the formation of ozone and PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, then it follows that the Project would contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact for ozone, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. If the Project exceeds the threshold for NOx, it would contribute to nitrogen dioxide concentrations. Project impacts on a regional scale may occur many miles away from the Project site. Project emissions when added to the overall emission burden of the Basin could result in a cumulatively significant impact. (DEIR p. 3.3-41.)

Other parameters (besides those presented in Impact AQ-2) which are used to estimate emissions such as the worker and vendor trips and trip lengths utilize the CalEEMod defaults, with the addition of 5 daily haul trips during grading, which is to haul the construction equipment to the site or any import/export of material. (DEIR p. 3.3-41.)

Construction emissions are calculated during each period according to the type and level of construction activity occurring during the period. Activities can be discreet or overlapping. Emissions occur from construction equipment, fugitive dust, asphalt paving, architectural coating, and worker and delivery vehicles. Table 3.3-24 in the Draft EIR summarizes the Project's short-term regional construction emissions without application of mitigation measures for each construction activity (however, the particulate matter emissions do include compliance with the mitigation measures outlined in SCAQMD Rule 403). As shown in the Draft EIR, without mitigation, the Project's construction emissions would exceed the AQMD regional emission thresholds for VOC and NO_x during construction. Therefore, the short-term construction emissions would have a potentially significant regional impact. (DEIR p. 3.3-42.)

Mobile source emissions from motor vehicles are the largest single long-term source of air pollutants from the operation of the Project and consist of emissions from delivery trucks and customer and worker vehicles. Small amounts of emissions are also generated from area sources such as landscaping equipment, use of consumer products, natural gas consumption, and architectural coating/painting and from the operation of the service station. The emissions were generated using CalEEMod; assumptions are discussed in Impact AQ-2. Operational emissions (unmitigated) from mobile and area operational emission sources as derived from CalEEMod and from the service station shown in Table 3.3-25, Table 3.3-26, and Table 3.3-27 for the summer season for years 2010, 2013, and 2030, and Table 3.3-28 for the winter season within the Draft EIR. (DEIR p. 3.3-43; FEIR p. 4-1.)

As shown in the Draft EIR, operation of the Project would exceed the SCAQMD's regional operational significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM_{10}. VOC and NO_x are precursors in the formation of ozone and both contribute to the formation of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, pollutants for which the Basin has been identified as a non-attainment area (i.e., an area exceeding national or State standards). Thus, even though the Project's incremental emissions by themselves would not likely exceed the ozone, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ standards, their contribution to the overall SCAQMD regional emission burden would add to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, the Project does not meet Criterion 1. (DEIR p. 3.3-45.)

Note that as discussed in Impact AQ-2, during operation the Project would not exceed the ambient air quality standards for the pollutants assessed. This is based on localized emissions and concentrations. The analysis under this impact assesses the emissions based on the regional thresholds identified by the SCAQMD. Based on the regional thresholds, the cumulative impact is significant. (DEIR p. 3.3-45.)

Criterion 2: Consistency with Existing Air Quality Plans

The geographic scope for cumulative criteria pollution from air quality impacts is the Basin, because that is the area in which the air pollutants generated by the sources within the basin circulate and are often trapped. The SCAQMD is required to prepare and maintain an AQMP and a State Implementation Plan to document the strategies and measures to be undertaken to reach attainment of ambient air quality standards. While the SCAQMD does not have direct authority over land use decisions, it recognized that changes in land use and circulation planning are necessary to maintain clean air. The SCAQMD evaluated the entire basin when it developed the AQMP. (DEIR p. 3.3-45.)

According to the above analysis, the Project is not consistent with the most recent AQMP without mitigation. Therefore, the Project does not meet Criterion 2. (DEIR p. 3.3-46.)

Criterion 3: Cumulative Health Impacts

The basin is in nonattainment for ozone, nitrogen dioxide, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, which means that the background levels of those pollutants are at times higher than the ambient air quality standards. The air quality standards were set to protect public health, including the health of sensitive individuals (i.e., elderly, children, and the sick). Therefore, when the concentration of those pollutants exceeds the standard, it is likely that some sensitive individuals in the population will experience health effects as described above in the sub-section, Air Pollutants. However, the health effects are a factor of the dose-response curve. Concentration of the pollutant in the air (dose), the length of time exposed, and the response of the individual are factors involved in the severity and nature of health impacts. If a significant health impact results from Project emissions, it does not mean that 100 percent of the population would experience health effects. There are no models or methodology to calculate with certainty what health risks would be experienced from potential cumulative impacts. (DEIR p. 3.3-46.)

The regional analysis of construction emissions indicates that without mitigation, the Project would exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for VOC and NO_x (ozone precursors). In addition, long-term operational emissions of VOC and NO_x are over the District's significance thresholds. Because ozone is a secondary pollutant (it is not emitted directly but formed by chemical reactions in the air), it can be formed miles downwind of the Project site. Project emissions of VOC and NO_x may contribute to the background concentration of ozone and cumulatively cause health effects. Project emissions of NOx may contribute to the background concentration of nitrogen dioxide and cause health effects. (DEIR p. 3.3-46.)

Health impacts from ozone exposure may or may not include the following:

(a) Pulmonary function decrements and localized lung edema in humans and animals
(b) Risk to public health implied by alterations in pulmonary morphology and host defense in animals
(c) Increased mortality risk
(d) Risk to public health implied by altered connective tissue metabolism and altered pulmonary morphology in animals after long-term exposures and pulmonary function decrements in chronically exposed humans.

(DEIR p. 3.3-46.)

Short-term exposure to ozone can result in breathing pattern changes, reduction of breathing capacity, increased susceptibility to infections, inflammation of the lung tissue, and some immunological changes. Children who live in high ozone communities and who participate in multiple sports have been observed to have a higher asthma risk. This is a significant cumulative health impact associated with ground-level ozone concentrations. (DEIR p. 3.3-46.)

Health effects from nitrogen dioxide may include the following:

(a) Potential to aggravate chronic respiratory disease and respiratory symptoms in sensitive groups
(b) Risk to public health implied by pulmonary and extra-pulmonary biochemical and cellular changes and pulmonary structural changes
(c) Contribution to atmospheric discoloration

(DEIR p. 3.3-47.)

Additionally, during operation, the Project could result in a significance cumulative contribution to PM_{10}. Sensitive individuals may experience health impacts when concentrations of those pollutants exceed the ambient air quality standards. Health impacts from particulate matter may include the following: (a) exacerbation of symptoms in sensitive patients with respiratory or cardiovascular disease; (b) declines in pulmonary function growth in children; (c) and/or increased risk of premature death from heart or lung diseases in the elderly. Therefore, the Project does not meet Criterion 3. (DEIR p. 3.3-47.)

Criteria pollutants are treated differently from toxic air contaminants because criteria pollutants have state and federal standards and are set in a different regulatory environment than toxic air contaminants. Diesel particulate matter is a major part of PM2.5 and PM10 and thus is included in the criteria pollutant impact analysis for PM2.5 and PM10. Benzene is a hydrocarbon whose emissions are also estimated as part of the Project's operational VOC emissions (see regional operational emissions). Further, risk (as in estimating health risks) is estimated on a probability basis (e.g., cancer risk of 10 in one million) while criteria pollutant impacts are expressed as a not to be exceeded basis. Therefore, criteria pollutant impacts are not expressed as a risk. (DEIR p. 3.3-47.)

Construction: Less than significant. Mitigation measures AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3 would reduce the significance of construction emissions, as shown in Table 3.3-29 of the Draft EIR.

Table 0-3: Construction Air Pollutant Emissions (Mitigated)

Source	Onsite and Offsite Emissions (pounds per day)					
	VOC	**NO_x**	**CO**	**SO_x**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Grading of main Project	46.1	95.8	70.7	0.1	11.9	6.7
Grading of outparcels	8.9	72.2	40.5	0.1	7.4	4.8
Paving (parking lots, roads)	9.4	35.7	22.2	<0.1	3.4	3.1
Building	12.2	76.9	53.6	0.1	6.7	5.1
Coating	58.0	3.1	3.1	0.0	0.5	0.3
Overlapping: Paving, Coating	*67.4*	*38.8*	*25.3*	*<0.0*	*3.9*	*3.4*
Overlapping: Building, Coating	*70.2*	*80.0*	*56.7*	*0.1*	*7.2*	*5.4*
Maximum Daily Emissions	70.2	95.8	70.7	0.1	11.9	6.7
Significance Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source	Onsite and Offsite Emissions (pounds per day)					
	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Notes: The maximum daily emissions refer to the maximum emissions that would occur in one day. VOC = volatile organic compounds NO_x = nitrogen oxides CO = carbon monoxide SO_x = sulfur oxides PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter Source of emissions: Appendix A: CalEEMod Output. Source of thresholds: South Coast Air Quality Management District 2011a.						

The emissions reductions from AQ-1 are estimated by CalEEMod. The emission reductions from AQ-2 (not allowing overlap) are manually estimated by changing the overlapping additions. To attribute the emission reductions from AQ-3: the unmitigated emissions were estimated assuming 250 grams of VOC per Liter; assuming 125 grams per Liter would reduce emissions by half. (DEIR p. 3.3-49.)

Operation: ***Significant and unavoidable.*** The Project would result in a cumulatively significant impact even after mitigation because of the exceedances of the SCAQMD's regional emission thresholds for VOC, NOx, CO, and PM10. The Project may result in cumulative health effects from cumulative exposures from ozone, nitrogen dioxide, and PM10. The emission reductions resulting from the implementation of mitigation measures AQ-5, AQ-7, AQ-8, AQ-9, AQ-10, AQ-11, and T-6a would result in approximately a 1 percent reduction in motor vehicle emissions (see Table 3.17-6 in the Greenhouse Gas Draft EIR section for documentation). This reduction would not reduce operational emissions to less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.3-49.)

Impact AQ-4: Would the proposed Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Air Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 and AQ-2. (DEIR pp.3.3-50 to 3.3-57.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

See MM AQ-1 and MM AQ-2 under Impact AQ-1 above.

(DEIR p.3.3-57.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The closest existing sensitive receptors are residences located approximately 25 meters (82 feet) to the east and southeast of the Project across Karon Street. A review of the City of Redlands General Plan (City of Redlands 1995) indicates that the areas to the north, south, and west of the Project site have been designated as commercial and, therefore, would not involve the future location of sensitive receptors in these areas. The closest schools are the Citrus Valley High School located 0.3 miles north of the Project, the Lugonia School located 0.8 mile east of the Project, Clement Middle School located 1.0 miles east of the Project, and the Packinghouse Christian Academy located 0.6 mile west of the Project. (DEIR p.3.3-50; FEIR p. 4-1.)

Criterion 1: Localized Significance Analysis

The localized analysis uses thresholds that represent the maximum emissions for a Project that would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area. The thresholds are also based on the location of the sensitive receptors. If the Project results in emissions less than those thresholds, it follows that the Project would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the standard and, therefore, would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (DEIR p.3.3-50.)

The localized analysis discussed in Impact AQ-2 demonstrated that with incorporation of mitigation, the Project would not exceed any SCAQMD localized significance threshold during construction or operation. Therefore, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The Project meets Criterion 1. (DEIR p.3.3-50.)

Criterion 2: CO Hot Spot Analysis

The CO hot spot analysis presented in the discussion of Impact AQ-2 found that the CO emissions from Project-related traffic, combined with CO emissions resulting from the growth in background traffic and identified development projects, would not result in the formation of a CO hot spot and, thus, not result in an exceedance of the CO air quality standards. The standards are set to protect the health of sensitive individuals. Because the standards would not be exceeded, the Project would not result in a significant impact related to CO. Therefore, the Project meets Criterion 2. (DEIR pp.3.3-50 to 3.3-51.)

Criterion 3: Toxic Air Contaminants

Cancer risk is expressed in terms of a probability that an individual out of a population of one million people would contract cancer because of continuous exposure to toxic air contaminants over a specified period. For sensitive receptors such as residences, this exposure period is a lifetime of 70 years. (DEIR p.3.3-51.)

Assumptions

The operation of the Project would result in the release of two primary TACs that pose the greatest potential to cause a health risk to the community surrounding the Project. These two TACs are diesel particulate matter (DPM) from the operation of diesel-powered trucks and transport refrigeration units and benzene from the operation of a gasoline service station that would be located at the southwest corner of the Project. Exposure to these TACs would have the potential to cause health risks in terms of excess risk of cancer and chronic and acute non-cancer health effects as discussed below. (DEIR p.3.3-51.)

The air dispersion model, receptor locations, and meteorological data used in the HRA used the same information as that used in the assessment of criteria pollutant impacts described in Impact AQ-2. (DEIR p.3.3-51.)

The cancer risk from DPM and benzene is calculated by multiplying the annual average DPM and benzene concentrations calculated using the AERMOD model and an inhalation exposure factor. See the Draft EIR for the associated equations. (DEIR pp. 3.3-51 to 3.3-52.) Values for the Inhalation Exposure Factor for DPM and Benzene are shown in Table 3.3-30 of the Draft EIR. (DEIR p.3.3-52.)

Exposures to TACs such as DPM and benzene can also cause chronic (long-term) related non-cancer illnesses such as reproductive effects, respiratory effects, eye sensitivity, immune effects, kidney effects, blood effects, central nervous system, birth defects, or other adverse environmental effects. Risk characterization for non-cancer health risks from DPM and benzene is expressed as a hazard index (HI). The HI is a ratio of the predicted concentration of the Project's emissions to a concentration considered acceptable to public health professionals, termed the Reference Exposure Level (REL). A significant risk is defined by the SCAQMD as an HI of 1 or greater. (DEIR p.3.3-52.)

For the assessment of health risks to sensitive/residential receptors, the DPM emissions factors derived from the ARB EMFAC model were developed as an average of fleet emission factors over a 70-year time period commencing in 2010 (2010 to 2080 average emissions) and in 2013 (2013 to 2083 average emissions). For the year 2030 assessment, the DPM emission factors from the EMFAC2007 model in the year 2030 were utilized. The DPM emission factors used in this assessment are provided in Table 3.3-31 of the Draft EIR. (DEIR p.3.3-54.)

Benzene emissions are associated with the operation of a gasoline service station located at the southwestern corner of the Project. Benzene emissions were estimated considering the following emission processes: Offloading of cargo tank trucks into the storage tanks at the station (Loading emissions); Gasoline vapors released from the storage tank due to temperature and pressure changes within the storage tank vapor space (Breathing emissions); Vehicle refueling process (Refueling emissions), and spillage of fuels during vehicle fueling (Spillage emissions). The emission factors for benzene emissions associated with the gasoline service station are shown in Table 3.3-32 of the Draft EIR. (DEIR p.3.3-54.)

The benzene emission factors were assumed to be constant over both the 70-year and 40-year exposure periods. An annual gasoline throughput of 6.4 million gallons was assumed to estimate benzene emissions. This amounts to the delivery of tanker truck with two 8,800 gallon tanks each day. (DEIR p.3.3-55.)

The SCAQMD health risk significance thresholds specifically state that the cancer threshold (10 in one million cancer risk) is based on the incremental increase. Communications with SCAQMD staff indicate that the SCAQMD does not discourage lead agencies from reporting the total cumulative impact from all sources in the basin on an individual receptor; however the SCAQMD has not requested that a lead agency use the incremental threshold (10 in 1 million cancer risk) to determine cumulative significance. (DEIR p.3.3-55.)

This analysis addresses the impact to sensitive receptors, not onsite or offsite worker receptors, since the sensitive receptors (residences) would receive a greater impact than offsite workers. The offsite workers would not be exposed to the onsite pollutants for as long as the residences because they would only be there for eight hours or less. (DEIR p.3.3-55.)

Onsite workers are not required to be addressed through this health risk assessment process. A document published by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (2009), Health Risk Assessments for Proposed Land Use Projects, indicates that onsite receptors are included in risk assessments if they are persons not employed by the Project. Persons not employed by the Project would not remain onsite for any significant period. Therefore, a health risk assessment for onsite workers is not required or recommended. The document also states that the guidance does not include how risk assessments for construction projects should be addressed in CEQA. Risks near construction projects are expected to be included at a later time as the toxic emissions from construction activities are better quantified. The equipment used during construction would emit DPM, which has been identified

by the ARB as a carcinogen. However, the DPM emissions during construction are short term in nature. Determination of the health risk from DPM is considered over a 70-year exposure time for sensitive receptors. Therefore, considering the short timeframe during which DPM emissions would be emitted during construction, exposure to DPM is anticipated to be less than significant during construction. (DEIR p.3.3-56.)

During operation of the Project, diesel-powered delivery vehicles would emit DPM emissions from truck exhausts, idling, and the use of transport refrigeration units. A health risk assessment of these DPM emissions was performed to assess the health consequences from the DPM emissions from the onsite truck activity associated with Project operations on nearby sensitive receptors such as residences. Estimates of DPM emissions were prepared using the trip generation and vehicle information from the Project-specific traffic impact analysis, the diesel truck inventory established for the Project and emission factors from the ARB EMFAC mobile source emission model. Because the California Environmental Protection Agency methodology (see report for reference) dictates that health risks are calculated over periods of 70-years for sensitive receptors, the estimates of DPM emissions were also averaged over each respective period using the fleet average emission factors contained in the EMFAC2007 model. (DEIR p.3.3-56.)

In addition to the DPM emissions from the diesel truck traffic, the Project description also calls for the operation of a gasoline service station located at the southwest corner of the Project. As a result, emissions of benzene from the operation of the service station were also analyzed in the health risk assessment. Benzene has been identified by the ARB as a toxic air contaminant having both cancer and non-cancer health impacts. The estimation of benzene emissions follows the procedures of the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association risk assessment guidelines for gasoline service stations. The estimation of health risks followed the guidance from the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment that uses the AERMOD air dispersion model to disperse the DPM and benzene emissions and to determine health risks from nearby sensitive receptors. (DEIR p.3.3-56.)

The results of the health risk assessment are summarized in Table 3.3-33 of the Draft EIR and indicate that the Project's operations would not exceed the SCAQMD's cancer risk health risk significance threshold for any scenario year. (DEIR pp.3.3-56 to 3.3-57.) All other receptors and locations outside of the Project site would have a cancer risk less than the values listed in Table 3.3-33 in the Draft EIR, including the Packinghouse Christian Academy and the Citrus Valley High School. Contours of the cancer risk are shown on page 4-3 of the Final EIR, which was created using the results of the Health Risk Assessment. As shown in the figure, the greatest risk is near the fueling station, which is located away from the residences and the high school. The maximum risk shown to sensitive receptors is the residences located between the 0.6 and 0.8 cancer risk contour to the east of the project. (FEIR p. 4-3.)

The maximum chronic non-cancer risk is calculated to have a value of 0.0006 at the maximally impacted sensitive receptor or worker receptor. An acute non-cancer hazard index due to the emissions of benzene was estimated to be 0.001. The magnitudes of both the acute and chronic non-cancer indices are less than the SCAQMD hazard index of 1.0. Therefore, the operation of the Project would not exceed the SCAQMD's threshold for chronic or acute non-cancer risk. (DEIR p.3.3-57.)

Impact AQ-5: Would the proposed Project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Air Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant

but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-12. (DEIR pp.3.3-57 to 3.3-58.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

MM AQ-12 The Project shall have a Maintenance Plan for any detention basins, which includes a description of the routine and non-routine maintenance. The Plan shall include the following components:

Routine inspections, particularly after major rainfall events, to check for obstructions and damage and to remove debris/trash.

Vegetation management, including prohibiting the use of fertilizers and pesticides in and around the basins to minimize entry into downstream waters or the underwater basin.

Routine trash, debris, and litter removal.

Structural component check, to inspect the outlet structure, inlet, orifice, emergency spillway (if applicable) on a regular basis.

Non-routine maintenance such as bank erosion stabilization and ensuring that all surfaces of the basin are vegetated for proper infiltration of runoff.

Sediment removal once per year to ensure that the depth of the accumulated sediment is less than 25 percent of the original design depth. Sediment blocking inlets or outlets should be removed.

(DEIR p.3.3-58.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Diesel exhaust and VOCs would be emitted during construction of the Project, which are objectionable to some; however, emissions are short-term in nature only lasting as long as the construction equipment operates, would disperse rapidly from the Project site, and therefore should not be at a level to induce a negative odor response. (DEIR p.3.3-58.)

The odors from the operation of the Project would include the occasional scent from cooking odors from the restaurants, odors from trash recycling, and from the gasoline service station. However, these emission sources are generally located within the western half of the Project and, after accounting for distance and air dispersion, would not induce a negative odor response to nearby sensitive receptors. (DEIR p.3.3-58.)

Poorly maintained detention basins could result in odors. Therefore, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-12, regular maintenance, as required, within the proposed detention basin will ensure the basin will operate as intended and will not emit any objectionable odors. Thus, no significant impact would result after implementation of mitigation. (DEIR p.3.3-58.)

3. Biological Resources

Impact BR-1: Would the proposed 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 CDFG or USFWS?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Biological Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure BR-1a and BR-1b. (DEIR pp.3.4-12 to 3.4-13.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

Western Burrowing Owl (BUOW)

MM BR-1a A protocol focus survey for BUOW shall be conducted pursuant to CDFG protocols and prior to grading activities to determine presence or absence. If owls are found, passive relocation (i.e., use of one-way doors to ensure owls have been evacuated and then collapse of burrows) shall be used to ensure that no owls are directly injured or killed during construction. Active relocation shall not be employed unless approved by the CDFG prior to grading, and if passive relocation has been determined not to be practical. Active relocation would entail capture of the owls, relocation off-site, construction of an artificial burrow, and fencing and feeding to habituate the owls to the new burrow.

Nesting Birds

MM BR-1b Vegetation removal shall occur outside of the nesting bird season (February to August). If such avoidance is not feasible, the applicant shall have a qualified biologist survey for actively nesting birds within the nesting bird season. Any active nests identified shall have highly visible construction fencing installed not less than 100-feet (200-feet for birds of prey) of the active nests. Disturbance shall not occur within the buffer area until the biologist determines that the young have fledged.

(DEIR p.3.4-13.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The biological resource and habitat assessment report (LSA 2005b, MBA 2009a) indicated that none of the special-status plants was observed on the site during the field surveys. The Project site is regularly disked and is highly disturbed from past agricultural and human activities, and dominated by non-native species. Therefore, there is a very low potential for any rare plant species to occur on the Project site. (DEIR p.3.4-14.)

None of the special-status wildlife species was observed in the 2005 and 2009 surveys. However, the literature survey suggested that the Project site provides moderately suitable habitat for SBKR and BUOW. Both of these species are special-status wildlife species. Therefore, a live-trapping effort for the federally listed endangered SBKR was conducted within portions of the Project site (Appendix C). The focused survey was conducted to determine the presence or absence of SBKR on the site, as suggested by the habitat assessment report. According to the focused SBKR survey report, SBKR were not captured as part of the 2009 trapping effort and they are not currently present on the Project site. The species diversity is very low within the survey area (MBA 2009b). (DEIR p.3.4-14.)

Additionally, the Project site is not located within USFWS designated critical habitat for SBKR. The closest designated critical habitat area is approximately one mile north of the Project site. Based on the negative findings of the focused surveys and the disturbed nature of the habitat on-site, development and operation of the Project will not directly impact SBKR. Therefore, impacts to SBKR are less than significant. (DEIR p.3.4-14.)

The Project site contains suitable burrows and foraging habitat for BUOW. Even though BUOW were not observed during the biological survey, there is a potential for BUOW to utilize the site. Therefore, significant impacts could occur to BUOW from the Project without implementation of appropriate mitigation measures. (DEIR p.3.4-14.)

A number of common variety bird species were observed foraging on the Project site (MBA 2009). None of the common variety bird species observed were "special-status" species, however, the Project site contains approximately 0.25 acre of eucalyptus trees that will, presumably, be taken off the site. Ground clearance and vegetation removal (including the 0.25 acre of eucalyptus trees) could result in potential impacts to the nesting birds, as per Section 3503 of the State Fish and Game Code. Therefore, significant impacts could occur to nesting birds from the Project without implementation of appropriate mitigation measures. (DEIR p.3.4-14.)

4. Cultural Resources

Impact CR-2: Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA §15064.5?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Cultural Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-2a through CR-2c. (DEIR pp.3.5-18 to 3.5-21.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

MM CR-2a Cultural resource monitoring by a qualified Project Archaeologist and/or his representative in the field, an Archaeological Inspector, is required during construction-related earthmoving. The Inspector shall comply with the cultural mitigation-monitoring plan (CMMP) written and signed by the Project Archaeologist. The CMMP shall be based on excavation parameters associated with a rough grading plan the City will approve as part of the construction-permitting process and should, in addition to the qualities noted below, include certain archaeological performance standards specific to the required earthmoving methods. A pre-grade meeting shall occur between the Project Archaeologist, the grading contractor, and a City representative to discuss the details of the CMMP.

The CMMP shall contain the following attributes, and if needed, additional attributes may be added at the request of the City:

- *i) Archaeological monitoring is defined to include monitoring of all excavation activities of virgin earth encountered within the Project site once Project-related excavations occur at least three (3) feet below the modern ground surface.*
- *ii) On-site archaeological monitoring must be undertaken by the Project Archaeologist and/or a qualified archaeological inspector whose credentials shall be provided to the City of Redlands.*
- *iii) The archaeological inspector shall perform monitoring duties safely and must avoid slowing the rough grading work if possible. The inspector shall keep a daily log of all activities and observations. Copies of the log shall be delivered at the end of each workweek to the Applicant or his/her designated on-site representative.*
- *iv) It is not necessary for the archaeological inspector to observe cuts of earth than were turned during previous Project-related excavations, but the inspector must make certain that no virgin*

earth will be turned by the contractors before the end of a work day before discontinuing his/her work for the day.

v) If cultural deposits are observed by the inspector, earthmoving shall be diverted temporarily around the find until the deposits have been thoroughly examined. The inspector will create a buffer zone of at least 20 feet around the furthest margins of the find with lathe and yellow tape. Earthmoving shall be allowed to proceed through the area of the find only after the Project Archaeologist determines and reports to the City that all potential isolated artifacts are recovered and/or the site has been mitigated to the extent necessary.

vi) Any observed cultural resources made on or before about 1965 shall be identified and plotted following standard professional archaeological practice. Examination by an archaeological specialist shall be included where necessary, dependent upon the artifacts, features, or sites that are encountered. Resources that are isolated and/or considered not significant by the inspector will be plotted but need not be further analyzed or curated in a local museum.

vii) If it is determined that the observed resources are part of previously recorded resource CA-SBR-7765H, CA-SBR-7766H or CA-SBR-7767H, work on the find can be discontinued.

viii) If the find is not a previously recorded resource, it is understood that the archaeological team will undertake significance determinations with the concurrence of the City. If it is found that a significance determination is required for an inadvertent find, the site shall be evaluated and recorded in accordance with requirements of California Code of Regulations §15064.5(f) thusly:

a) If the resource is determined Not Significant, no additional mitigation measures, save for recordation of the site onto DPR523 site forms, will be required. Construction-related earthmoving can resume in the area of the find.

b) If the resource is determined to be Significant, it is assumed that the site cannot be avoided by construction and Phase III data recovery must be undertaken before construction-related earthmoving at the resource can continue.

ix) Any resources removed from the Project site for curation in an appropriate facility shall be those resources considered Significant under CR-2a (viii) above. Resources recovered and examined, but not considered significant, shall be catalogued and reburied on the Project site where later Project-related disturbance is not anticipated.

x) A final report of findings will be prepared by the Project Archaeologist for submission to the Proponent and the City. Reports associated with cultural resource finds shall be submitted to the EIC at the University of California-Riverside. The report will describe the history of the Project area, summarize field and laboratory methods used, if applicable, and include any testing or special analysis information conducted to support the resultant findings.

xi) In the event that any potentially significant cultural remains are encountered by earthmoving when the monitor is not present, the earthmoving contractor will divert excavations around the find location and the Project Archaeologist shall called to the location immediately to recover the remains.

MM CR-2b Once a depth of three (3) feet is reached by construction-related earthmoving, the potential for impacts to significant archaeological resources rises to a "moderate" level. Earthmoving of all "moderate" potential soils shall be inspected on a full-time basis, but the Project Archaeologist may, at his or her discretion, terminate monitoring if and only if no buried cultural resources have been detected after 50 percent of the qualifying ground has been moved during the grading process. If any buried cultural resources are detected by the Inspector, monitoring shall continue until 100 percent of the virgin earth on the Project site has been inspected.

MM CR-2c Following CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 and the objectives, criteria and procedures required by PRC 21083.2, should any previously unidentified prehistoric or historic-era resources be found during monitoring, they shall be Phase II tested and evaluated for significance following performance standards found in the MMP (see MM CR-2a[i through x]) prior to allowing a continuance of grading in the area of the find. Should the Project Archaeologist determine that the finds are significant, and with the concurrence of the City, the finds shall be Phase III excavated before earthmoving is allowed to continue in the area.

(DEIR pp.3.5-18 to 3.5-21.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: MBA archaeological staff conducted a cultural resource records search at the Archaeological Information Center (AIC) on August 1, 2007. The search shows that three known historic cultural resources are located within the Project site, and that 15 additional cultural resources are located within one mile of the Project area boundary. Cultural resources CA-SBR-7765H, CA-SBR-7766H and CA-SBR-7767H are located within the Project site and these resources could be significant archaeological resources. Thus, MBA conducted Phase II testing within the site footprints. As described in Impact CR-1, the Assessment determined that these cultural resources are not significant and do not meet any of the following criteria established by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 to be considered "significant archaeological resources" (MBA 2009b). (DEIR p.3.5-18.)

It is known that the whole of the Project site was plowed and utilized for citrus, which destroys the integrity of the topsoil to a point roughly three (3) feet below modern grade. Certain places on the property once exhibited structures and buried utilities, which can disrupt soils at an even greater depth, but most of the property was in citrus. Despite this damage, and based upon the prehistoric sensitivity of the Project area, there is potential for impacts to potentially significant archaeological resources at depth. MBA's testing work showed that the upper three feet of soil has "low" potential for impacts to archaeological resources because of farming related disturbances, but depths below the three foot level have a "moderate" potential for impacts to archaeological resources. Therefore, mitigation measures MM CR-2a through MM CR-2c shall be implemented to reduce potentially significant archaeological impacts to a less than significant level in those portions of the Project site with moderate potential (i.e. three feet below modern grade). (DEIR p.3.5-18.)

Impact CR-3: Would the proposed Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Cultural Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-3a. (DEIR pp.3.5-21 to 3.5-23.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

MM CR-3a Limited paleontological resource monitoring by a qualified Project Paleontologist and/or his representative in the field, a Paleontological Inspector, is required during construction-related earthmoving. The Paleontological Inspector shall comply with a paleontological resource impact mitigation plan (PRIMP) written and signed by the Project Paleontologist. The PRIMP shall be based on excavation parameters associated with a rough grading plan the City will approve as part of the construction-permitting process and should, in addition to the qualities noted below, include certain paleontological performance standards specific to the required earthmoving methods. A pre-grade

meeting shall occur between the Project Paleontologist, the grading contractor, and a City representative to discuss the details of the PRIMP.

The PRIMP shall contain the following attributes, and if needed, additional attributes may be added at the request of the City:

i) Paleontological monitoring is defined to include monitoring of all excavation activities of virgin earth encountered within the Project site once Project-related excavations occur at least fifteen (15) feet below the modern ground surface.
ii) If fossil remains are found, the Project Paleontologist must develop a storage agreement with a museum repository acceptable to the City to allow for the permanent storage and maintenance of any fossil remains recovered in the Project area as a result of the mitigation program, and for the archiving of associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data.
iii) Any recovered fossil remains will be prepared to the point of identification and identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible by knowledgeable paleontologists. The remains then will be curated (assigned and labeled with museum repository fossil specimen numbers and corresponding fossil site numbers, as appropriate; placed in specimen trays and, if necessary, vials with completed specimen data cards) and catalogued. Associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data will be archived (specimen and site numbers and corresponding data entered into appropriate museum repository catalogs and computerized databases) at the museum repository by a laboratory technician. The remains then will be accessioned into the museum repository fossil collection, where they will be permanently stored and maintained. The associated specimen and site data will be made available for future study by qualified investigators.
iv) A final report of findings will be prepared by the Project Paleontologist for submission to the Proponent and the City. The report shall be submitted to the museum in which the fossil collection has been curated. The report will describe the finds, summarize field and laboratory methods used, if applicable, and include any testing or special analysis information conducted to support the resultant findings.
v) In the event that any fossil remains are encountered by earthmoving when the monitor is not present, the earthmoving contractor will divert excavations around the fossil site and the Project Paleontologist shall called to the location immediately to recover the remains.

(DEIR pp.3.5-22 to 3.5-23.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: A paleontological records check was prepared in August 13, 2007 from Eric Scott of the San Bernardino County Museum. The paleontological records review showed that the entire Project site is located upon middle Holocene younger axial-valley alluvium, and that no known fossil resources are located within 1 mile of the Project area in any direction. The Holocene sediments have low potential to contain fossil resources; however, the Holocene units may overlie older Pleistocene alluvium sediments. The Pleistocene alluvial deposits can carry significant fossil deposits and therefore have "high" potential for significant impacts (MBA 2009b). In this area, such deposits are typically encountered at a point about 15 feet below modern grade and lower. Therefore, the Project has potential to result in impacts to unique paleontological resources without mitigation measures once Project-related excavations reach 15 feet below modern grade. (DEIR p.3.5-21.)

Impact CR-4: Would the proposed Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Cultural Resources are discussed in detail in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially

significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-4a. (DEIR pp.3.5-23 to 3.5-24.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

MM CR-4a If human remains are uncovered under any circumstances, the County Corner shall be notified. If the Corner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 5097.98, the Applicant shall halt work, and shall ensure that the immediate vicinity of the find is not further disturbed, and that notification of, and conferral with, likely decedents occurs immediately. Through coordination between the Coroner, Native American Heritage Commission, local Native American representatives, the archaeological consultants, and Applicant, the disposition of the remains will be determined. The cost of the recovery and disposition of the remains shall be the responsibility of the Applicant.

(DEIR p.3.5-23.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Based on the records search and field survey, no human remains are located in or near the Project site and none are expected (MBA 2009b). However, there is always the potential that unknown human remains will be uncovered. Consequently, impacts in this regard are potentially significant. Therefore, mitigation will be imposed to reduce impacts to human remains to a level of less than significant. In addition, State law (California Health and Safety Code 7050.5) requires that, if human remains are recovered, the County Coroner shall be immediately notified and the excavation shall be halted until the situation is resolved. With implementation of mitigation, impacts associated with human remains will be less than significant for the Project. (DEIR p.3.5-23.)

5. Geology and Soils

Impact GS-2: Would the proposed Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on related to Geology and Soils are discussed in detail in Section 3.6 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measures MM HWQ 1a and HWQ 1b. (DEIR p.3.6-18.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

See Mitigation Measures MM HWQ 1a- and HWQ 1b under the Hydrology and Water Quality section of the Findings.

(DEIR p.3.6-18.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: According to the Geotechnical Report (2005) conducted for the Project, mass grading of the majority of the site is expected to entail minor cuts and fills (±5 feet) from existing grades to establish building pads and to provide for surface drainage of the site, thus resulting in a balance of cut and fill. The entire Project site is proposed to be massed graded in one phase. During construction activities, there would be the potential for surface water to carry sediment from on-site erosion into the stormwater system and local waterways. Soil erosion may occur along Project boundaries during construction in areas where temporary soil storage is required. In addition, the geotechnical report indicated that a majority of the areas planned for development on the Project site have soil types with moderate erosion potential. Therefore, a potentially significant risk of erosion associated with construction activities exists. However, consistency with mitigation measures MM

HWQ 1a- and HWQ 1-b (See DEIR Section 3.8 Hydrology and Water Quality), as well as all other applicable water quality standards and requirements will reduce impacts from erosion associated with construction activities to a level of less than significant. (DEIR p.3.6-18.)

Impact GS-3: Would the proposed 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?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on related to Geology and Soils are discussed in detail in Section 3.6 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measures GS-3a. (DEIR pp.3.6-18 to 3.6-19.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

MM GS-3a The developer shall implement the grading recommendations identified in the Geotechnical Report (KA 2005). Prior to the commencement of building construction, the applicant shall retain a qualified engineer to design foundations adequate to support the Project's structures where necessary, based on the recommendations of the Geotechnical Report (KA 2005). Settlement analysis shall be performed once the structural design loads and foundation system geometry have been defined for each building. The total settlement due to foundation loads shall not exceed the 1-inch. The differential settlements shall be less than 1-inch between adjacent columns and perimeter walls to adjacent columns, and less than 1/2-inch in 40 feet along perimeter walls. Most of the settlement is expected to occur during construction as the loads are applied.

(DEIR p.3.6-19.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The geotechnical report for the Project site indicates that the underlying bedrock is capable of supporting the proposed development (KA 2005). In addition, the potential for liquefaction is considered low based on the analysis of soil characteristics and depths to the groundwater (see Impact GS-1). However, the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation by Cruzan & Associates Inc. in 2005 concluded that the subsurface soils generally consisted of 6 to 12 inches of loose disturbed soil and a thin layer of fill underlain by native alluvial silty sand. These soils are disturbed, have low strength characteristics, and are highly compressible when saturated. The Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Report (KA 2005) provided grading recommendations based on the underlying soil conditions, which should be implemented during grading activities. Unless these recommendations are implemented, the Project has the potential to produce potentially significant impacts concerning unstable geologic units. (DEIR pp.3.6-18 to 3.6-19.)

6. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact HHM-1: Would the proposed Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are discussed in detail in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measures HHM-1a for short-term impacts and Mitigation Measures HHM-1b and HHM-1c for long-term impacts. (DEIR pp.3.7-11 to 3.7-13.) These mitigation measures,

enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

MM HHM-1a If septic systems or domestic water wells are identified during excavation of the Project site, then the septic systems and domestic water wells shall be properly abandoned/closed or destroyed in accordance with Section 13.42.020, Permits, of the City of Redlands Municipal Code.

MM HHM-1b If any hazardous materials or contamination is found during excavation, all work shall be halted in the affected area until a qualified hazmat consultant (i.e., Registered Environmental Assessor, Registered Geologist) makes a determination as to the scope and extent of the contamination. If contamination is limited, remediation of the site shall be conducted by a licensed contractor in accordance with State and local guidelines. If the scope of the contamination is considered extensive, the developer shall contact the State DTSC to determine the appropriate form of remediation, which may include the developer entering into a Voluntary Work Plan (VWP). The hazmat consultant shall file a final report to the City upon completion of remediation activities. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Development Services Director or his designee.

MM HHM-1c Any removal of the soils from the entire site identified to contain elevated levels of DDT and DDE will require profiling and manifesting for disposal as potentially hazardous waste. If contamination is limited, remediation of the site shall be conducted by a licensed contractor in accordance with State and local guidelines. Any soils removed from the site that have high levels of DDT or DDE shall be disposed of at a landfill or other facility licensed to accept such materials. If the scope of the contamination is considered extensive, the developer shall contact the State DTSC to determine the appropriate form of remediation, which may include the developer entering into a VWP. The hazmat consultant shall file a final report to the City upon completion of remediation activities. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Development Services Director or his designee.

(DEIR pp.3.7-12 to 3.7-13.)

Facts in Support of the Finding:

Short-Term Impacts - Grading and construction activities may involve the limited transport, storage, usage, or disposal of hazardous materials, such as the fueling/servicing of construction equipment. However, such activity is short-term or one-time in nature and is subject to federal, State, and local health and safety requirements. Adherence to federal, State, and local health and safety requirements would reduce the potential impacts associated with construction activities to less than significant. (DEIR p.3.7-11.)

In addition, septic systems and domestic water wells were likely associated with the three former on-site dwellings located along the northern boundary of the Project site. According to a Bear Valley Mutual Water Company (BVMWC) official, no water wells were associated with the Project site. However, it is unknown if septic systems are currently located in the vicinity of the former dwellings. Therefore, short-term impacts during excavation are potentially significant. (DEIR p.3.7-11.)

Long-Term Impacts - The Project site is not listed on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Based on the site reconnaissance and a review of physiographic, historical, and regulatory information, there is no evidence of incidents or accidents involving hazardous materials on the Project site. However, hazardous materials have been used on the

site in the past, mainly for agricultural uses. Therefore, there is a potential for soil contamination on the site. (DEIR p.3.7-11.)

In addition, the proposed Project would result in the construction of approximately 275,500 square feet of commercial retail uses and a gas station on-site. Potentially hazardous materials such as petroleum products, pesticides, fertilizer, and other household hazardous products such as paint products, solvents, and cleaning products would be stored and sold in conjunction with on-site commercial retail sales. The transport, storage, handling, and retail sale of these substances are routinely conducted at such sites. All activity involving hazardous substances would be conducted in accordance with applicable local, State, and Federal safety standards. The transport and delivery of fuel to gasoline stations is regulated by the Federal Department of Transportation while the Hazardous Materials Division of the San Bernardino County Fire Department provides permitting, inspection, and enforcement activities of gas stations including leaking and non-leaking underground storage tanks (USTs) and spill incidents. With adherence to the existing requirements applicable to activities at the commercial retail and gas station, potential impacts associated with the use, transport, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant. (DEIR p.3.7-12.)

Impact HHM-2: Would the proposed Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are discussed in detail in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measures HHM-1a through HHM-1c. (DEIR pp.3.7-13 to 3.7-15.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

See MM HHM-1a through HHM-1c as identified under Impact HHM-1 above.

(DEIR p.3.7-15.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Based on the Phase I and Phase II ESAs, there is no evidence of incidents or accidents involving hazardous materials on the Project site. Due to the past presence of agricultural activities, it is likely on-site soils may be contaminated by low levels of pesticides, herbicides, waste oil from smudge pots, etc. Some persistent chemicals were used in the past for citrus orchards and row crops (e.g., DDT, DDE, etc.). Therefore, a Phase II ESA was conducted on the westerly portion of the Project site to identify areas with soils contaminated by hazardous materials, if any are still present on-site. The Phase II ESA concluded that with exception to two soil samples, all soil samples contained detectable concentrations of DDE. In addition, with exception to four soil samples, all analyzed soil samples contained detectable concentrations of DDT. However, according to the Phase II ESA, all detected pesticide concentrations (DDE and DDT) are well below their respective residential soil (1.7 mg/kg) and industrial soil (7 mg/kg) EPA PRG. Therefore, the reported pesticide concentrations are significantly below the PRGs established by the EPA and may likely represent ambient "background" concentrations. (DEIR p.3.7-13.)

Additionally, on the basis of slightly elevated results achieved for three of the samples compared to the California Title 22 Hazardous Waste Regulations, soils would be characterized as California hazardous waste. Any removal of the soil from the specific areas of the site will require profiling and manifesting for disposal as potentially hazardous waste. Therefore, the Project could have potentially significant

impacts related to the possible release of hazardous materials during on-site grading and construction. (DEIR p.3.7-13.)

Furthermore, septic systems and domestic water wells were likely associated with the three former on-site dwellings located along the northern boundary of the Project site. According to a BVMWC official, no water wells were associated with the subject site. However, it is unknown if septic systems are currently located in the vicinity of the former dwellings. However, the presence of septic systems is not anticipated to adversely impact the Project site due to their use for domestic purposes only. Therefore, impacts from accidental conditions will be potentially significant. However, through mitigation measures MM HHM-1a through MM HHM-1c, potentially significant impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level. (DEIR pp.3.7-13 to 3.7-14.)

The Project would not be a large-quantity user of hazardous materials. Small quantities of hazardous materials would be used on-site, including cleaning solvents (e.g., degreasers, paint thinners, and aerosol propellants), paints (both latex- and oil-based), acids and bases (such as many cleaners), disinfectants, and fertilizers. These substances would be stored in secure areas and would comply with all applicable storage, handling, usage, and disposal requirements. The potential risks posed by the use and storage of these hazardous materials are primarily limited to the immediate vicinity of the materials. Transport of these materials would be performed by commercial vendors who would be required to comply with various federal and state laws regarding hazardous materials transportation. (DEIR p.3.7-14.)

In addition, because of the volume of materials involved in the transport and dispensing of petroleum products, any hazardous material release at either the proposed gas station or tire and lube facility could be larger than that at any of the proposed commercial retail uses. As stated within Impact HHM-1, any hazardous materials on-site would be handled in accordance with all applicable State and Federal laws, specifically the Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP), which includes containment, reporting, and remediation requirements in the event of a spill or accidental release. The handling of hazardous materials in accordance with all applicable local, State, and Federal standards, ordinances, or regulations would reduce the impacts associated with environmental and health hazards related to an accidental release of hazardous materials to a less than significant level. (DEIR p.3.7-14.)

The Project may also include a medical clinic, which would involve the potential for storage, transport, and disposal of biomedical wastes (e.g., needles). These wastes would be regularly picked up and disposed of by commercial vendors who would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials transportation. Furthermore, the medical clinic would only offer basic services such as check-ups and, thus, medical wastes would be limited to low-level, non-bio-hazardous items such as bandages, latex gloves, needles, tongue depressors, and similar items. (DEIR p.3.7-14.)

The Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad line is located approximately 0.85 mile south of the Project site. Due to the distance to the Project site (i.e. 0.85 mile) and the up-gradient elevation of 40 feet above mean sea level to the Project site (i.e. an elevation of 1,245 above mean sea level at the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad line to an elevation of 1,285 feet above mean sea level at the Project site), potential impacts related to a release of hazardous materials by the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad are considered less than significant. (DEIR p.3.7-14.)

7. Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact HWQ-1: Would the proposed Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on related to Hydrology and Water Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measures HWQ-1a for construction impacts and HWQ-1b for operational impacts. (DEIR pp.3.8-14 to 3.8-17.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

Construction Mitigation Measure

MM HWQ-1a Prior to the issuance of grading permits for any portion or phase of the Project, the Project applicant shall submit an NOI to the State Water Board and shall also prepare a SWPPP, which shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board for approval and to the City for review. The SWPPP shall contain a site map(s), which shows the construction site perimeter, existing and proposed buildings, lots, roadways, storm water collection and discharge points, general topography both before and after construction, and drainage patterns across the Project. The SWPPP shall list BMPs the discharger will use to protect storm water runoff and the placement of those BMPs. Additionally, the SWPPP shall contain a visual monitoring program; a chemical monitoring program for "non-visible" pollutants to be implemented if there is a failure of BMPs. Once approved by the City, the applicant's contractor shall be responsible, throughout the duration of the Project for installing, constructing, inspecting, and maintaining the control measures included in the SWPPP and Grading Plan.

Operation Mitigation Measure

MM HWQ-1b Prior to building permit issuance for any portion or phase of the Project, the applicant shall receive City approval for the Final WQMP. Prior to final building inspection, the applicant shall be responsible for installing, constructing, inspecting all provisions of the final WQMP, and maintaining the control measures included in the Final WQMP. Operation and maintenance (O&M) requirements for all Source Control, Site Design, and Treatment Control BMPs shall be identified within the WQMP. The WQMP shall include the following:

O&M Description and Schedule That Must:

List and identify each BMP that requires O&M.

Provide a thorough description of O&M activities (include the O&M process, and the handling and placement of any wastes).

Include BMP start-up dates.

Provide a schedule of the frequency of O&M for each BMP.

Inspection & Monitoring Requirements That Must:

Provide thorough descriptions of water quality monitoring (if locally required).

Provide self-inspections and record keeping requirements for BMPs (review local specific requirements regarding self-inspections and/or annual reporting), including identification of responsible parties for inspection and record keeping.

Identification of Responsible Parties That Must:

Provide the party or parties that will be responsible for each BMP O&M. For each responsible party, include the party's name, address, contact name and telephone number.

(DEIR pp.3.8-16 to 3.8-17.)

Facts in Support of the Finding:

Short-term Construction Impacts - Project implementation would require extensive construction and grading. Implementation of the Project will result in construction activities that may have the potential to contribute pollutants to three off-site drainage courses (Area 1, 2 and 3 of the Drainage Report, 2008), including the confluence of Tennessee Street/Channel at San Bernardino Avenue. Construction may generate increased amounts of pollutants, mainly silt, debris, chemicals, and dissolved solids, from the following sources: Grading - Disruption of surface soils and increased susceptibility to erosion; Building construction - Use of sealants, glues, wood preservatives, oils, concrete, and the generation of debris related to construction activities; Painting - Paint fragments and stucco flakes; and Construction equipment and vehicle maintenance - Washing, chemical degreasing. (DEIR p.3.8-14.)

These construction activities may result in short-term degradation of surface water quality due to the increased pollutant burden. However, the Project must be consistent with the SWRCB NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity. The permit requires the property owner/developer to prepare and implement a Project-specific SWPPP, which includes BMPs intended to reduce erosion, sedimentation, and non-permitted discharges of materials during construction. The BMPs to be used during construction typically include gravel bags, silt fencing, and general housekeeping measures to prevent erosion and stormwater contact with construction materials. (DEIR p.3.8-14.)

The Project will be required to develop and implement a SWPPP which will demonstrate compliance with the State NPDES permit, and provide protection of water quality during construction and operation of the Project and will submit the SWPPP to the RWQCB along with the required Notice of Intent prior to commencement of grading activities. The imposition of BMPs ensure that federal and State water quality standards will not be violated and are considered less than significant without mitigation. (DEIR p.3.8-14.)

Typically, the following would occur during construction of the Project:

- Erosion control. Employ measures to prevent the movement of soil by wind or water during construction and may include watering, and physical barriers to the movement of soil particles.

- Tracking of Soil. Employ measures to effectively minimize the tracking of soil by vehicles and may include gravel driveways, wheel washes and street sweeping.

- Wastes and Cleanup. The SWPPP must also address washout, cleanup, and disposal related to debris, trash, concrete, asphalt, paint, coatings, solvents, and other materials applicable to preparation and construction at the Project site.

- Other Reasonable BMPs. The SWPPP must also implement other applicable BMPs as needed to keep pollutants away from stormwater.

- The SWPPP must also identify additional applicable measures taken during the storm season and when storms are anticipated. (DEIR pp.3.8-14 to 3.8-15.)

Compliance with the requirements and the provisions of the SWPPP during construction activities would mitigate any potential construction period impacts on water quality to a less than significant level. (DEIR p.3.8-15.)

Long-Term Operational Impacts - This Project falls under five (5) of the Project Categories/Land Uses including Industrial/Commercial Development (>100,000 ft.), Automotive Repair Shops, Restaurants (>5,000 ft.) , Parking Lots (>5,000 ft.), and Streets/Highways/Freeways as indicated in Table 2-1 of the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Model Water Quality Management Plan Guidance (revised June, 2005). The potential and expected pollutants of concern for the Redlands Crossings development were identified in the Project's Water Quality Management Plan (see Appendix G of this DEIR) and are based on the Project categories and land uses utilizing Table 2-1 the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Model Water Quality Management Plan Guidance (revised Jun e, 2005). According to the Project's Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), the long-term operations, and development of the Project would potentially increase the pollutant burden of the stormwater flows. The Project will increase the amount of impervious surfaces on-site, resulting in an increase in stormwater flows. Furthermore, the Project's potential commercial and retail activities may result in runoff containing the following contaminants: oil, grease surfactants, heavy metals, solvents, pesticides or nutrients. (DEIR p.3.8-15.)

To minimize potential pollutant burden, by virtue of the size of the Project, the applicant has prepared, and will be consistent with, the Preliminary WQMP through the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), NPDES. The Project's Preliminary WQMP may include, but is not limited to, guidance, operation and maintenance for all source control, site design, and treatment control BMPs; that requires operation and maintenance, which include maximizing canopy interception and water conservation, landscape planning, roof runoff controls, efficient irrigation, storm drain system signage, trash storage areas and litter control, employee training/education program, protect slopes and channels, common area catch basin inspection, energy dissipaters, pervious concrete/alternative materials, and stormwater filtration systems. The Project will also be required to provide a thorough description of operation and maintenance activities, and provide a schedule of the frequency of operation and maintenance for each BMP. (DEIR pp.3.8-15 to 3.8-16.)

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HWQ-1a and HWQ-1b will require the Project to follow the recommendations of the Preliminary WQMP concerning water supplies, demands, and BMPs for the Project relating to water quality. Consistency with Mitigation Measures HWQ-1a and HWQ-1b will reduce impacts to any violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality (as outlined within the Preliminary WQMP), to a level of less than significant. (DEIR p.3.8-16.)

Impact HWQ-2: Would the proposed Project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on related to Hydrology and Water Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measures HWQ-2a through HWQ-2c. (DEIR pp.3.8-17 to 3.8-21.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

MM HWQ-2a Prior to issuance of building permits, the Project applicant shall submit landscaping plans to the City of Redlands for review and approval that identify and require the use of the following outdoor irrigation water conservation measures:

Drought resistant vegetation.

Irrigation systems employing the following features:

Drip irrigation;

Low-precipitation-rate sprinklers;

Bubbler/soaker systems;

Programmable irrigation controllers with automatic rain shutoff sensors;

Matched precipitation rate nozzles that maximize the uniformity of the water distribution characteristics of the irrigation system;

Conservative sprinkler spacings that minimize overspray onto paved surfaces; and

Hydrozones that keep plants with similar water needs in the same irrigation zone.

Minimally or gently sloped landscaped areas to minimize runoff and maximize infiltration.

Organic topdressing mulch in non-turf areas to decrease evaporation and increase water retention.

MM HWQ-2b Prior to issuance of building permits, the Project applicant shall submit building plans to the City of Redlands for review and approval that identify and require the use of the following indoor water conservation measures:

Low-flow or ultra-low-flow toilets and urinals;

Faucet aerators or low-flow faucets in bathrooms; and

Sensor-activated, low-flow faucets.

MM HWQ-2c Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the Project applicant shall install the "purple pipe" system (used to distinguish recycled water from potable water) within the landscaped areas, as approved by the City Engineer, for future use of recycled irrigation water from the Redlands Municipal Utilities and Engineering Department.

(DEIR p.3.8-21.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Potential Project impacts to groundwater include the increased consumption/use of groundwater supplies and creation of impermeable surface cover restricting groundwater recharge. The Project consists of a Walmart, totaling approximately 215,000 square feet and Parcel's 1-9 totaling approximately 60,500 square feet for a grand total of approximately 275,500 square feet of commercial retail uses with an overall total of approximately 436 employees. As per SB 221 and SB 610, a WSA is required for the commercial center or business with more than 500,000 square feet of space or 1,000 employees. Additionally, as defined under State CEQA Guidelines Section

15155, the Project would not contribute an equivalent volume of water as a 500 dwelling unit project. Thus, the Project does not meet the criteria on virtue of its size and number of employees. (DEIR pp.3.8-17 to 3.8-18.)

Implementation of the Project will increase the amount of impervious surfaces on-site, which could conceptually affect groundwater recharge due to the loss of soil infiltration. To facilitate groundwater recharge, the permeable areas on-site have been maximized through site design considerations, including vegetated swales, a nutrient separating baffle box and inlet inserts before discharging into one of five infiltration basins. The design feature allows the majority of drainage from impervious surface to permeable areas for on-site infiltration. One surface level infiltration basin and four (4) underground infiltration basins have been incorporated into the site plan (Exhibit 3.8-3, Proposed Drainage Plan) to maximize on-site infiltration. In addition, various BMPs have been incorporated in the Project design (AE 2007). Maximizing permeable areas on-site will improve the groundwater recharge in the local aquifer. Since the Project will not deplete groundwater in the local area and is not expected to lower the groundwater recharge rate to any measurable degree, impacts will be less than significant. (DEIR p.3.8-18.)

Currently, the City of Redlands provides water services within the Project area and it is anticipated to provide water to the Project site. According to water usage rates for Walmart stores with similar square footage, the Project is anticipated to demand approximately 11,571 gallons of water per day (0.042 gallons per square foot multiplied by 275,500 equals 11,571). Redlands' average daily water consumption is 27 million gallons per day (mgd) with a maximum daily of 50 mgd in the summer. The maximum storage capacity for the City is 54.5 million gallons. Therefore, the estimated amount of water usage by the Project (11,571 gallons of water per day) will be well below the City's average water consumption rate (50 mgd). (DEIR p.3.8-18.)

Further, the Project will be consistent with the City of Redlands Municipal Code Chapter 15.54, Water Efficient Landscape Requirements, through installation, maintenance, and management of water efficient landscaping; and through implementation of water management practices and water waste prevention for landscaping. Consistency with the City of Redlands Municipal Code Chapter 15.54 will further reduce impacts to groundwater supplies. (DEIR p.3.8-18.)

Nonetheless, long-term water supply is a significant concern in California, and the Project can reduce its demand on water supply through the implementation of water conservation measures. Mitigation is proposed that would require the Project applicant to implement outdoor irrigation and indoor domestic water conservation measures and practices. These measures would reduce overall Project demand for potable water and ensure that long-term water supply impacts are less than significant. (DEIR p.3.8-18.)

Impact HWQ-3: Would the proposed Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on related to Hydrology and Water Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measures HWQ-1a and HWQ-1b. (DEIR pp.3.8-22 to 3.8-23.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

See MM HWQ-1a and HWQ-1b under Impact HWQ-1 above.

(DEIR p.3.8-23.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The development of the Project will result in an increase in surface runoff, due to increasing the amount of impervious surfaces and decreasing the amount of permeable surfaces. This lowers the infiltration rate through the Project site, resulting in the necessity for an on-site drainage system (See Exhibit 3.8-3 Proposed Drainage Plan in the Draft EIR). (DEIR p.3.8-22.)

Currently, the site drains northerly and westerly towards the Santa Ana River. The proposed drainage system will alter the current drainage pattern. In post -development conditions the 45.71 acre of the property area will be re-parceled and some of the area will be dedicated to the Tennessee Street to the West, some area to the San Bernardino Avenue to the North, a small portion to the existing Karon Street to the east, but the major changes will be the construction and dedication of a new portion of Pennsylvania Avenue to the south and a new portion of New York Avenue, now crossing the Project site and dividing it with 11 parcels to the west and limited off-site improvements to the east. However, the drainage report prepared by Adams Engineering indicated that the total area draining to the corner of San Bernardino Avenue and Tennessee Street will remain the same and the proposed drainage system (pond, sediment pond and underground systems) would control the peak flow and reduce the total volume of runoff to levels similar to the pre-development runoff levels (AE 2008). (DEIR p.3.8-22.)

Additionally, the drainage report concluded that the proposed drainage system will improve the drainage conditions of Tennessee Street, Tennessee Channel and San Bernardino Avenue. The drainage system will not only reduce the peak flows, but will also provide more inlets along San Bernardino Ave and Tennessee Street. This will relieve existing flooding conditions experienced by Tennessee and San Bernardino Avenue during significant storm events. Thus, the proposed drainage system will improve the overall flooding situation in the drainage conditions of the existing channels (AE 2008). Therefore, as discussed above, the Project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area or result in flooding on- or off-site. (DEIR p.3.8-22.)

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HWQ-1a and HWQ-1b (see Impact HWQ-1 for mitigation measures) will require erosion and siltation reduction measures to be implemented during construction of the Project by developing and implementing a SWPPP, which will demonstrate compliance with the State NPDES permit and will submit the SWPPP to the RWQCB along with the required Notice of Intent (NOI) prior to commencement of grading activities, which is consistent with federal and State standards. Consistency with Mitigation Measures MM HWQ-1a and MM HWQ-1b will reduce impacts to substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site to a level of less than significant. (DEIR p.3.8-22.)

8. Noise

Impact N-4: Would the proposed Project create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on related to Noise are discussed in detail in Section 3.11 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1. (DEIR pp. 3.11-51 to 3.11-53.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

MM N-1 The Project applicant shall require construction contractors to adhere to the following noise attenuation requirements:

Construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., except Sundays and holidays. No construction shall be allowed on Sundays or holidays.

All construction equipment shall use noise-reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer.

Construction staging and heavy equipment maintenance activities shall be performed a minimum distance of 300 feet from the nearby noise sensitive uses.

The existing berm along the eastern edge of the Project site shall be preserved and a minimum 10-foot high temporary noise barrier with a minimum STC 12 rating shall be placed along the length of the eastern property line that is adjacent to Karon Street. The temporary noise barrier shall be placed on the top of the existing berm. The temporary noise barrier shall be installed prior to the commencement of grading activities and shall not be removed until completion of building construction. A noise barrier with a minimum STC 12 rating could be obtained through the use of ½ inch or greater plywood/ oriented strand board (OSB), or from acoustically rated vinyl curtains.

(DEIR p. 3.11-53.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: Short-term noise impacts could occur during construction activities from either the noise impacts created from the transport of workers and movement of construction materials to and from the Project site, or from the noise-generated on-site during ground clearing/excavation, grading, and building construction activities. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are residential homes located approximately 75 feet east of the proposed area to be graded. Construction noise impacts onto the nearby receptors have been calculated based on the loudest construction equipment noise sources. Table 3.11-23 in the Draft EIR provides the estimated maximum noise levels that sensitive receptors would be expected to experience during construction. The construction noise often varies significantly on a day-to-day basis, and the noise levels shown in the table represent a worst-case scenario. (DEIR p. 3.11-51.)

Table 3.11-23 of the Draft EIR shows that the Project construction activities would increase the existing noise level by as much as 12.7 dBA over baseline conditions and result in noise levels of up to 65.9 dBA at the nearby receptors. Although the City Noise Ordinance allows for construction noise for specified hours and the Project would comply with these requirements, these increases in temporary noise level are considered substantial since they would exceed the City's 60-dBA CNEL standard for residential uses. However, mitigation measure MM N-1 that would require the Project applicant to install a temporary 10-foot high noise barrier along the length of the eastern property line that is adjacent to Karon Street and implement noise-reduction measures and practices during construction. Additional measures to further reduce noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors, include limiting construction activities to daytime hours, using noise attenuation devices on heavy equipment, preserving the existing berm along the eastern edge of the Project site, and locating staging and maintenance areas at least 300 feet from residences. (DEIR p. 3.11-52.)

The construction noise levels have been recalculated based on construction of the temporary 10-foot high wall on the east side of the Project site and the results are shown in Table 3.11-24 of the Draft EIR. (DEIR p. 3.11-52.)

As indicated in Table 3.11-24 in the Draft EIR, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM N-1, the Project will provide noise-suppression techniques to minimize the impact of temporary construction noise and avoid possible violations of local rules, standards, and ordinances. In addition, the Project will

require the installation of noise reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) on construction equipment that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer. Implementation of mitigation measure MM N-1, construction noise levels at the nearby sensitive receptors would be reduced to meet the City's 60-dBA CNEL standard, or, in the case of Receiver 8 where the standard is already exceeded under the existing condition, would not result in an increase in noise above existing levels. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM N-1impacts impacts would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.11-53.)

9. Public Services

Impact PS-2: Would the proposed 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 Police Protection?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on related to Public Services are discussed in detail in Section 3.13 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measures PS-2. (DEIR pp. 3.13-8 to 3.13-9.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

MM PS-2: Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for each building, the Project applicant shall install the following applicable security measures and implement the following operational practices:

Install strategically placed emergency phones.

Provide sufficient, professionally trained loss prevention staff on-site.

Submit loss-prevention plan with staffing levels on-site to the Redlands Police Department for review and approval.

Install security devices and alarms in the Walmart pharmacy.

Ensure that the site layout for the parking lot areas are properly designed to provide maximum safety and security through adequate lighting, and ingress and egress.

Installation of a high-quality resolution video surveillance cameras throughout the interior and parking lot areas.

Provide 24-hour staffed roving security patrols throughout the parking lot areas and rear of building. If applicant intends to use an outside private security company, the firm must be from the approved list provided by the Police Department or the firm must be approved by the Police Department.

Provide Redlands Police Department with access to live and historical surveillance video for investigations, responses to issues, and prosecution of suspects. Surveillance cameras should be of sufficient quality to ensure identification of suspects.

Prohibit the private sales of vehicles in the parking lot areas.

(DEIR p. 3.13-9.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The proposed 24-hour operation of the Walmart store and outparcels have the potential to increase demands of policing in the early morning hours and during the holiday season. In addition, the Project's location to the States Route 210 (SR-210) Freeway increases the potential for criminal activity to occur on-site. An increase in calls for service has the potential to impact the agency's response time. Consequently, several recommendations for security measures and operational practices will be implemented to deter criminal activity and ultimately reduce demands on the agency. The recommendations include providing emergency phones, on-site security personnel, exterior lighting, surveillance equipment, and prohibiting overnight recreational vehicle parking and private vehicle sales in the parking areas. The recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure PS-2. (DEIR p. 3.13-8.)

In order to offset the incremental costs associated with police protection in the City of Redlands, the proposed Project would be required to pay a law enforcement fee equating to $0.31 per square foot that would be utilized to fund various capital improvements and personnel additions. The applicant shall pay the applicable law enforcement fee at the time of building permit issuances. Furthermore, impacts on police protection would be minimized through the provision of on-site security personnel 24 hours a day at the Walmart store that would monitor and patrol the store and parking areas. Security personnel would serve as a first line of defense against criminal activities and nuisances, and would be able to resolve minor incidents that ordinarily would not warrant a police response (e.g., a lost child or a verbal dispute between customers). In addition, exterior lighting would be provided along buildings and in the parking area, which would serve to deter criminal activity during the nighttime hours. Refer to Section 2, Project Description, for further discussion of the proposed security measures. With the implementation of mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.13-8.)

10. Transportation

Impact T-5: Would the proposed Project conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on related to Transportation are discussed in detail in Section 3.15 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-6a. (DEIR pp.3.15-131 to 3.15-132.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

MM TRANS-6a: Prior to Project occupancy, the Project applicant shall install an enhanced Omnitrans bus stop to serve the Project site. The bus stop shall conform to Omnitrans requirements and include, at a minimum: a shelter, signage, transit information, lighting, and a trash receptacle. Alternately, the Project applicant can satisfy this requirement by providing payments to Omnitrans for the cost of this improvement if Omnitrans commits to having it in place prior to Project occupancy. The design of the bus shelter shall be compatible with the architecture of the Project.

(DEIR p. 3.15-132.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: The Project area is currently served by Omnitrans, a public transit agency serving the San Bernardino Valley, with bus service along Orange Street, San Bernardino

Avenue, Alabama Street, Lugonia Avenue, Mountain View, and Redlands Boulevard through various routes (Routes 8, 15 and 19).Due to the size of the Project and the employment of approximately 436 new jobs, it would be expected that transit usage would increase. Accordingly, it would be expected that Omnitrans would serve the Project. At the time of this writing, the Project site plan does not identify a bus stop. As such, mitigation is proposed that would require the Project applicant to install an enhanced bus stop that would include amenities such as a shelter, signage, transit information, lighting, a trash receptacle, and direct pedestrian connection to the store entrance. The implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure that adequate access to public transit is provided. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.15-132.)

In addition, the City of Redlands East Valley Corridor Specific Plan identifies a trail system for the Project area. There is a proposed trail located along the east side of Mountain View Avenue trending southeast through the study area, and a proposed Class I bikeway trail located along the east side of California Street trending north-south. Given the proximity of bicycle facilities and nearby residential neighborhoods, it would be expected that some customers and employees would use bicycles to travel to the Project. To facilitate bicycle access, the Project will provide bicycle receptors throughout the Project site to facilitate both customer and employee bicycle storage. The provision of these bicycle storage facilities would ensure that adequate storage is available. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.15-132.)

11. Utilities and Service Systems

Impact U-4: Would the proposed Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on related to Utilities and Service Systems are discussed in detail in Section 3.16 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure HWQ-2a through HWQ-2c. (DEIR pp. 3.16-13 to 3.16-14.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

See Mitigation Measures HWQ-2a through HWQ-2c as discussed under Impact HWQ-2.

(DEIR p. 3.16-14.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: California Water Code Section 10910 through 10915 requires that a Water Supply Assessment be prepared for any project containing a shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space. The Project proposes to develop 215,000 square feet for the proposed Walmart, 60,500 square feet for outparcels 1-9, totaling 275,500 square feet. In addition, implementation of the Project will generate approximately 436 new jobs. Therefore, the Project is below the 500,000 square feet of floor use, 1,000-employee and so a Water Supply Assessment is not required. (DEIR p. 3.16-13.)

Water consumption would be consumed from short-term construction activities and long-term operational activities. Short-term construction water consumption from development of the proposed Project would be spread out over the length of construction activities and would not occur all at once. The actual volume of water consumption of at any one time is not expected to pose a significant impact to water supply. (DEIR pp. 3.16-13 to 3.16-14.)

The Project will tie in to the nearest water line, which is located immediately adjacent to the site. The Project's water consumption estimate is provided in Table 3.16-4 (see Impact Analysis U-2). As shown in the Table 3.16-4, the Project is anticipated to demand 14,817 gallons of water on a daily basis. As previously described, the 2010 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan concluded that sufficient water supply is available between 2010 and 2030 to serve all customers within the City of Redlands; refer to Table 3.16-2 (See Section 3.16.2, Existing Conditions, for Table 3.16-2). The Project is consistent with the Land Use and Zoning designations for the Project site and will therefore be served with adequate long-term water supply. In addition, as previously outlined within Table 3.16-2, the current and planned water supplies for the City of Redlands includes 31,479-acre feet per year for the year 2010 and 43,120-acre feet per year for the year 2030. Consequently, implementation of the Project will consume approximately 0.00000014 to 0.00000011 percent of the available water supply for the year 2010 and 2030, respectively. (DEIR p. 3.16-14.)

In addition, the Project would reduce its demand on water supply through the implementation of various indoor and outdoor water conservation measures detailed in the Project's sustainability features discussed in detail in Section 2, Project Description. Specifically, water conservation measures recommended by the California Department of Water Resources, as well as the City's landscape ordinance, will be incorporated into the Project as appropriate, including but not limited to: a) low flush toilets of no greater than 1.6 gallons per flush and b) keeping water pressure at 55 pounds per inch or less. Some portion of the landscaping, especially shrubs and trees, may be native species or species that are adapted to drought conditions. However, the commercial nature of the project means that a good portion of each lot will likely be asphalt, concrete, and minimal turf, which will have a "low" water consumption. (DEIR p. 3.16-14.)

Additionally, mitigation measure MM HWQ-2a through HWQ-2c requires the applicant to install outdoor irrigation and indoor domestic water conservation measures and practices and plumb landscaped areas with "purple pipe" prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the Walmart store to allow for recycled water irrigation. These measures would reduce overall Project demand for potable water and ensure that long-term water supply impacts are less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.16-14.)

12. Greenhouse Gasses

Impact GHG-1: Would the proposed Project generate direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions; however, these emissions would not result in a significant impact on the environment?

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on related to Greenhouse Gasses are discussed in detail in Section 3.17 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-5; AQ-7 through AQ-11; HWQ-2a and HWQ-2b; and TRANS-6a. (DEIR pp. 3.17-14 to 3.17-32.) These mitigation measures, enumerated below, are adopted and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein.

See Mitigation Measures Measure AQ-5; AQ-7 through AQ-11; HYD-2a and HYD-2b; and T-6a *as discussed under Impact AQ-3, HWQ-2, and T-6.*

(DEIR p.3.17-32.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: To determine whether the Project is significant, this Project utilizes the SCAQMD draft local agency tiered threshold. The threshold is as follows:

- Tier 1: The Project is not exempt under CEQA; go to Tier 2.
- Tier 2: There is no greenhouse gas reduction plan applicable to the Project; go to Tier 3.
- Tier 3: Project greenhouse gas emissions compared with the threshold: 3,000 MTCO2e per year (see analysis below).
- Tier 4, option 1: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from business as usual by 28.4 percent. The California 2020 emissions target is 427 MMTCO2e and the 2020 business as usual is 596 MMTCO2e (California Air Resources Board 2011b). Therefore, a 28.4 percent reduction is required to reduce emissions to the target.
- Tier 4, option 3: 4.8 MTCO2e per service population per year (see analysis below). The service population refers to the quantity of workers anticipated on the Project site. \

(DEIR p.3.17-17.)

Section 15064.4(b) of the CEQA Guideline amendments for greenhouse gas emissions state that a lead agency may take into account the following three considerations in assessing the significance of impacts from greenhouse gas emissions. Consideration #1: The extent to which the Project may increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting. Consideration #2: Whether the Project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the Project. Consideration #3: The extent to which the Project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. Such regulations or requirements must be adopted by the relevant public agency through a public review process and must include specific requirements that reduce or mitigate the Project's incremental contribution of greenhouse gas emissions. If there is substantial evidence that the possible effects of a particular project are still cumulatively considerable notwithstanding compliance with the adopted regulations or requirements, an EIR must be prepared for the Project. (DEIR pp.3.17-17 to 3.17-18.)

The operational emissions for the Project are shown in Table 3.17-10 of the Draft EIR, with minor clarifications on page 4-4 to 4-5 of the Final EIR. The main source of emissions is motor vehicles, contributing almost 75 percent of the business as usual emissions. (DEIR p.3.17-25; FEIR pp. 4-4 to 4-5.)

A variety of regulations would reduce Project emissions. A summary of the future regulations that would reduce Project emissions are shown in Table 3.17-11 of the Draft EIR, and are discussed in more detail below. (DEIR p.3.17-27.)

The following tables outline the various Project design features and mitigation measures in other impact areas that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Project will meet the energy efficiency standards of Title 24. To achieve this reduction in energy consumption, the Walmart store will incorporate, at a minimum, the following sustainability features or other features that are equally efficient. Table 3.17-12 in the Draft EIR displays the design features that Walmart would implement to conserve energy, conserve water, and reduce waste. (DEIR pp. 3.17-27 to 3.17-31.) Strategy consistency refers to consistence with strategies in the ARB Scoping Plan and the papers published by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. Table 3.17-11 in the Draft EIR shows mitigation measures in other impact areas that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions. As shown in the tables, the Project is consistent with a variety of Scoping Plan measures. (DEIR p.3.17-27.)

Several measures that have been identified as greenhouse gas emissions reduction strategies by various agencies are not applicable or are infeasible to implement with regard to the Project. For example, the

ARB Scoping Plan identifies a number of strategies that apply to statewide activities, such as tailpipe emissions standards for vehicles. (DEIR p.3.17-31.)

Emissions with Reductions

The operational emissions, after incorporation of Project design features, mitigation measures in other impact areas, and future regulations are shown in Table 3.17-14 of the Draft EIR, with additional clarifications on page 4-5 of the Final EIR. Project reductions and future regulations reduce emissions from business as usual by approximately 30 percent, meeting the threshold set by Tier 4, Option 1. After application of reductions from the Project and regulations, the main source of emissions is from motor vehicles, contributing approximately 75 percent of the emissions. (DEIR p.3.17-31; FEIR pp. 4-5 to 4-6.)

The Project will promote the goals of AB 32. The Walmart store would retail general merchandise and groceries 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and the other components of the Project would operate 12 hours per day, providing convenient access to nearby residents and employees. The Project site is near public transit and accessible to bicycles and pedestrians. Collectively, these characteristics indicate that the Project is planned growth within the urban footprint of Redlands and is well positioned to reduce travel lengths. The Project incorporates a number of features and mitigation measures in other impact areas that would minimize greenhouse gas emissions. These features are consistent with Project-level strategies identified in the ARB's Scoping Plan and the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association white papers. Therefore, although the Project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, these emissions would not have a significant impact on the environment. The Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Impacts would be less than significant. (DEIR p.3.17-32.)

The SCAQMD is in the process of preparing significance thresholds for greenhouse gases and the SCAQMD Board had not approved the thresholds as of the date of the NOP. The current draft thresholds consist of a tiered approach (South Coast Air Quality Management District 2010). One of the tiers involves reducing emissions from business as usual by at least 28.4 percent, with the requirement that the resulting emissions are under 25,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year. With implementation of Project design features and regulations, greenhouse gas emissions are reduced by more than 28.4 percent, to approximately 24,200 $MTCO_2e$ per year. These reductions are consistent with the SCAQMD draft interim threshold of emissions less than 25,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year and a 28.4 percent reduction in emissions. (DEIR p.3.17-32.)

C. Impacts Analyzed In The EIR And Determined To Be Significant And Unavoidable

With the implementation of all available and feasible mitigation measures recommended in the EIR, the following adverse impacts of the Project stated below are considered to be significant and unavoidable, based upon information in the EIR and in the administrative record. These impacts are considered significant and unavoidable despite the imposed mitigation measures which will reduce impacts to the extent feasible.

1. Air Quality

Impact AQ-3: See the discussion under Impact AQ-3 under Section B above. The analysis in that impact found that with mitigation incorporated, while the construction related emissions impacts would be reduced to less than significant, the operational impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the EIR evaluated and concluded that the Project would result in a cumulatively considerable

net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).

Finding: Potential impacts of the Project on Air Quality are discussed in detail in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, and pursuant to State CEQA Guideline § 15091(a)(2) the City finds that the Project's potential impacts to related to the potential for the proposed Project to result in a cumulatively significant impact even after mitigation because of the exceedances of the SCAQMD's regional emission thresholds for VOC, NOx, CO, and PM10. Additionally, the Project may result in cumulative health effects from cumulative exposures from ozone, nitrogen dioxide, and PM10. The impacts will remain significant notwithstanding imposition of Mitigation Measures AQ-4 through AQ-11. *Therefore, despite mitigation, impacts will remain significant and unavoidable.* (DEIR pp. 3.3-39 to 3.3-49.)

See Mitigation Measures MM AQ-4 through AQ-11 as discussed within Impact AQ-3 under Section B above.

(DEIR pp. 4.2-59 to 4.2-61.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: See the previous discussion within Impact AQ-3 under Section II (B) in the Findings above.

The South Coast Air Quality Management District 1993 Handbook suggests three voluntary approaches to determine cumulative significance. The first approach is a 1-percent-per-year reduction (or 18 percent over 18 years to the year 2010) in Project emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, PM_{10}, and SO_x. This approach is not straightforward and operational reductions are not easy to quantify. The second approach is not applicable because it relies on SCAQMD Regulation XV, which was repealed in 1995 and therefore is not applicable. The third approach is to reduce the rate of growth in vehicle miles traveled and trips. In this approach, the rate of growth in vehicle miles traveled and trips "should be held to the rate of population or household growth." Data that was used by Southern California Association of Governments in the AQMP should be used in this approach; however, that data is not available. Therefore, the approaches in the 1993 SCAQMD Handbook pertaining to cumulative impacts are not used. (DEIR p. 3.3-41.)

Criterion 1: Regional Impact Analysis

If an area is in nonattainment for a criteria pollutant, then the background concentration of that pollutant has historically been over the ambient air quality standard. It follows that if a project exceeds the regional threshold for that nonattainment pollutant, then it would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of that pollutant and result in a significant cumulative impact. (DEIR p. 3.3-41.)

The Basin is in nonattainment for nitrogen dioxide, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and ozone. Therefore, if the project exceeds the regional thresholds for PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$, then it contributes to a cumulatively considerable impact for those pollutants. Additionally, if the Project exceeds the regional threshold for NO_x or VOC, which are precursors to the formation of ozone and PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, then it follows that the Project would contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact for ozone, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. If the Project exceeds the threshold for NOx, it would contribute to nitrogen dioxide concentrations. Project impacts on a regional scale may occur many miles away from the Project site. Project emissions when added to the overall emission burden of the Basin could result in a cumulatively significant impact. (DEIR p. 3.3-41.)

Other parameters (besides those presented in Impact AQ-2) which are used to estimate emissions such as the worker and vendor trips and trip lengths utilize the CalEEMod defaults, with the addition of 5 daily haul trips during grading, which is to haul the construction equipment to the site or any import/export of material. (DEIR p. 3.3-41.)

Construction emissions are calculated during each period according to the type and level of construction activity occurring during the period. Activities can be discreet or overlapping. Emissions occur from construction equipment, fugitive dust, asphalt paving, architectural coating, and worker and delivery vehicles. Table 3.3-24 in the Draft EIR summarizes the Project's short-term regional construction emissions without application of mitigation measures for each construction activity (however, the particulate matter emissions do include compliance with the mitigation measures outlined in SCAQMD Rule 403). As shown in the Draft EIR, without mitigation, the Project's construction emissions would exceed the AQMD regional emission thresholds for VOC and NO_x during construction. Therefore, the short-term construction emissions would have a potentially significant regional impact. (DEIR p. 3.3-42.)

Mobile source emissions from motor vehicles are the largest single long-term source of air pollutants from the operation of the Project and consist of emissions from delivery trucks and customer and worker vehicles. Small amounts of emissions are also generated from area sources such as landscaping equipment, use of consumer products, natural gas consumption, and architectural coating/painting and from the operation of the service station. The emissions were generated using CalEEMod; assumptions are discussed in Impact AQ-2. Operational emissions (unmitigated) from mobile and area operational emission sources as derived from CalEEMod and from the service station shown in Table 3.3-25, Table 3.3-26, and Table 3.3-27 for the summer season for years 2010, 2013, and 2030, and Table 3.3-28 for the winter season within the Draft EIR. (DEIR p. 3.3-43; FEIR p. 4-1.)

As shown in the Draft EIR, operation of the Project would exceed the SCAQMD's regional operational significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM_{10}. VOC and NO_x are precursors in the formation of ozone and both contribute to the formation of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, pollutants for which the Basin has been identified as a non-attainment area (i.e., an area exceeding national or State standards). Thus, even though the Project's incremental emissions by themselves would not likely exceed the ozone, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ standards, their contribution to the overall SCAQMD regional emission burden would add to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, the Project does not meet Criterion 1. (DEIR p. 3.3-45.)

Note that as discussed in Impact AQ-2, during operation the Project would not exceed the ambient air quality standards for the pollutants assessed. This is based on localized emissions and concentrations. The analysis under this impact assesses the emissions based on the regional thresholds identified by the SCAQMD. Based on the regional thresholds, the cumulative impact is significant. (DEIR p. 3.3-45.)

Criterion 2: Consistency with Existing Air Quality Plans

The geographic scope for cumulative criteria pollution from air quality impacts is the Basin, because that is the area in which the air pollutants generated by the sources within the basin circulate and are often trapped. The SCAQMD is required to prepare and maintain an AQMP and a State Implementation Plan to document the strategies and measures to be undertaken to reach attainment of ambient air quality standards. While the SCAQMD does not have direct authority over land use decisions, it recognized that changes in land use and circulation planning are necessary to maintain clean air. The SCAQMD evaluated the entire basin when it developed the AQMP. (DEIR p. 3.3-45.)

According to the above analysis, the Project is not consistent with the most recent AQMP without mitigation. Therefore, the Project does not meet Criterion 2. (DEIR p. 3.3-46.)

Criterion 3: Cumulative Health Impacts

The basin is in nonattainment for ozone, nitrogen dioxide, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, which means that the background levels of those pollutants are at times higher than the ambient air quality standards. The air quality standards were set to protect public health, including the health of sensitive individuals (i.e., elderly, children, and the sick). Therefore, when the concentration of those pollutants exceeds the standard, it is likely that some sensitive individuals in the population will experience health effects as described above in the sub-section, Air Pollutants. However, the health effects are a factor of the dose-response curve. Concentration of the pollutant in the air (dose), the length of time exposed, and the response of the individual are factors involved in the severity and nature of health impacts. If a significant health impact results from Project emissions, it does not mean that 100 percent of the population would experience health effects. There are no models or methodology to calculate with certainty what health risks would be experienced from potential cumulative impacts. (DEIR p. 3.3-46.)

The regional analysis of construction emissions indicates that without mitigation, the Project would exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for VOC and NO_x (ozone precursors). In addition, long-term operational emissions of VOC and NO_x are over the District's significance thresholds. Because ozone is a secondary pollutant (it is not emitted directly but formed by chemical reactions in the air), it can be formed miles downwind of the Project site. Project emissions of VOC and NO_x may contribute to the background concentration of ozone and cumulatively cause health effects. Project emissions of NOx may contribute to the background concentration of nitrogen dioxide and cause health effects. (DEIR p. 3.3-46.)

Health impacts from ozone exposure may or may not include the following:

(a) Pulmonary function decrements and localized lung edema in humans and animals
(b) Risk to public health implied by alterations in pulmonary morphology and host defense in animals
(c) Increased mortality risk
(d) Risk to public health implied by altered connective tissue metabolism and altered pulmonary morphology in animals after long-term exposures and pulmonary function decrements in chronically exposed humans.

(DEIR p. 3.3-46.)

Short-term exposure to ozone can result in breathing pattern changes, reduction of breathing capacity, increased susceptibility to infections, inflammation of the lung tissue, and some immunological changes. Children who live in high ozone communities and who participate in multiple sports have been observed to have a higher asthma risk. This is a significant cumulative health impact associated with ground-level ozone concentrations. (DEIR p. 3.3-46.)

Health effects from nitrogen dioxide may include the following:

(a) Potential to aggravate chronic respiratory disease and respiratory symptoms in sensitive groups
(b) Risk to public health implied by pulmonary and extra-pulmonary biochemical and cellular changes and pulmonary structural changes
(c) Contribution to atmospheric discoloration

(DEIR p. 3.3-47.)

Additionally, during operation, the Project could result in a significance cumulative contribution to PM_{10}. Sensitive individuals may experience health impacts when concentrations of those pollutants exceed the ambient air quality standards. Health impacts from particulate matter may include the following: (a) exacerbation of symptoms in sensitive patients with respiratory or cardiovascular disease; (b) declines in pulmonary function growth in children; (c) and/or increased risk of premature death from heart or lung diseases in the elderly. Therefore, the Project does not meet Criterion 3. (DEIR p. 3.3-47.)

Criteria pollutants are treated differently from toxic air contaminants because criteria pollutants have state and federal standards and are set in a different regulatory environment than toxic air contaminants. Diesel particulate matter is a major part of PM2.5 and PM10 and thus is included in the criteria pollutant impact analysis for PM2.5 and PM10. Benzene is a hydrocarbon whose emissions are also estimated as part of the Project's operational VOC emissions (see regional operational emissions). Further, risk (as in estimating health risks) is estimated on a probability basis (e.g., cancer risk of 10 in one million) while criteria pollutant impacts are expressed as a not to be exceeded basis. Therefore, criteria pollutant impacts are not expressed as a risk. (DEIR p. 3.3-47.)

Construction: Less than significant. Mitigation measures AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3 would reduce the significance of construction emissions, as shown in the Draft EIR. The emissions reductions from AQ-1 are estimated by CalEEMod. The emission reductions from AQ-2 (not allowing overlap) are manually estimated by changing the overlapping additions. To attribute the emission reductions from AQ-3: the unmitigated emissions were estimated assuming 250 grams of VOC per Liter; assuming 125 grams per Liter would reduce emissions by half. (DEIR p. 3.3-49.)

Operation: ***Significant and unavoidable***. The Project would result in a cumulatively significant impact even after mitigation because of the exceedances of the SCAQMD's regional emission thresholds for VOC, NOx, CO, and PM10. The Project may result in cumulative health effects from cumulative exposures from ozone, nitrogen dioxide, and PM10. While the Project and associated air quality reports and evaluations completed a thorough review of all feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the operational impacts to the greatest extent possible, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. No additional mitigation measures were considered to be feasible or determined to further reduce the operational emissions. The EIR also considered three Alternatives developed to reduce the air quality impacts of the Project (Ten Percent Reduction Alternative, Walmart Standalone Alternative, and No Walmart/Medium Size Tenant Alternative). However, while each of these Alternatives would reduce the Project's air quality impacts, none would reduce those impacts to a less than significant level. (See DEIR 6-14,, 6-24, 6-31- 6-32.) The emission reductions resulting from the implementation of mitigation measures AQ-5, AQ-7, AQ-8, AQ-9, AQ-10, AQ-11, and T-6a would result in approximately a 1 percent reduction in motor vehicle emissions (see Table 3.17-6 in the Greenhouse Gas Draft EIR section for documentation). This reduction would not reduce operational emissions to less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.3-49.)

2. Transportation

Impact T-1: The EIR evaluated and concluded that the Project would cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections) and/or exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

Finding: Project related Transportation impacts are discussed in detail in Section 3.15 of the Draft EIR. Based on the entire record before it, the City finds that this impact is potentially significant but will be reduced to the extent feasible through mitigation measures. (DEIR pp. 3.15-36 to 3.15-113.) Mitigation Measures TRANS-1a through TRANS-1e will reduce direct project impacts; Mitigation Measures TRANS-2a through TRANS-2t will reduce cumulative impacts; and Mitigation Measures TRANS-3a through TRANS-3i, TRANS-4a through TRANS-4e, and TRANS 5a through TRANS 5b will reduce impacts related to site access and onsite roadway improvements. These mitigations, as set forth below, are incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and will be implemented as specified therein. Notwithstanding, while the direct Project impacts will be reduced to less than significant with mitigation, the Project's cumulative impacts and impacts to freeway ramps and mainline improvements will remain significant and unavoidable.

Direct Project Impacts

The following mitigation measures reduce the Project's direct impacts to below a level of significance. These measures shall be implemented and improvements constructed prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.

MM TRANS-1a: Alabama Street/I-10 Westbound Ramps (#9) - The addition of Project traffic would result in unacceptable levels of service during the Saturday peak hour as compared to existing (2010) conditions. Southbound Approach: Stripe for a southbound right turn lane.

MM TRANS-1b: SR-210 Eastbound Ramps/San Bernardino Avenue (#12) - The addition of Project traffic would result in unacceptable levels of service during the PM and Saturday peak hours as compared to existing (2010) conditions. Southbound Approach: Re-stripe the number 1 through lane to provide a 2nd left turn lane. Eastbound Approach: Re-stripe the right turn lane to provide a shared through-right turn lane (with a minimum of 550-feet of storage).

MM TRANS-1c: SR-210 Westbound Ramps/San Bernardino Avenue (#14) - The addition of Project traffic would result in unacceptable levels of service during the PM and Saturday peak hours as compared to existing (2010) conditions. Northbound Approach: Widen to provide a dedicated right turn lane. Eastbound Approach: Re-stripe to provide a 2nd through lane. Westbound Approach: Construct a 2nd through lane and a dedicated right turn lane with a minimum of 150-feet of storage.

MM TRANS-1d: Church Street/San Bernardino Avenue (#40) - The addition of Project traffic would result in unacceptable levels of service during the PM and Saturday peak hours as compared to existing (2010) conditions. Install a traffic signal.

MM TRANS-1e: Church Street/Lugonia Avenue (#41) - The addition of Project traffic would result in unacceptable levels of service during the PM peak hour as compared to existing (2010) conditions. Northbound Approach: Re-stripe to provide a left turn lane and a shared through-right turn lane. Southbound Approach: Re-stripe to provide a left turn lane and a shared through-right turn lane.

Cumulative Impacts

The applicant will be required to provide payment for their fair share of the improvements identified under Mitigation TRANS-2 as described below. Fair share improvements are typically satisfied through the payment of fees for improvements included in an established fee program, a financial contribution based on estimated costs of improvements as assigned by the approving jurisdiction, specific improvements that are significantly triggered by the Project or a combination of these strategies.

Several of the facilities forecasted to be impacted under cumulative conditions would be funded by the City of Redlands Development Impact Fee (DIF) Program, while many of them are not included in the DIF. Further, the following improvements are located outside of the City, within unincorporated San Bernardino County:

• Alabama Street / San Bernardino Avenue: 1.NB Right Turn Lane with Overlap, 1.WB Left Turn Lane.

• Alabama Street / Lugonia Avenue: 1.NB Left Turn Lane, 1.NB Through Lane, 1.NB Right Turn Lane with Overlap, 1.SB Left Turn Lane, 1.EB Left Turn Lane, 1.EB Right Turn Lane with Overlap, 1.WB Left Turn Lane.

• SR-210 Eastbound Ramps / San Bernardino Avenue: 1.NB Right Turn Lane with Overlap, 1.SB Left Turn Lane, 1.SB Right Turn Lane, 1.EB Left Turn Lane, 2.EB Through Lanes, 1.WB Left Turn Lane, 2.WB Through Lanes, 1.WB Right Turn Lane.

None of these improvements are included in the County's Development Impact Fee Program. As a condition of approval, Walmart will be required to make a fair share contribution into the existing County fee program to be directed towards those improvements.

As shown in Table 7-5 of the Traffic Impact Analysis, the proposed Project contributes to cumulative traffic impacts at twenty (20) intersections located within the City of Redlands or the County of San Bernardino. For facilities not covered by an existing fee program, the Project would contribute the associated intersection fair-share percentage toward the costs of the recommended improvements. Improvements included in the column labeled "Non-Program Improvements" do not appear to be in an established fee program. A fair share financial contribution based upon the Project's fair share impacts may be imposed in order mitigate the Project's share of impacts in lieu of construction. The fair-share calculations provided in Appendix 7.11 of the Draft EIR shows that the proposed Project contributes between 2.0% and 37.6% of trips at the study area intersections. These percentages are also shown on Table 7-5 of the Traffic Impact Analysis in the last column for each cumulatively impacted location.

However, cumulative impacts will remain significant and unavoidable. This is because, although the intersections identified as being subject to cumulative impacts may be improved by time that the various improvements identified are needed to maintain acceptable LOS in support of the Project, there are many uncertainties related to the timing of the full funding and completion of such improvements including; payment of DIF fees/fair share payments by other development in the future, availability of non-DIF funding that may be available to the City in the future, and, for improvements located in County unincorporated areas, County decisions and funding availability for completing the necessary improvements. Due to these uncertainties, timely construction of improvements needed to address cumulative impacts cannot be guaranteed.

MM TRANS-2: The applicant shall participate in the funding of off-site improvements, including traffic signals that are needed, as identified in Mitigation Measures 2a through 2t to serve cumulative traffic conditions through the payment of City of Redlands Development Impact Fees (DIF) or through a fair share contribution, or combination of both, as directed by the City.

MM TRANS-2a: California Street/I-10 Westbound Ramps (#3) - This intersection can be mitigated by providing the following geometric improvement: Westbound Approach: Widen to provide a left turn lane.

MM TRANS-2b: California Street/Redlands Boulevard (#5) - This intersection can be mitigated by implementing protected left turn phasing on all approaches in conjunction with the following geometric improvement: Northbound Approach: Widen to provide a left turn lane. Striping shall be provided within the intersection for the eastbound and westbound left turning vehicles due to the off-set nature of the intersection.

MM TRANS-2c: Alabama Street/San Bernardino Avenue (#7) - This intersection can be mitigated by providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Re-stripe to provide a dedicated northbound right turn lane with overlap phasing. Westbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane.

MM TRANS-2d: Alabama Street/Lugonia Avenue (#8) - This intersection can be mitigated by providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane, 3rd through lane and a right turn lane with overlap phasing. Southbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane. Eastbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane and right turn lane with overlap phasing. Westbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane.

MM TRANS-2e: Alabama Street/I-10 Westbound Ramps (#9) - This intersection can be mitigated by providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane and a 3rd through lane. Southbound Approach: Widen to provide a 3rd through lane and a right turn lane.

MM TRANS-2f: Alabama Street/I-10 Eastbound Ramps (#10) - This intersection can be mitigated by providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Widen to provide a 3rd through lane and a right turn lane. Southbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane and a 3rd through lane. Eastbound Approach: Widen to provide a dedicated right turn lane.

MM TRANS-2g: Alabama Street/Redlands Boulevard (#11) - This intersection can be mitigated by protecting the northbound and southbound approach left turn movements and providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane and a 3rd through lane. Southbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane and a right turn lane. Eastbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane and a 3rd through lane. Westbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane.

MM TRANS-2h: SR-210 Eastbound Ramps/San Bernardino Avenue (#12) - This intersection can be mitigated by providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Re-stripe to provide a dedicated right turn lane with overlap phasing. Southbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane and a right turn lane. Eastbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane and 2nd and 3rd through lanes. Westbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane, 2nd and 3rd through lanes and a 2nd right turn lane.

MM TRANS-2i: SR-210 Westbound Ramps/San Bernardino Avenue (#14) - This intersection can be mitigated by providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Widen to provide a dedicated right turn lane. Southbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane and 2nd through lane. Eastbound Approach: Widen to provide 2nd and 3rd through lanes. Westbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd and 3rd through lanes.

MM TRANS-2j: Tennessee Street/Lugonia Avenue (#17) - This intersection can be mitigated by providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left

turn lane and a 2nd through lane. Southbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd through lane. Eastbound Approach: Implement overlap phasing on the right turn lane.

MM TRANS-2k: Tennessee Street/I-10 Eastbound Ramps (#19) - This intersection can be mitigated by providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Widen to provide a right turn lane. Eastbound Approach: Widen to provide a right turn lane.

MM TRANS-2l: Tennessee Street/Colton Avenue (#20) - This intersection can be mitigated by providing the following geometric improvements: Southbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd left turn lane. Westbound Approach: Widen to provide a right turn lane.

MM TRANS-2m: Tennessee Street/Redlands Boulevard (#21) - This intersection can be mitigated by protecting the north and south left turn movements and providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Widen to provide a left turn lane. Southbound Approach: Widen to provide a left turn lane.

MM TRANS-2n: New York Street/Lugonia Avenue (#27) - This intersection can be mitigated by providing the following geometric improvement: Westbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd through lane.

MM TRANS-2o: Texas Street/Brockton Avenue (#31) - This intersection can be mitigated by installing a traffic signal and providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Widen to provide a left turn lane. Southbound Approach: Widen to provide a left turn lane.

MM TRANS-2p: Orange Street/Pioneer Avenue (#35) - This intersection can be mitigated by installing a traffic signal. No other lane geometric improvements are needed.

MM TRANS-2q: Church Street/San Bernardino Avenue (#40) - This intersection can be mitigated by installing a traffic signal and providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Re-stripe to provide one left turn lane and a shared through-right turn lane. Southbound Approach: Re-stripe to provide one left turn lane and a shared through-right turn lane. Eastbound Approach: Widen to provide a left turn lane and 2nd through lane. Westbound Approach: Widen to provide a left turn lane and 2nd through lane.

MM TRANS-2r: Church Street/Lugonia Avenue (#41)- This intersection can be mitigated by protecting the northbound and southbound approach left turn movements and providing the following geometric improvements: Northbound Approach: Widen to provide a left turn lane and 2nd through lane. Southbound Approach: Widen to provide a left turn lane and 2nd through lane.

MM TRANS-2s: University Street/San Bernardino Avenue (#42) - This intersection can be mitigated by installing a traffic signal and providing the following geometric improvements: Eastbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd through lane. Westbound Approach: Widen to provide a 2nd through lane.

MM TRANS-2t: Judson Street/San Bernardino Avenue (#44) - This intersection can be mitigated by providing the following geometric improvements: Eastbound Approach: Widen to provide a left turn lane and 2nd through lane. Westbound Approach: Widen to provide a left turn lane and 2nd through lane.

Site Access and On-Site Roadway Improvements

Roadway improvements necessary to provide site access and on-site circulation are assumed to be constructed in conjunction with site development and are described below. These improvements should be in place prior to occupancy.

Site Access Improvements

Site access driveway improvements for the Project are described below. Construction of on-site and site adjacent improvements shall occur in conjunction with adjacent project development activity or as needed for Project access purposes. These improvements shall be in place prior to occupancy, to ensure impacts are mitigated to a level of less than significant.

MM TRANS-3a: Tennessee Street at Driveway 1 - Install a traffic signal and construct the intersection with the following geometrics: one northbound through lane, one northbound shared through-right turn lane, southbound left turn lanes providing a minimum of 350-feet of storage, two southbound through lanes, one westbound left turn lane and one westbound right turn lane.

MM TRANS-3b: Tennessee Street at Pennsylvania Avenue - Install a traffic signal and construct the intersection with the following geometrics: one northbound through lane, one northbound shared through-right turn lane, one southbound left turn lane providing a minimum of 150-feet of storage, two southbound through lanes, one westbound left turn lane with a minimum of 150-feet of storage and one westbound right turn lane.

MM TRANS-3c: Driveway 2 at Pennsylvania Avenue - Install a stop control on the southbound approach and construct the intersection with the following geometrics: one southbound left turn lane, one southbound right turn lane, one eastbound left turn lane one eastbound through lane and one westbound shared through-right turn lane.

MM TRANS-3d: Driveway 3 at San Bernardino Avenue - Install a traffic signal and construct the intersection with the following geometrics: dual northbound left turn lanes, one northbound right turn lane, three eastbound through lanes, one eastbound right turn lane providing a minimum of 300-feet of storage, one westbound left turn lane providing a minimum of 250-feet of storage and one westbound through lane. It should be noted that it is necessary for the Project to construct a second westbound through lane between Tennessee Street and Driveway 3 to provide the appropriate number of receiving lanes for the dual northbound left turn lanes out of Driveway 3.

MM TRANS-3e: Driveway 4 at Pennsylvania Avenue - Install a stop control on the southbound approach and construct the intersection with the following geometrics: one southbound shared left-right turn lane, one eastbound left turn lane with a minimum of 100-feet of storage, one eastbound through lane and one westbound shared through-right turn lane.

MM TRANS-3f: New York Avenue at San Bernardino Avenue - Install a traffic signal and construct the intersection with the following geometrics: one northbound left turn lane with a minimum of 150-feet of storage, one northbound right turn lane with a minimum of 150-feet of storage, two eastbound through lanes, one eastbound shared through-right turn lane, one westbound left turn lane providing a minimum of 300-feet of storage and one westbound through lane. It should be noted that space for a northbound through lane should be provided for future access onto the extension of New York Avenue, north of San Bernardino Avenue.

MM TRANS-3g: New York Avenue at Driveway 5 - Install a stop control on the eastbound approach and construct the intersection with the following geometrics: one northbound left turn lane

with a minimum of 100-feet of storage, one northbound through lane, one southbound shared through-right turn lane and one eastbound shared left-right turn lane.

MM TRANS-3h: On-site traffic signing and striping should be implemented in conjunction with detailed construction plans for the Project site.

MM TRANS-3i: Sight distance at each Project access point should be reviewed with respect to standard Caltrans and City of Redlands sight distance standards at the time of preparation of final grading, landscape and street improvement plans.

On-Site Roadway Improvements

Site-adjacent roadway improvements for the Project are described below. Construction of site-adjacent roadway improvements shall occur in conjunction with adjacent Project development activity or as needed for Project access purposes.

MM TRANS-4a: San Bernardino Avenue - Construct at its ultimate half-section width as a Major Arterial (120-foot right-of-way) between Tennessee Street and New York Avenue, consistent with the circulation recommendations found in the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

MM TRANS-4b: Tennessee Street - Construct at its ultimate full-section width as a Minor Arterial (88-foot right-of-way) between San Bernardino Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue, consistent with the City of Redlands General Plan Circulation Element.

MM TRANS-4c: New York Avenue - Construct a minimum of one lane in each direction of travel and a two-way-left-turn lane (painted median) on New York Avenue between San Bernardino Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue \ (66-foot right-of-way).

MM TRANS-4d: Pennsylvania Avenue - Construct a minimum of one lane in each direction of travel and a two-way-left-turn lane (painted median) on Pennsylvania Avenue between Tennessee Street and New York Avenue (48-foot right-of-way). It should be noted that the construction of Pennsylvania Avenue along the Project frontage will not connect to the existing Pennsylvania Avenue east of Karon Street.

MM TRANS-4e: Roadways adjacent to the Project, site access points and site-adjacent intersections will be constructed to be consistent with the recommended roadway classifications and respective cross-sections in the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan (the governing land use document for the area north of the Project site which includes San Bernardino Avenue).

Short-Term Construction

MM TRANS-5a The export and import of construction materials shall occur during off-peak hours in order to have a minimal traffic impact to the surrounding roadway network. In addition, a construction traffic management plan shall be implemented for the duration of the construction phase.

MM TRANS-5b The delivery and removal of heavy equipment shall occur outside of the morning and evening peak hours in order to have nominal impacts to traffic and circulation near the vicinity of the Project.

(DEIR pp. 3.15-103 to 3.15-112.)

Facts in Support of the Finding: According to the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan (EVCSP) Final EIR (October 1988), buildout of the Specific Plan will have a significant and unavoidable impact to local and regional traffic within the Specific Plan area. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, decision-makers are required to adopt a statement of overriding considerations for the Project's significant unavoidable impacts that cannot be fully mitigated or avoided and to explain why the EVCSP's benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. Therefore, the County of San Bernardino Land Management Department/Office of Planning (Lead Agency) prepared a statement of overriding considerations to find that the EVCSP would provide specific economic, social, and other benefits that outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts of the EVCSP, such that those impacts are considered acceptable. (DEIR p. 3.15-36.)

The Project site is located within the East Valley Corridor Plan (September 1989) and is required to be consistent with the following applicable goals and policies related to the transportation and circulation. The Project related traffic impacts were analyzed in the TIA prepared by Urban Crossroads (UC 2011). Operation of these facilities has been analyzed for both weekday evening (4:00 to 6:00 PM) and Saturday (2:00 to 4:00 PM) peak hour conditions for the following scenarios: Scenario 1: Existing – Existing volumes obtained from recent (2010) traffic counts and existing lane configurations. Scenario 2: Existing Plus Project – Existing volumes obtained from recent (2010) traffic counts and existing lane configurations plus the new traffic generated by the proposed Project. Scenario 3: Opening Year 2013 With Project – Existing volumes plus three (3) years of ambient growth plus the new traffic generated by pending and approved, but not yet constructed developments in the area, plus the new traffic generated by the proposed Project. Scenario 4: Year 2030 Without Project – Traffic volumes representing the area-wide growth anticipated between 2010 and Year 2030, less traffic from the proposed Project. Scenario 5: Year 2030 With Project – Year 2030 volumes with the proposed Project. (DEIR pp. 3.15-36 to 3.15-37.)

Note: AM Peak Hour conditions were not analyzed because these conditions are not worse case scenario when compared to PM Peak Hour and Saturday Peak Hour conditions. (DEIR p. 3.15-37.)

The traffic generation is based upon the specific land uses planned for the Project. A summary of Project trip generation is shown in Table 3.15-9 in the Draft EIR. The trip generation rates are based upon data collected by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 8th Edition, 2008. (DEIR p. 3.15-37.)

As shown on Table 7.1 of the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, the internal capture percentage between retail-to-retail land uses is approximately 20% during the weekday PM peak hour. As such, a 10% internal capture reduction has been utilized in an effort to estimate a conservative trip generation for the proposed Project. Weekend daily trip generation has been estimated for both Saturday and Sunday at the request of City of Redlands staff. However, only the Saturday peak hour and daily trip generation has been utilized for the purposes of this analysis as Saturday is the worst-case weekend condition. As such, the Sunday daily trip generation has been provided in Table 3.15-9 for comparative purposes only. Sunday daily trip generation rates are not available in the ITE Trip Generation Manual for the fast-food without drive-thru window and gas station with convenience market and car wash uses. As such, a percentage has been applied to the Saturday daily rate to estimate a Sunday daily trip generation rate. In comparing land uses that had daily trip generation rates available for both Saturday and Sunday, it appears the Sunday rate is approximately 49 to 88 percent of the Saturday trip generation rate. A conservative reduction rate of 80 percent has been applied to the Saturday trip generation rate to determine the Sunday daily rate for the fast-food without drive-thru window and gas station with convenience market and car wash uses. (DEIR pp. 3.15-37 to 3.15-38.)

As can be seen within Table 3.15-9 in the Draft EIR, the proposed development is projected to generate a total of approximately 19,481 net trip-ends per day on a typical weekday, 22,907 net trip-ends per day on a Saturday and approximately 18,820 net trip-ends per day on a Sunday. The Project is anticipated to generate a total of approximately 1,402 net weekday PM peak hour trips and 1,941 net Saturday peak hour trips. (DEIR p. 3.15-38.)

The Project traffic is distributed to the network via Project driveways to ensure the necessary lane geometrics for the site access points are understood, and to identify potential Project impacts to nearby intersections. The Project inbound trip distribution pattern is graphically depicted on Exhibit 3.15-5a of the Draft EIR. The Project outbound distribution pattern is graphically depicted on Exhibit 3.15-5b of the Draft EIR. (DEIR p. 3.15-38.)

CEQA Guidelines require that other reasonably foreseeable development projects which are either approved or being processed concurrently in the study area also be included as part of a cumulative analysis scenario. As a worst-case scenario, the cumulative development projects included in this analysis were derived form current applications and projects undergoing development within the City of Redlands and were subsequently provided by City of Redlands staff. Projects outside of the City of Redlands city limits have also been obtained from the County of San Bernardino, City of Highland and City of Loma Linda to include the future projects proposed within the study area, including the Donut Hole region. (DEIR p. 3.15-38.)

Cumulative development projects included in this analysis are assumed to contribute traffic to at least one or more of the study area intersections. A list of the cumulative development projects is included in Table 3.15-10 and shown in Exhibit 3.15-6 of the Draft EIR. (DEIR p. 3.15-38.)

The cumulative development projects assumed in the TIA were estimated to generate 126,627 net trip-ends per day with approximately 11,601 vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour and 11,851 vehicle trips during the Saturday peak hour. In light of current market conditions, these traffic forecasts would tend to overstate as opposed to understate traffic impacts for cumulative conditions. (DEIR p. 3.15-49.)

In an effort to more accurately represent current economic conditions, the forecasted growth in traffic volumes related to cumulative development has been based on a different absorption percentage for each future year scenario. Specifically, the future traffic scenarios assume 30 percent of the projected cumulative development traffic for 2013 conditions and 100 percent of the projected cumulative development traffic for 2030. Future projected cumulative development traffic is assumed as a worst-case scenario for 2013 and 2030 cumulative traffic conditions. (DEIR p. 3.15-49.)

Note that future year traffic forecasts have been based upon three (3) years of background (ambient) growth at 2% per year for Opening Year 2013 traffic conditions. The ambient growth factor is intended to approximate regional traffic growth. The adopted Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) growth forecasts for San Bernardino County identifies projected growth in population of 1,864,264 in 2003 to 3,133,801 in 2035, or a 68% increase over the 32 year period. The change in population equates to roughly a 1.64 percent growth rate compounded annually. Similarly, growth over the same 32-year period in households is projected to increase by 76 percent, or 1.78 percent annual growth rate. Finally, growth in employment over the same 32-year period is projected to increase by 96 percent, or a 2.13 percent annual growth rate. The use of an annual growth rate of 2.0 percent would appear to conservatively approximate the anticipated regional growth in traffic volumes in the San Bernardino County, especially when considered along with

the addition of project-related traffic and traffic generated by other known development projects. (DEIR p. 3.15-49.)

The total ambient growth is 6.12% for Opening Year 2013 traffic conditions (compounded growth of two percent per year over three years). This ambient growth rate is added to existing traffic volumes to account for area-wide growth not reflected by cumulative development projects. Ambient growth has been added to daily and peak hour traffic volumes on surrounding roadways, in addition to traffic generated by the Project. Opening Year 2013 with Project traffic conditions includes the traffic generated by the Project, which is added to the Opening Year 2013 without Project traffic volumes. (DEIR p. 3.15-49.)

Construction Traffic - Traffic operations during the proposed construction phase of the Project may potentially result in traffic impacts related to construction employees, export of materials, import of construction materials, etc. It is anticipated that the following construction-related activities would generate traffic and may potentially result in construction-related traffic impacts: Employee trips; Export of materials; Import of construction materials; Use of heavy equipment. Each of the traffic generating activities listed above is discussed thoroughly in the subsequent sections. It has been assumed that construction activity will occur during the hours of 7:00 AM and 4:00 PM. (DEIR pp. 3.15-49 to 3.15-50.)

Employee trips are estimated based on the number of employees estimated to be onsite throughout the various stages of construction. Each employee is assumed to drive and from the construction site each day. It has been assumed that employees will arrive up to 30 minutes prior to the workday and will leave up to 30 minutes after the workday ends. Parking for employees and non-employee vehicles can be accommodated through the construction of a portion of the proposed parking lot for the Project. (DEIR p. 3.15-50.)

It is anticipated that the majority of employees would arrive and depart from the site adjacent to the peak commute traffic periods (i.e., 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.) with a period of overlap. Employee trips are based on the number of employees estimated to be onsite during different points throughout the Project. Each employee is assumed to drive to and from the site alone each day. The impacts of construction-related parking and employee traffic are considered less-than-significant. (DEIR p. 3.15-50.)

Construction of the Project will require the export and import of construction materials to and from the site. The export/import materials will be transported via 15-cubic yard (cy) capacity dump trucks. Each truck will generate one (1) inbound and one (1) outbound trip, accounting for a total of two (2) truck trips per load of material exported or imported. Export of construction materials is anticipated to consist of the exportation of "cut" soil from the site. Import of construction materials is anticipated to consist of the importation of raw building materials, concrete, asphalt, etc. (DEIR p. 3.15-50.)

In order to minimize the impact of construction truck traffic to the surrounding roadway network, mitigation measure MM TRANS-5a will require trucks to utilize the most direct route between the site and the SR-210 Freeway via San Bernardino Avenue to Tennessee Street. It is anticipated that the construction staging will be located off of Tennessee Street. As such, the proposed construction access on Tennessee Street will provide the most direct access. (DEIR p. 3.15-50.)

In addition, implementation of mitigation measure MM TRANS-5b will require the export and import of construction materials to occur during off-peak hours in order to have a minimal traffic impact to the surrounding roadway network. Further, a construction traffic management plan shall be implemented

for the duration of the construction phase. Consistency with these measures will reduce truck traffic impacts associated with the export and import of construction materials to less-than-significant levels. (DEIR p. 3.15-50.)

Heavy equipment to be utilized onsite during construction include, but is not limited to: flat beds, dozers, scrapers, graders, track hoes, dump trucks, forklifts, cranes, cement trucks, pavers, rollers, water trucks, rolling container trucks and bobcats. Heavy equipment will be delivered and removed from the site throughout the construction phase. As most heavy equipment is typically not an authorized vehicle to be driven on a public roadway, most of the equipment will be delivered and removed from the site via large flatbed trucks. It is anticipated that delivery of heavy equipment would not occur on a daily basis, but rather periodically throughout the construction phase based on need. (DEIR p. 3.15-51.)

The delivery and removal of heavy equipment shall occur outside of the morning and evening peak hours in order to have nominal impacts to traffic and circulation near the vicinity of the Project. Consistency with this measure will reduce traffic impacts associated with the delivery and removal of heavy equipment to less-than-significant levels. (DEIR p. 3.15-51.)

Existing 2010 Plus Project

No changes to existing lane configurations and traffic controls have been assumed to be in place for existing plus Project traffic conditions. This scenario includes existing (2010) traffic volumes plus traffic generated by the proposed Project. (DEIR p. 3.15-51.)

Intersection Operations - Level of service calculations were conducted for the study intersections to evaluate their operations under existing plus Project conditions with roadway and intersection modifications. The results of the intersection level of service analysis are presented in Table 3.15-11 of the Draft EIR. (DEIR p. 3.15-51.)

As shown in Table 3.15-11, the study area intersections that are projected to not meet the City of Redlands level of service threshold of C or better have been denoted with bold text. It should be noted that the level of service threshold of C or better does not apply to the intersection of Boulder Street at Greenspot Road in the City of Highland. The level of service threshold for the City of Highland is LOS D or better. (DEIR p. 3.15-57.)

For existing plus Project traffic conditions, the following study area intersections are projected to operate at an unacceptable level of service during the peak hours: California Street/Redlands Boulevard (LOS D – Saturday peak hour); Alabama Street/Lugonia Avenue (LOS D – PM and Saturday peak hours); Alabama Street/I-10 Westbound Ramps (LOS D – Saturday peak hour); Alabama Street/Redlands Boulevard (LOS D – PM and Saturday peak hours); SR-210 Eastbound Ramps/San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours); SR-210 Westbound Ramps/San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – PM peak hour; LOS E – Saturday peak hour); Tennessee Street/Lugonia Avenue (LOS D – Saturday peak hour); Texas Street/Brockton Avenue (LOS D – Saturday peak hour); Church Street/San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours); Church Street/Lugonia Avenue (LOS E – PM peak hour). (DEIR p. 3.15-57.)

It should be noted that the intersections listed above are consistent with the locations that have been identified to be currently operating at unacceptable levels of service under existing traffic conditions, with the exception of the intersection of Alabama Street at the I-10 Westbound ramps. (DEIR p. 3.15-57.)

Freeway Mainline Operations - The existing plus Project freeway analysis assumes the existing mixed-flow lanes only and does not include any future mainline improvements. Segment analysis results for the weekday PM and Saturday peak hours are summarized on in Table 3.15-12 of the Draft EIR. As shown on in Table 3.15-12 of the Draft EIR, the following segment is anticipated to operate at unacceptable service levels for existing plus Project conditions: SR-210 Westbound, north of San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – Saturday peak hour). (DEIR pp. 3.15-57 to 3.15-59.)

Freeway Ramp Operations - Ramp merge and diverge operations were evaluated under existing plus Project conditions for the I-10/California Street (Saturday peak hour only), I-10/Alabama Street, SR-210 to/from I-10 Freeway, I-10/Tennessee Street and SR-210/San Bernardino Avenue interchanges, as presented in Table 3.15-13 in the Draft EIR. As also shown on Table 3.15-13, it is anticipated that the following ramp junctions along the SR-210 and I-10 Freeways would operate at unacceptable service levels for existing plus Project conditions: SR-210 Westbound, on-ramp at San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – Saturday peak hour); I-10 Eastbound, on-ramp from SR-210 Eastbound (LOS F – PM and LOS E Saturday peak hours). It should be noted that these ramp junction locations are currently operating deficiently under existing traffic conditions. (DEIR p. 3.15-59.)

Project Impacts, Proposed Mitigation and Improvement Strategies

The study area intersections found to be significantly impacted by the Project at which are shown in Table 3.15-14 in the Draft EIR. As shown on Table 3.15-14, five (5) intersections are projected to operate at level of service D or worse and are significantly impacted by the Project. They are as follows: Alabama Street/I-10 Westbound Ramps –Saturday peak hour only; SR-210 Eastbound Ramps/San Bernardino Avenue – PM and Saturday peak hours; SR-210 Westbound Ramps/San Bernardino Avenue – PM and Saturday peak hours; Church Street/San Bernardino Avenue – PM and Saturday peak hours; Church Street/Lugonia Avenue – PM peak hour only. (DEIR pp. 3.15-59 to 3.15-64.)

Mitigation measures have been identified to address LOS and delay at each affected intersection consistent with the applicable jurisdiction's LOS standards. Consistency with Mitigation Measures MM TRANS-1a through MM TRANS-1e will reduce impacts for Existing Plus Project Conditions to a level of less than significant. (DEIR p. 3.15-64.)

Opening Year 2013 - Based on discussions with City staff, there are no committed improvements that are currently planned to be in place by Opening Year 2013 traffic conditions. The results of the intersection LOS analysis for Opening Year 2013 are presented in Table 3.15-15 (including Existing 2010, Year 2013 Without Project and Year 2013 With Project). The study area intersections that are projected to not meet the City of Redlands LOS threshold of C or better have been denoted with bold text. It should be noted that the LOS threshold of C or better does not apply to the intersection of Boulder Street at Greenspot Road in the City of Highland. The LOS threshold for the City of Highland is LOS D or better. (DEIR p. 3.15-64.)

As can be seen within Table 3.15-15 of the Draft EIR, for 2013 Conditions Intersection Analysis, the following study area intersections are projected to operate at an unacceptable level of service during the peak hours (see Exhibit 3.15-7 for Year 2013 Without Project Peak Hour Intersection LOS): California Street/Redlands Boulevard (LOS D – Saturday peak hour); Alabama Street/Lugonia Avenue (LOS D – PM peak hour; LOS E – Saturday peak hour); Alabama Street/I-10 Westbound Ramps (LOS D – PM peak hour; LOS F – Saturday peak hour); Alabama Street/I-10 Eastbound Ramps (LOS D – PM peak hour; LOS F – Saturday peak hour); Alabama Street/Redlands Boulevard (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours); SR-210 Eastbound Ramps/San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours); SR-210 Westbound Ramps/San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours);

Tennessee Street/Lugonia Avenue (LOS D – PM and Saturday peak hours); Tennessee Street/I-10 Eastbound Ramps (LOS D – PM peak hour); Tennessee Street/Colton Avenue (LOS D – PM and Saturday peak hours); Tennessee Street/Redlands Boulevard (LOS D – PM peak hour); Texas Street/Brockton Avenue (LOS D – PM peak hour; LOS E – Saturday peak hour); Church Street/San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours); and Church Street/Lugonia Avenue (LOS F – PM peak hour). (DEIR p. 3.15-69.)

These study area intersections are anticipated to exceed LOS thresholds and thus have a significant cumulative impact due to traffic volumes generated by other reasonably foreseeable development projects in the area in conjunction with Project traffic. Measures to address cumulative impacts for Opening Year 2013 traffic conditions are discussed in Mitigation Measure MM TRANS 2 at the end of this Impact Analysis. As such, the Project is required to pay its fair share/DIF amount of the improvement costs of the impacted intersections to the City in order to mitigate the Project's traffic impacts. Additionally, as a condition of approval, Walmart will be required to make a fair share contribution into the existing County fee program to be directed towards those improvements.

After the City's DIF fees are collected, they are placed in a separate restricted use account pursuant to the requirements of Government Code sections 66000 et seq. The timing to use the DIF fees is established through periodic capital improvement programs which are overseen by the City's Municipal Utilities and Engineering Department. Periodic traffic counts, review of traffic accidents, and a review of traffic trends throughout the City are also periodically performed by City staff and consultants. The City uses this data to determine the timing of the improvements listed in its facilities list. The City also uses this data to ensure that the improvements listed on the facilities list are constructed before the LOS falls below the LOS performance standards adopted by the City. In this way, the improvements are constructed before the LOS falls below the City's LOS performance thresholds. The City's DIF program establishes a timeline to fund, design, and build the improvements. The Project applicant will be subject to the City's DIF fee program, and will pay the requisite City DIF fees at the rates then in effect pursuant to the City's ordinance. The payment of the requisite DIF fees then in effect pursuant to the DIF Program will mitigate its contribution to cumulative impacts to DIF-funded facilities.

Fair share improvements are typically satisfied through the payment of fees for improvements included in an established fee program, a financial contribution based upon rough order of magnitude costs as assigned by the approving jurisdiction, specific improvements that are significantly triggered by the project or a combination of these strategies. As shown in Table 7-5 of the Traffic Impacts Analysis, the proposed Project contributes to cumulative traffic impacts at twenty (20) intersections located within the City of Redlands or the County of San Bernardino. For facilities not covered by an existing fee program, the Project would contribute the associated intersection fair-share percentage toward the costs of the recommended improvements. Improvements included within the column labeled "Non-Program Improvements" do not appear to be in an established fee program. A fair share financial contribution based upon the Project's fair share impacts that are reasonably related to the traffic burdens caused by the Project will be imposed in order to mitigate the Project's share of impacts in lieu of construction. This fee is collected by the City and County, held in a separate reserve account in the jurisdiction's general fund, and used solely for the specific surface transportation improvements. The fair-share calculations provided in Appendix 7.11 of the Traffic Impacts Analysis shows that the proposed Project contributes between 2.0% and 37.6% of trips at the study area intersections. These project-related traffic increases provide the basis for the Project's fair share percentage contribution.

Although these intersections may be improved by time that the various improvements identified are needed to maintain acceptable LOS in support of the Project, there are many uncertainties related to the timing of the full funding and completion of such improvements including; payment of DIF fees/fair share payments by other development in the future, availability of non-DIF funding that may be available to the City in the future, and, for improvements located in County unincorporated areas, County decisions and funding availability for completing the necessary improvements.

Due to these uncertainties, timely construction of improvements needed to address cumulative impacts cannot be guaranteed. *Therefore, impacts in this regard will be significant and unavoidable and a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be developed.* (DEIR p. 3.15-69.)

Freeway Mainline Operations - Opening Year 2013 without and with Project mainline directional volumes for the PM and Saturday peak hours assumes the existing mixed-flow lanes only and do not include any future mainline improvements. Segment analysis results for the weekday PM and Saturday peak hours are summarized on Table 3.15-16 of the Draft EIR. (DEIR p. 3.15-69.)

As shown on Table 3.15-16, the following segment is anticipated to operate at unacceptable service levels for Opening Year 2013 without Project conditions: SR-210 Westbound, north of San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – Saturday peak hour). Consequently, impacts in this regard will be significant. However, for Opening Year 2013 with Project conditions, there are no additional segments along the SR-210 or I-10 Freeways anticipated to operate at unacceptable service levels. (DEIR p. 3.15-73.)

Freeway Ramp Operations - Ramp merge and diverge operations were evaluated under Opening Year 2013 conditions for the I-10/California Street (Saturday peak hour only), I-10/Alabama Street, SR-210 to/from I-10 Freeway, I-10/Tennessee Street and SR-210/San Bernardino Avenue interchanges, as presented in Table 3.15-17 of the Draft EIR. As also shown on Table 3.15-17, it is anticipated that the following ramp junctions along the SR-210 and I-10 Freeways would operate at unacceptable service levels for Opening Year 2013 without Project conditions: SR-210 Westbound, on-ramp at San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – Saturday peak hour); and I-10 Eastbound, on-ramp from SR-210 Eastbound (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours). (DEIR pp. 3.15-73 to 3.15-76.)

Consequently, impacts in this regard will be significant. However, for Opening Year 2013 with Project conditions, there are no additional ramp junctions along the SR-210 or I-10 Freeways anticipated to operate at unacceptable service levels. (DEIR p. 3.15-76.)

Mitigation measures have been identified at intersections that have been identified as cumulatively impacted to improve each location's peak hour delay and associated LOS grade to LOS C or better, consistent with the City of Redlands General Plan Policy 5.20. The effectiveness of the mitigation measures discussed below to address Opening Year 2013 cumulative traffic impacts are presented in Table 3.15-18. The Project shall participate in funding or construction of offsite improvements that are needed to serve cumulative traffic conditions through the payment of the City of Redlands Development Impact Fees (DIF) or on a fair share basis as directed by the City. The fees are collected as part of a funding mechanism aimed at ensuring that roadway network improvements keep pace with the projected population increases. Measures to address cumulative impacts for Opening Year 2013 cumulative traffic conditions are discussed in Mitigation Measure MM TRANS 2 at the end of this Impact Analysis. (DEIR p. 3.15-76.)

In addition, in consultation with Caltrans District 8 staff, planned future improvements to the SR-210 Freeway includes the construction of a mixed-flow lane and HOV lane in each direction and the future planned improvements to the I-10 Freeway include the construction of an HOV lane in each direction.

Caltrans does not have an estimated date of completion for these widening projects; however, it is anticipated that due to the existing need and volume of traffic utilizing the freeway, Caltrans would work diligently to complete the upgrades by Year 2030. (DEIR p. 3.15-76.)

As shown on Table 3.15-18 of the Draft EIR, the freeway segment and merge junctions are anticipated to operate at acceptable levels of service with the planned future improvements in place, with the exception of the I-10 Eastbound on-ramp merge junction from the SR-210 Freeway during the weekday PM peak hour. This location is anticipated to operate at LOS D operations. However, this merge junction is anticipated to experience capacity issues due to projected future SR-210 Eastbound on-ramp volumes, and as a result is anticipated to operate at LOS F. As this merge junction is a freeway-to-freeway interchange within Caltrans' jurisdiction, neither the Project nor the City the Redlands has the ability to improve this cumulative near-term impact. (DEIR p. 3.15-76.)

Horizon Year 2030 - LOS calculations were conducted for the study intersections to evaluate their operations under Horizon Year 2030 conditions with roadway and intersections and are shown in Table 3.15-19 of the Draft EIR. The study area intersections that are projected to not meet the City of Redlands LOS threshold of LOS C or better have been denoted with bold text. It should be noted that the LOS threshold of LOS C or better does not apply to the intersection of Boulder Street at Greenspot Road in the City of Highland. The LOS threshold for the City of Highland is LOS D or better. (DEIR p. 3.15-80.)

As can be seen within Table 3.15-19 of the Draft EIR, for Horizon Year 2030 without Project traffic conditions, the following study area intersections are projected to operate at an unacceptable LOS during the peak hours (see Exhibit 3.15-8 of the Draft EIR, for Year 2030 Without Project Peak Hour Intersection LOS): California Street/I-10 Westbound Ramps (LOS D – Saturday peak hour); California Street/Redlands Boulevard (LOS D – Saturday peak hour); Alabama Street/San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – PM peak hour); Alabama Street/Lugonia Avenue (LOS E – PM peak hour; LOS F – Saturday peak hour); Alabama Street/I-10 Westbound Ramps (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours); Alabama Street/I-10 Eastbound Ramps (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours); SR-210 Eastbound Ramps/San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours); SR-210 Westbound Ramps/San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours); Tennessee Street/Lugonia Avenue (LOS D – Saturday peak hour); Tennessee Street/I-10 Eastbound Ramps (LOS E – PM peak hour; LOS D – Saturday peak hour); Tennessee Street/Colton Avenue (LOS D – PM and Saturday peak hours); Tennessee Street/Redlands Boulevard (LOS D – PM peak hour); New York Street/Lugonia Avenue (LOS D – Saturday peak hour); Texas Street/Brockton Avenue (LOS E – PM and Saturday peak hours); Orange Street/Pioneer Avenue (LOS E – PM peak hour); Church Street/San Bernardino Avenue (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours); Church Street/Lugonia Avenue (LOS F – PM peak hour); University Street/San Bernardino Avenue (LOS D – PM peak hour); Judson Street/San Bernardino Avenue (LOS D – PM peak hour). (DEIR p. 3.15-85.)

As shown on Table 3.15-19 of the Draft EIR, there are no additional intersections anticipated to operate at unacceptable levels of service with the addition of Project traffic, with the exception of the intersection of Tennessee Street/Lugonia Avenue (#17) during the weekday PM peak hour. Although the intersection of Tennessee Street/Lugonia Avenue is projected to operate unacceptably during the Saturday peak hour (as listed above), the intersection is projected to operate at acceptable levels of service during the weekday PM peak hour without the Project. However, the addition of Project traffic is anticipated to result in unacceptable operations during the PM peak hour (i.e., LOS D). (DEIR p. 3.15-85.)

It is anticipated that the addition of Project traffic would result in an increase in delay of less than two seconds and the projected delay at the intersection of Tennessee Street/Lugonia Avenue is 34.0 seconds (one second below LOS D) without the Project. (DEIR p. 3.15-86.)

Measures to address cumulative traffic impacts for Horizon Year 2030 traffic conditions are discussed at the end of this Impact Assessment under Mitigation Measure TRANS 2. The Project is required to pay its fair share/DIF amount of the improvement costs of the impacted intersections to mitigate the Project's traffic impacts. Both the City of Redlands and the County of San Bernardino have DIF programs to fund identified improvements. As discussed previously, for facilities and improvements not covered by an existing fee program, the Project would contribute the associated intersection fair-share percentage toward the costs of the recommended improvements to the appropriate agencies as directed by the impacted jurisdiction. Although these intersections may be improved by time that the various improvements identified are needed to maintain acceptable LOS in support of the Project, there are many uncertainties related to the timing of the full funding and completion of such improvements including; payment of DIF fees/fair share payments by other development in the future, availability of non-DIF funding that may be available to the City in the future, and, for improvements located in County unincorporated areas, County decisions and funding availability for completing the necessary improvements. Due to these uncertainties, timely construction of improvements needed to address cumulative impacts cannot be guaranteed. *Therefore, impacts in this regard will be significant and unavoidable and a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be developed*. (DEIR p. 3.15-86.)

Freeway Mainline Operations - Based on consultation with Caltrans District 8 staff, the Horizon Year 2030 freeway analysis assumes the following planned future improvements: SR-210 Freeway: the addition of one (1) mixed-flow lane and one (1) HOV lane in each direction; and I-10 Freeway: the addition of one (1) HOV lane in each direction. Segment analysis results for the weekday PM and Saturday peak hours are summarized on Table 3.15-20 of the Draft EIR. (DEIR p. 3.15-86.)

As shown on Table 3.15-20, the following segment is anticipated to operate at unacceptable service levels for both Horizon Year 2030 without and with Project traffic conditions, with the planned future improvements described above in place: I-10 Westbound, west of California Street (LOS F – Saturday peak hour). Therefore, impacts to the I-10 Westbound, west of California Street segment will be potentially significant. (DEIR p. 3.15-90.)

Freeway Ramp Operations - Ramp merge and diverge operations were evaluated under both Horizon Year 2030 without and with traffic conditions for the I-10/California Street (Saturday peak hour only), I-10/Alabama Street, SR-210 to/from I-10 Freeway, I-10/Tennessee Street and SR-210/San Bernardino Avenue interchanges, as presented in Table 3.15-21 of the Draft EIR. (DEIR p. 3.15-90.)

As shown on Table 3.15-21 it is anticipated that the following ramp junctions along the SR-210 and I-10 Freeways would operate at unacceptable service levels under Horizon Year 2030 without Project conditions: I-10 Eastbound, on-ramp from SR-210 Eastbound (LOS F – PM and Saturday peak hours); and I-10 Westbound, on-ramp at California Street (LOS F – Saturday peak hour). (DEIR p. 3.15-94.)

In addition, as shown on Table 3.15-21 of the Draft EIR, there are no additional ramp merge and diverge junctions anticipated to operate at unacceptable levels of service with the addition of project traffic, with the exception of the SR-210 Westbound on-ramp at San Bernardino Avenue and the I-10 Eastbound off-ramp to the SR-210 Westbound (upstream only). It should be noted that the I-10 Eastbound off-ramp to the SR-210 Westbound is a freeway-to-freeway diverge junction and is anticipated to operate at LOS F due to the addition of background growth and cumulative traffic in conjunction with Project traffic. (DEIR p. 3.15-94.)

Horizon Year 2030 Mitigation and Improvement Strategies

Mitigation strategies have been recommended at intersections that have been identified as cumulatively impacted to improve each affected intersection's peak hour operations to LOS C or better, consistent with the City of Redlands General Plan Policy 5.20. The effectiveness of the recommended mitigation measures to address Horizon Year 2030 cumulative traffic impacts are presented in Table 3.15-22 of the Draft EIR. It should be noted that the improvements recommended below are consistent with the future planned roadway cross-sections and the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan, where applicable. (DEIR p. 3.15-94.)

As can be seen within Table 3.15-22 of the Draft EIR, implementation of recommended mitigation measures will reduce direct Project impacts to intersections anticipated to operate at unacceptable levels of service to a level of less than significant*; however, cumulative impacts will remain significant and unavoidable due to the uncertain timing of the completion of improvements*. (DEIR p. 3.15-99.)

It is not within the jurisdictional authority or purview of the lead agency or developer to adopt, implement, or enforce mitigation measures requiring the construction of improvements by Caltrans, or upon facilities within Caltrans' jurisdiction. As such, there are no further mitigation measures that will reduce cumulative mainline freeway impacts below significance thresholds. Traditional funding mechanisms used to improve mainline freeways include Measure I retail sales tax revenue for transportation, state and federal gas tax, and formula distributions from vehicle registration fees. Future patrons of the Project contribute indirectly to freeway improvements through these sources. *Therefore, impacts in this regard will remain significant and unavoidable*. (DEIR p. 3.15-99.)

The Project applicant will participate in the funding and construction of offsite improvements, including traffic signals that are needed to serve cumulative traffic conditions through the payment of City of Redlands Development Impact Fees (DIF) or through a fair share contribution as directed by the City. Both the City of Redlands and the County of San Bernardino have DIF programs to fund identified improvements. As discussed previously, for facilities and improvements not covered by an existing fee program, the Project would contribute the associated intersection fair-share percentage toward the costs of the recommended improvements to the appropriate agencies as directed by the impacted jurisdiction. These fees are collected as part of a funding mechanism aimed at ensuring that regional highways and arterial expansions keep pace with the projected population increases. See Table 3.15-23 of the Draft EIR for a summary of transportation impact fee program improvements for Horizon Year 2030 conditions. (DEIR p. 3.15-99.)

The improvements listed in Table 3.15-22 are comprised of lane additions, installation of signals and signal modifications. Lane additions are shown as the number of lanes required and the direction of travel, for example, 1.EBT indicates one additional eastbound through lane. Depending on the width of the existing pavement and right-of-way, these improvements may involve only striping modifications or they may involve construction of additional pavement width. As set forth in Table 3.15-22, several of the facilities forecast to be impacted under cumulative conditions are already planned for improvements through the City of Redlands DIF Program. The Project applicant will be subject to the City's DIF fee program, and will pay the requisite City DIF fees at the rates then in effect pursuant to the City's ordinance. The payment of the requisite DIF fees then in effect pursuant to the DIF Program will mitigate its contribution to cumulative impacts to DIF-funded facilities. (DEIR p. 3.15-103.)

As previously discussed and as shown in Table 3.15-22 of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project contributes to cumulative traffic impacts at twenty (20) intersections located within the City of Redlands or "Redlands Sphere" of the County of San Bernardino. For facilities not covered by an existing fee

program, the Project would contribute the associated intersection fair-share percentage toward the costs of the recommended improvements. (DEIR p. 3.15-103.)

There are no additional ramp merge and diverge junctions anticipated to operate at unacceptable levels of service with the addition of Project traffic, with the exception of the SR-210 Westbound on-ramp at San Bernardino Avenue and the I-10 Eastbound off-ramp to the SR-210 Westbound (upstream only). It should be noted that the I-10 Eastbound off-ramp to the SR-210 Westbound is a freeway-to-freeway diverge junction and is anticipated to operate at LOS F due to the addition of background growth and cumulative traffic in conjunction with Project traffic. (DEIR p. 3.15-112.)

With respect to the significant impacts to the State facilities (mainline and ramp junctions) at the 2030 time horizon, no further mitigation measures or improvements are feasible. The I-10 Freeway and SR-210 Freeway would operate at LOS F even without the Project under Horizon Year 2030 traffic conditions. The Project's contribution to cumulative impacts under 2030 conditions is relatively minor, involving only a small percentage of the forecast traffic occurring on the identified segments at Horizon Year 2030 traffic conditions. Because the City has no control over State facilities, and because the State facilities funded and planned to be developed under 2030 conditions are already anticipated to operate at LOS E and F even without the Project, there are no further mitigation measures that can be imposed upon the Project to mitigate its small cumulative contribution to significant impacts to the identified segments of SR-210 Freeway and I-10 Freeway under 2030 conditions. Caltrans has exclusive control over State highway improvements and State highway improvements are by and large a matter of statewide control. Thus, for the aforementioned reasons there are no available and feasible mitigation measures available to mitigate the Project's minor cumulative contribution to traffic on the SR-210 and I-10 Freeways under Horizon Year 2030 traffic conditions. *Therefore, impacts in this regard will be significant and unavoidable and a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be developed for the deficient Caltrans facilities*. (DEIR pp. 3.15-112 to 3.15-113.)

Mitigation for the cumulative transportation impacts the Project will have on intersections is provided under Mitigation Measure TRANS 2 above. As previously detailed, the Project is required to pay its fair share/DIF amount of the improvement costs of the impacted intersections to mitigate the Project's traffic impacts in both the City and County (See Table 3.15-23 for a summary of transportation impact fee program improvements for Horizon Year 2030 conditions). Although these intersections may be improved by time that the various improvements identified are needed to maintain acceptable LOS in support of the Project, there are many uncertainties related to the timing of the full funding and completion of such improvements including; payment of DIF fees/fair share payments by other development in the future, availability of non-DIF funding that may be available to the City in the future, and, for improvements located in County unincorporated areas, County decisions and funding availability for completing the necessary improvements. Due to these uncertainties, timely construction of improvements needed to address cumulative impacts cannot be guaranteed. *Therefore, impacts in this regard will be significant and unavoidable and a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be developed.* (DEIR p. 3.15-113.)

The Project and associated traffic impact reports and evaluations completed a thorough review of all feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the operational impacts to the greatest extent and would ensure the traffic impacts operate at appropriate levels of service. Regardless, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable due to the inability to ensure the identified improvements are completed in a timely manner in order to offset the traffic impacts as they may occur in the future. Additional mitigation measures considered were found to be infeasible or it was determined the mitigation would not solve this uncertainty in regards to timing. Furthermore, a majority of these impacts will occur

regardless of project implementation. Therefore, while it is anticipated that all future improvements will be completed and the identified intersections and roadway segments would operate at an appropriate level of service once the improvements are completed, impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

D. Cumulative Impacts

The Cumulative Impact section of the Findings include all of the listed impact categories associated with the proposed Project. The discussion includes both discussions of impacts determined to be less than significant as well as impacts that are only less than significant with mitigation incorporated. There are no significant and unavoidable impacts for the cumulative impact section.

For purposes of the proposed Redlands Crossings Project, criteria No. 1 as discussed within the EIR was considered to identify the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions or projects that could, when combined with the proposed Project, result in cumulative impacts to the physical environment. Table 4-1 in the Draft EIR identifies approved and pending projects that are in the Project vicinity that will be considered in the scope of this cumulative analysis. The cumulative development projects included in this analysis were provided within the Traffic Impact Analysis conducted for this Project. The cumulative development projects included in the analysis were provided by City of Redlands staff. Projects outside of the City of Redlands city limits have also been obtained from the County of San Bernardino, City of Highland and City of Loma Linda to include the future projects proposed within the study area, including the "Donut Hole" region. (DEIR p. 4-2.)

1. Aesthetics

The geographic scope of the cumulative aesthetics, light, and glare analysis is the area surrounding the Project site. This is the area within view of the Project; therefore, the area most likely to experience changes in visual character or experience light and glare impacts. As shown in Table 4-1, there are several development projects in the Project vicinity (e.g., Cumulative Numbers 11, 13, 36, etc.) that have the potential to alter the visual character of the area. These projects would be subject to design and landscaping requirements to ensure that they do not degrade visual character and comply with applicable General Plan and Zoning Ordinance standards. (DEIR p. 4-6.)

The design guidelines the City has adopted in its General Plan address various land use classifications within the City, including commercial development located within the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan (on which the Project site and area is located). The East Valley Corridor Specific Plan (EVCSP) is consistent with the land use map and land use element of the General Plan; however, the standards of development established by the general provisions, community design, overlay districts, and community facility sections of the EVCSP are covered in the Specific Plan and are not expressly part of the General Plan. The EVSP address building scale, setbacks, parking, landscaping, signs, and lighting, and are designed to encompass a large geographic area, and ensures that projects within this area aesthetically integrate with the character of the adjacent neighborhood. The EVSP's design guidelines therefore contemplate an evaluation of how the Project would integrate with existing and future development that would occur over a broad area. At the same time, the purpose of the City's zoning ordinances is to protect the character of all areas of the City and encourage the orderly and beneficial development of the City. This includes ensuring that projects are compatible with the aesthetic quality and character of the adjacent neighborhood. Therefore, the governing land use regulations would ensure that the proposed Project, in conjunction with other planned or approved projects, would not have cumulatively considerable aesthetic impacts. (DEIR p. 4-6.)

The proposed Project has the potential to introduce new sources of light and glare, but mitigation is proposed requiring that fixtures be shielded, recessed, or directed downward to prevent spillage onto neighboring properties. Consequently, the amount of light spillage onto neighboring roads would be extremely insignificant, and the existing streetlights are brighter than the light halos of Project and thus would render any contribution to be indiscernible. To some extent, other City requirements, such as those pertaining to landscaping, would further reduce impacts. As such, given the small amount of spillover and intervening landscaping, the proposed Project would not have the potential to have a cumulative contribution to a light and glare impact. (DEIR p. 4-6.)

2. Agricultural Resources

The "universe" for agricultural resource impacts is the current agricultural land uses within the City of Redlands. Projects within Table 4-1 are included in the "universe." The proposed Project has not been used for agricultural operations in the recent past (i.e., at least eight years), however, it may have been used for some type of agriculture before that time. According to state resource maps, the site contains Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance. However, due to the significant duration of absence of agricultural production (i.e. over eight years) at the Project site, impacts to Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance are considered less than significant. (DEIR p. 4-7.)

In addition, the City of Redlands General Plan proposes to preserve approximately 500 acres of citrus in agricultural lands of Prime Agricultural Land, Unique Agricultural Land, and Agricultural Lands of Statewide Importance. The Project site is not designated within the City of Redlands General Plan as an area preserved for agricultural lands. Consequently, development of the Project site will be not cumulatively considerable impacts on agriculture. (DEIR p. 4-7.)

3. Air Quality

The "universe" for this issue is the South Coast Air Basin, as that is the area in which air pollutants circulate and are at times trapped. Cumulative Air Quality Impacts are addressed in Section 3.3 of this EIR, specifically under Impact AIR-3. Analysis in this section of the EIR determined the Project would result in a cumulatively significant impact during operation because of the exceedances of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD's) regional emission thresholds for VOC, NO_x, PM_{10}, and CO. During construction, before mitigation, emissions of VOC and NOx would exceed the regional significance thresholds. (DEIR p. 4-7.)

Regarding toxic air contaminants, the health risk assessment summarized in Impact AIR-4 in Section 3.3 of the EIR indicates that the incremental increase in cancer risk at the nearby sensitive receptors (0.8 in one million) is below the SCAQMD's cancer threshold of 10 in one million. The SCAQMD does not have a cumulative risk threshold. As discussed in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report, the South Coast Air Basin has many sources of toxic air contaminants, which results in an overall cancer risk over 10 in one million throughout the Basin. The Project's minor increase in cancer risk at the sensitive receptors would not result in a significant cumulative risk because the emissions are minor and because the concentrations would be below the individual cancer risk threshold. (DEIR pp. 4-7 to 4-8.)

See Mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-12 as discussed under the Air Quality sections of the Findings. The Project would result in a cumulatively significant impact even after mitigation by exceedances of the SCAQMD's regional emission thresholds during operation for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM10. This cumulative impact could result in cumulative health effects from exposure to ozone, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts during construction to less than significant. (DEIR p. 4-8.)

4. Biological Resources

The "universe" for this issue is the general Project area, but any potential impacts must be viewed in the context of available natural areas/habitat, and any planned regional habitat preservation programs such as the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) for Western Riverside County. San Bernardino County has not yet developed a similar type MSHCP for this portion of the County. The general area contains a number of vacant upland areas to the north and east that contain native vegetation. In addition, the Santa Ana River is located one mile north of the Project site. The "universe" area contains significant regional biological resources. Continued development in this portion of the City, mainly commercially zoned areas to the north and southeast, may cause cumulative impacts to local flora and fauna. Impacts may cause an incremental loss of native vegetation and habitat from encroachment along the Santa Ana River, and by the contribution of additional sediments and other urban pollutants into the river from local runoff. From impacts, local wildlife will have less resource areas to use, although much of the land already supports development. In contrast, the Project site and surrounding area have been largely impacted by industry (i.e. agricultural uses) and human activity, so their loss does not represent a regional or cumulative impact to plants or wildlife. (DEIR p. 4-8.)

Development projects in the Project vicinity would be contiguous to existing development. Of the potentially impacted species at the Project site, including the Burrowing Owl, (*Athene cunicularia*) (BUOW) and nesting birds, the focused surveys conducted at the Project site did not detect any occurrences of the species (see Section 3.4, Biological Resources). Note that the Project site was previously used for agricultural uses, which involved regular disking and tilling of the soil. As such, the Project site is in a disturbed state, which limits the potential for special-status species to be present on-site. Still, the other cumulative projects may contain nesting and foraging habitat for the above species, and so the potential to result in a loss of individual specimens and the loss of species habitat. (DEIR p. 4-8.)

The loss of individual specimens would most likely occur as a result of construction activities. To the extent there is potential for cumulative project's to result in a loss of individual specimens and the loss of species habitat, mitigation measures in the form of pre-construction surveys can be proposed to reduce potential impacts on these species to a less than significant level. Future development projects would be required to mitigate for impacts on special-status species in a manner similar to the Project. Given there is only a low to moderate likelihood of encountering the above-listed species, the disturbed nature of the Project site, and the comprehensive nature of the construction mitigation programs, cumulative impacts to special-status species would be less than significant. (DEIR pp. 4-8 to 4-9.)

With regard to the loss of habitat, the Project impact was deemed less than significant owing to the fact that it formerly was used for agricultural production. The Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to any cumulative impact because of this reason, and because it sits on the edge of an urbanized area and adjacent to Tennessee Street and SR-210 Freeway, a major thoroughfare in the City. Thus, given the level of existing development in the area, and the relatively small likelihood of these species frequenting the vicinity of the Project and the nearby probable future projects, there would not be a cumulatively significant impact and sits at the edge of an urbanized area. (DEIR p. 4-9.)

5. Cultural Resources

The geographic scope of the cumulative cultural resources analysis is the Project vicinity, which includes projects located within Table 4-1, above. Cultural resource impacts tend to be localized because the integrity of any given resource depends on what occurs only in the immediate vicinity around that resource, such as disruption of soils; therefore, in addition to the Project site itself, the area near the Project site would be the area most affected by Project activities (i.e., generally within a 500-

foot radius). Construction activities associated with development projects in the Project vicinity may have the potential to encounter undiscovered cultural resources. These projects would be required to mitigate for impacts through compliance with applicable federal and state laws governing cultural resources. Even if a significant cumulative impact could be found, the Project would not make a cumulatively considerable impact. The Project site was previously used for agricultural uses, which involved regular disking and tilling of the soil. As such, the Project site is in a disturbed state, which limits the potential for undiscovered resources to be encountered. (DEIR p. 4-9.)

The Phase I Cultural Resource Survey indicated that three known historical cultural resources are located within the Project site and 15 sites are located within one mile of the Project area boundary. Thus, Phase II testing was carried out for each of the individual sites. Phase II testing at the Project site indicated that none of the sites meets any of the significant criteria established by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 to be considered "unique historic properties" (MBA 2009b). One new cultural resource site (P#36-013622) was identified during Phase II Survey. However, recordation of the feature exhausted the data set associated with this historic cultural resources, thereby mitigating for impacts if the site is altered or destroyed by construction. (DEIR pp. 4-9 to 4-10.)

The Cultural Resource Survey (MBA 2009b) indicated the Project site is located within a moderately sensitive cultural resource area. Therefore, mitigation measures CR-1a through CR-1c were recommended to reduce the potential significant cultural resource impact to less than significant level. Although there is the possibility that previously undiscovered resources could be encountered by subsurface earthwork activities, the implementation of standard construction mitigation measures would ensure that undiscovered cultural resources are not adversely affected by project-related construction activities, which would prevent the destruction or degradation of potentially significant cultural resources in the Project vicinity. Given the low potential for disruption, and the comprehensiveness of mitigation measures that would apply to this Project and those in the vicinity, the residual, insignificant impacts of the projects would not combine to make a significant cumulative impact and, even if the combine impact was significant owing to substantial resources on a different project site, the Project would fail to make a cumulatively considerable contribution given previous disruptions to its ground and the lack of any significant resource within its boundaries. (DEIR p. 4-10.)

6. Geology and Soils

The "universe" for this issue is development in the City of Redlands and western San Bernardino County, within the larger context of Southern California due to regional seismicity. Development projects in the Project vicinity may have the potential to be exposed to seismic hazards. However, there is a less than significant potential of the projects in combination to expose people or structure to substantial adverse affects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death in the event of a major earthquake, fault rupture, groundshaking, seismic related ground failure, landslide, or liquefaction. There are no active or potentially active faults in the Project area and, though the Project site might be exposed to strong ground shaking during an earthquake from faults that lie further afield, continued construction of buildings and other structures to current development codes would minimize the potential for severe damage and loss of life. Seismic design criteria account for peak ground acceleration, soil profile, and other site conditions, and they establish corresponding design standards intended primarily to protect public safety and secondly to minimize property damage. (DEIR p. 4-10.)

Regarding liquefaction and soil stability, the topography of the Project site and the sites of the projects listed in Table 4-1 is relatively flat. At the same time, there is only a remote possibility that disruption of soils at one site would increase the risk of liquefaction and soil stability at another site, as soil stability is largely unaffected by instability at another site, especially in cases where there exist

intervening roads between sites, as is the case for adjacent Tennessee Street and San Bernardino Avenue. Thus, there is little potential of projects to cumulate in this regard, and so a less-than-significant cumulative impact would result. (DEIR p. 4-11.)

Regarding soil erosion, groundbreaking that could lead to increased erosion rates on-site soils, which in turn could cause unstable ground surfaces and increased sedimentation in nearby streams and drainage channels. However, Project construction activities would implement standard stormwater pollution prevention mitigation measures to ensure that earthwork activities do not result in substantial erosion off-site. This mitigation, in turn, would have to comply with the NPDES stormwater permitting program, which regulates water quality originating from construction sites. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program, which governs projects statewide (and nationwide), requires the preparation and implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Programs for construction activities that disturb more than one acre, and implement Best Management Practices (BMP) that ensure the reduction of pollutants during stormwater discharges, as well as compliance with all applicable water quality requirements. Thus, given the Project and nearby projects would have to comply with federal and state regulations that are designed to minimize impacts to projects on a wide geographic scale, this Project would make no cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impact. (DEIR p. 4-11.)

7. Greenhouse Gasses

The universe for this issue is the planet Earth. By its nature, climate change is a global and cumulative issue, as greenhouse gases combine with other greenhouse gases and this increase is believed to result in climate change. As discussed in Section 3.17, the Project would emit greenhouse gases during construction and operation. These emissions are potentially significant without the implementation of State regulation, Project design features, and mitigation measures. (DEIR p. 4-11.)

See Mitigation Measures GHG-1, AQ-5, AQ-7, AQ-8, AQ-9, AQ-10, AQ-11, HYD-2a, HYD-2b, and TRANS-6a as discussed under the Air Quality, Greenhouse Gasses, Hydrology, and Transportation sections.

8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The "universe" for this issue is the Project area but within a context of western San Bernardino County, and the northern portion of the City of Redlands in terms of transport of hazardous materials. As development of the identified Commercial project occurs, the area will experience an increase in the use of hazardous materials (i.e. automotive fluids, brake dust, oil, etc.). Growth may also increase the amount of these hazardous materials in the area, which may be especially destructive to natural waterways such as the Santa Ana River. However, it is expected that these materials will be handled, transported, and disposed of properly, according to existing City and State regulations. (DEIR p. 4-12.)

Furthermore, two freeways, the SR-210 (approximately 170 feet west) and Interstate 10 (I-10) Freeway (approximately 0.6 mile south), serve the area, both of which can provide routes for evacuation out of the area in all directions. If the area were to experience a major disaster (e.g., major flood, fire, or earthquake), evacuation of several thousand residents and employees via the current road system would probably take several hours, which is marginal even assuming there is adequate warning. Based on available information, evacuation routes for this area appear to be adequate for planned growth, so the Project will not create any cumulatively considerable impacts related to hazards. Therefore, no mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 4-12.)

9. Hydrology and Water Quality

The larger "universe" for this issue is Southern California, which is largely dependent on imported water to support existing development and planned growth. By comparison, the local universe for these impacts is the water service areas of the City of Redlands and other providers within the west San Bernardino County. In terms of construction, implementation of all the projects would require grading and construction. While potential to degrade water quality exists, the projects would have to comply with the NPDES stormwater permitting program, which regulates water quality originating from construction sites. The NPDES program requires the preparation and implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Programs for construction activities that disturb more than one acre, and implement Best Management Practices that ensure the reduction of pollutants during stormwater discharges, as well as compliance with all applicable water quality requirements. (DEIR p. 4-12.)

From an operational standpoint, the Project, in combination with other planned and approved projects, would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements because it would implement the pollution prevention measures listed in Mitigation Measure HYD-1a and HYD-1b. The Project, in combination with other planned and approved projects, would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. While the Project includes installation of a new drainage system, the new facilities would be designed to handle erosion and siltation efficiently and to the satisfaction of the City of Redlands Municipal Utilities and Engineering Department. Thus, the Project would make no cumulatively considerable contribution to any cumulative impact. (DEIR p. 4-13.)

The Project, in combination with other planned and approved projects, would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. The majority of water, over 40 percent delivered to the City in 2007, was from groundwater sources pumping from the Bunker Hill groundwater basin (CRCCR 2008). To facilitate groundwater recharge, the permeable areas on-site have been maximized through site design considerations, including vegetated swales, a nutrient separating baffle box and inlet inserts before discharging into one of five infiltration basins. The design feature allows the majority of drainage from impervious surface to permeable areas for on-site infiltration. One surface level infiltration basin and four (4) underground infiltration basins have been incorporated into the site plan to maximize on-site infiltration. In addition, various BMPs have been incorporated in the Project design (AE 2007). Implementation of the BMPs as described in the Preliminary WQMP will improve the groundwater recharge in the local aquifer. Since the Project will not deplete groundwater in the local area and is not expected to lower the groundwater recharge rate to any measurable degree, impacts will be less than significant. Nonetheless, long-term water supply is a significant concern in California, and the Project can reduce its demand on water supply through the implementation of water conservation measures. Mitigation is proposed that would require the Project applicant to implement outdoor irrigation and indoor domestic water conservation measures and practices. These measures would reduce overall Project demand for potable water and ensure that long-term water supply impacts are less than significant. (DEIR p. 4-13.)

Development projects in the Project vicinity may have the potential to increase impervious surface coverage and, therefore, may result in increased runoff volumes in downstream waterways. These projects would be required to provide drainage facilities that collect and detain runoff such that off-site releases are controlled and do not create flooding. The Project would install an on-site storm drainage system consisting of inlets and piping. The Project drainage plan allows the majority of drainage from impervious surface to permeable areas for on-site infiltration. One surface level infiltration basin and four (4) underground infiltration basins have been incorporated into the site plan to reduce the runoff water (AE 2007). In addition, the drainage report indicates that the proposed drainage system (pond,

sediment pond and underground systems) will control the total peak flow volume of runoff to level similar to the pre-development runoff levels. With the installation of these improvements, project-level drainage impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant; therefore, no cumulative contribution would occur. (DEIR pp. 4-13 to 4-14.)

Development projects in the Project vicinity may have the potential to increase impervious surface coverage and, therefore, may result in increased runoff volumes in downstream waterways. Applicants for these projects would be required (as would the applicant for the Project) to provide stormwater quality management plans to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits for the Project. Each plan must include the various control measures that will be in effect during Project operations to ensure that water quality in downstream water bodies is not degraded. Compliance with the aforementioned federal and State and local requirements will avoid significant adverse cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts in the Project area. (DEIR p. 4-14.)

10. Land Use and Planning

The potential "universe" for this issue ranges from the local Project area (i.e., the City of Redlands) to the western portion of San Bernardino County. Development of the area will eventually modify hundreds of acres of vacant land into additional commercial uses and suburban-type neighborhoods. The Project has existing residential uses to the east and southeast, with new residential uses being developed approximately 0.60 miles northeast of the site (Beaver Homes). Additionally, existing commercial uses (i.e. Citrus Plaza and Homes Depot Center) are to the east and south of the Project site. This and other planned development projects will eventually change the fundamental character of the area. However, the City of Redlands's General Plan has anticipated this type of change. (DEIR p. 4-14.)

On a broader scale, countywide growth will add tens of thousands of new homes, residents, businesses, and jobs in the future. This growth is not expected to have cumulatively considerable impacts related to land use and planning, as long as it occurs according to the City of Redlands General Plan. The Project site is zoned for commercial uses and is consistent with the General Plan. Due to the size of the Project, the Project is expected to create substantial contribution to new jobs, and will also help meet at least one of the City of Redlands General Plan job goals. The Project area already supports a wide variety and density of land uses, and the implementation of commercial uses is not expected to be cumulatively considerable in terms of land use impacts. Therefore, implementation of the Project will be consistent with the City's General Plan and will not make a significant contribution to cumulatively considerable land use impacts. Furthermore, as long as growth continues according to established plans, no cumulatively considerable impacts to land use and planning will occur. Because the Project would not result in a significant impact with respect to mineral resources, it would not contribute to cumulatively considerable regional impacts to mineral resources. These other impacts have separate regional mitigation programs that will be presented in each section. (DEIR pp. 4-14 to 4-15.)

11. Mineral Resources

The "universe" for this issue is the general Project area (City of Redlands), but any potential impacts must be viewed in the context of available mineral resources within San Bernardino County, and the City of Redlands. As development increase in the City of Redlands, greater demand will be placed on mineral resources, especially sand and gravel from areas along local drainages, including the Santa Ana River watershed, north of the Project site. Data from the State indicates the Project site is within an MRZ-2 classification. As outlined within Section 3.1 (Mineral Resources) although the Project site contains significant aggregate resources, the Mentone Dam places flood control within the Project area, also known as Sector F, and puts a question on the future availability of much of the resource in this

area. The MRZ-2 area designated as "F" is so large that putting the Project site to use as commercial development will not result in the loss of availability of any resource or access to that resource. In addition, due to the water table and clay layers of this area, much of the younger sediments are not economical to mine for sand and gravel. Finally, as identified within Policy 7.42c of the City of Redlands General Plan, The city will reserve designated MRZ areas outside the Santa Ana Wash for agricultural or urban use. The Project is located outside of the Santa Ana Wash and will be consistent with designated land uses at the Project site (CP-4). Therefore, the City's General Plan designation and zoning classification do not permit mining activities on the Project site and development of the Project will not create cumulatively considerable regional impacts to mineral resources. (DEIR p. 4-15.)

12. Noise

The "universe" for this issue is the City of Redlands, including the I-10 Freeway corridor. Noise impacts tend to be localized because ambient noise generally tends to dissipate within 0.25 mile, and existing noise from roadways tends to have a canceling effect on noise emanating from a project site; that is, the logarithmic properties of noise and distance usually mean there are no additive effects. Therefore, the area near the Project site (i.e., generally 0.25 mile) would be the area most affected by Project activities. (DEIR pp. 4-15 to 4-16.)

Construction activities associated with the Project would result in substantial sources of noise. As discussed in Section 3.11, Noise, the construction activities for Project would exceed the noise thresholds for certain receivers. Mitigation is proposed that would require the contractor implement various sound control measures including limitation of construction hours, using noise attenuation devices on heavy equipment, and the use of a minimum 10-foot-high construction noise barrier along the perimeter of the Project site within 300 feet of any residences. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. (DEIR p. 4-16.)

The timing of construction activities associated with other development projects would overlap minimally, if at all, with the Project. Furthermore, because noise is a highly localized phenomenon, even if construction activities did overlap in time with the Project, the intervening distance and roadway noise would diminish any additive effects. Construction activities at these other planned and approved projects would be required to take place during daytime hours, and the City and project applicants would be required to evaluate construction noise impacts and implement mitigation, if necessary, to minimize noise impacts. Given these distances and the intervening structures and vegetation, no significant cumulative construction noise impact would be expected. In addition, as outlined within Section 3.11, Noise, cumulative noise impacts were analyzed for Year 2030. The results shown below in Section 3.11 shows that for the year 2030 weekday and Saturday conditions, noise level contributions from the proposed Project onto the nearby roadways would range from 0.0 to 0.7 dBA CNEL. A 0.7 dBA noise increase would be below the thresholds established within the Section 8.06.070 of the City of Redlands Municipal Code. Therefore, for the year 2030 weekday and Saturday conditions, it is reasonable to conclude that construction noise from the Project would not combine with noise from other development projects to cause cumulatively considerable noise impacts. The average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day was obtained by adding 10 decibels to the hourly noise levels measured during the night (from 10 pm to 7 am). In this way, Ldn takes into account the lower tolerance of people for noise during nighttime periods. (DEIR p. 4-16.)

The Project's construction and operational vibration levels would not exceed annoyance thresholds. Because vibration propagates in waves through the soil, multiple pieces of equipment operating simultaneously would each produce vibration waves in different phases that typically would not increase the magnitude of the vibration. Furthermore, vibration is a highly localized phenomenon, and tends to

dissipate to insignificant levels within dozens of feet, as explained in Section 3.11, Noise; thus, there would be no possibility for vibration associated with the Project to combine with vibration from other projects because of their distances from the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable vibration impact. (DEIR p. 4-16.)

In addition, as shown in Impact NOI-3 in Section 3.11, Noise evaluated the combined stationary and transportation noise levels under existing conditions. The increase in noise levels from the Project would be the greatest when compared against the existing condition, since the without Project noise levels are lower than the year 2013 and 2030 conditions. Noise levels would not exceed 60 dBA CNEL at nearby sensitive receptors, the standard for normally acceptable noise levels. Therefore, the combined stationary and transportation noise impacts from the ongoing operations of the Project would be less than significant. In addition, other planned and approved projects would be required to mitigate for stationary- and transportation-related noise impacts at nearby sensitive receptors. Moreover, stationary noise and transportation noise are localized phenomena, and there is a very limited potential for other projects to contribute to cumulative noise impacts, beyond the transportation-related noise that is already analyzed above and found not to be cumulatively significant. As such, the Project, in conjunction with other projects, would not cause a cumulatively considerable, permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity. (DEIR pp. 4-16 to 4-17.)

13. Population and Housing

On the local scale, the potential "universe" for this issue includes the City of Redlands, while the larger universe encompasses western San Bernardino County. From 2000 to 2030, the population of the City of Redlands is expected to grow from 63,591 to 89,288 residents. The Redlands Crossing Walmart would be expected to create approximately 206 new job positions. This includes the creation of 85 new job positions at the new Walmart store and approximately 121 new job positions for Parcels 1-9. In addition, 230 of the existing jobs at the existing Walmart store would be moved to the new Walmart store, from the potential closure of the existing Walmart store. Consequently, the Project would provide an overall of 436 jobs at the Project site. Most of the new employment opportunities created by the Project would be entry-level. However, a portion of these employees can be expected to move into the City. The addition of new residences in the City would be an incremental growth. By comparison, the population of San Bernardino County area is expected to grow from 1.7 to 2.7 million over the same period; however, the Project would represent a minimal increase to this planned growth. Furthermore, the Project contains commercial uses, and will improve the jobs/housing balance for the City and County, as encouraged by the Regional Comprehensive Plan and the Compass Plan prepared by the SCAG in conjunction with the San Bernardino County General Plan. Therefore, the Project is expected to contribute minimal growth into the area, and will not create cumulatively considerable population and housing impacts in the region. (DEIR p. 4-17.)

14. Public Services

The City of Redlands provides the various public services available to the Project site and surrounding area. The most appropriate "universe" for this issue is therefore the City of Redlands, but more specifically the northern portions of the City and east of the SR-210 Freeway. The City of Redlands requires new development projects to pay their share of fire, police and school Facility Fees. Compliance with payment of fair share fees will provide adequate funding for fire, police and school services for the City of Redlands. Therefore, with payment of fair share fees, the Project and future projects will reduce cumulative impacts to a less than significant level. (DEIR p. 4-18.)

15. Recreation

The City of Redlands provides the various public services available to the Project site and surrounding area. The most appropriate "universe" for this issue is therefore the City of Redlands, but more specifically the northern portions of the City and east of the SR-210 Freeway. As the City of Redlands grows, the increased population will require additional parkland and recreational opportunities. New development projects are required to pay fees (i.e., Quimby) that typically mitigate any potential impact. The planned growth in the area will eventually generate hundreds of new residents who will need additional parkland based on the City's Quimby standard. Parks built within other projects, plus collection of anticipated in lieu fees, will allow the City to continue providing parkland and improvements within the surrounding area. As long as future projects continue to provide onsite parks or in lieu fees, there should be no cumulatively considerable impacts to recreational services. Therefore, no additional mitigation is required. (DEIR p. 4-18.)

16. Transportation

Opening Year 2013 and Horizon Year 2030 cumulative transportation impacts are addressed in Section 3.15 of this EIR. As outlined within Section 3.15, there are no additional ramp merge and diverge junctions anticipated to operate at unacceptable levels of service with the addition of Project traffic, with the exception of the SR-210 Westbound on-ramp at San Bernardino Avenue and the I-10 Eastbound off-ramp to the SR-210 Westbound (upstream only). It should be noted that the I-10 Eastbound off-ramp to the SR-210 Westbound is a freeway-to-freeway diverge junction and is anticipated to operate at LOS "F" due to the addition of background growth and cumulative traffic in conjunction with Project traffic. (DEIR pp. 4-18 to 4-19.)

With respect to the significant impacts to the State facilities (mainline and ramp junctions) at the 2030 time horizon, no further mitigation measures or improvements are recommended. The I-10 Freeway and SR-210 Freeway would operate at LOS "F" even without the Project under Horizon Year 2030 traffic conditions. The Project's contribution to cumulative impacts under 2030 conditions is relatively minor, involving only a small percentage of the forecast traffic occurring on the identified segments at Horizon Year 2030 traffic conditions. Because the City has no control over State facilities, and because the State facilities funded and planned to be developed under 2030 conditions are already anticipated to operate at LOS "E" and "F" even without the Project, there are no further mitigation measures that can be imposed upon the Project to mitigate its small cumulative contribution to significant impacts to the identified segments of SR-210 Freeway and I-10 Freeway under 2030 conditions. Caltrans has exclusive control over State highway improvements and State highway improvements are a matter of Statewide control. Thus, for the aforementioned reasons there are no available and feasible mitigation measures available to mitigate the Project's minor cumulative contribution to traffic on the SR-210 and I-10 Freeways under Horizon Year 2030 traffic conditions. *Therefore, impacts in this regard will be significant and unavoidable and a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be developed for the deficient Caltrans facilities.* (DEIR p. 4-19.)

Moreover, mitigation for the cumulative transportation impacts the Project will have on intersections is provided under Mitigation Measure MM TRANS 2. As previously discussed, the Project is required to pay its fair share/DIF amount of the improvement costs of the impacted intersections to mitigate the Project's traffic impacts in both the City and County. Although these intersections may be improved by time that the various improvements identified are need to maintain acceptable LOS in support of the Project, there are many uncertainties related to the timing of the full funding and completion of such improvements including; payment of DIF fees/fair share payments by other development in the future, availability of non-DIF funding that may be available to the City in the future, and, for improvements

located in County unincorporated areas, County decisions and funding availability for completing the necessary improvements. Due to these uncertainties, timely construction of improvements needed to address cumulative impacts cannot be guaranteed. *Therefore, impacts in this regard will be cumulatively significant and unavoidable and a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be developed.* (DEIR p. 4-19.)

17. Utilities

The geographic scope of the cumulative potable water analysis is the City of Redlands water service area, which encompasses the City limits. (DEIR p. 4-20.)

The City has four main supply sources. The potable wells can produce about 34 million gallons per day (mgd) of supply. In addition, The City has numerous options for obtaining new potable water sources or managing demand. The potential options include (1) increased use of existing surface water sources through purchase of additional water rights; (2) increased production of water from the groundwater basin through well rehabilitation, contaminated flow treatment, or new well construction; (3) increased conservation practices; (4) continued expansion of its reclaimed water system; or (5) purchase of additional water from the State Water Project (SWP). The Water Supply Analysis within Section 3.16 concluded that the City of Redlands Utilities and Engineering Department has sufficient water supply to serve the Project between 2010 and 2030 in addition to all customers within the City of Redlands. (DEIR p. 4-20.)

The Project is estimated to demand 14,817 gallons per day of potable water. Nonetheless, because long-term water supply is a significant concern in California, the Project would reduce its demand on water supply through the implementation of indoor and outdoor water conservation measures. An additional mitigation measure requires the applicant to plumb landscaped areas with "purple pipe" to allow for recycled water irrigation when this service becomes available. These measures would reduce overall Project demand for potable water and ensure that long-term water supply impacts are less than significant. All future projects also would be required to demonstrate that potable water supply sources are available, and these projects may be required to implement water conservation measures. Finally, the Urban Water Management Plan prepared for the City of Redlands (2005) concludes that sufficient supplies are available to serve growth contemplated by the General Plan, which accounts for a majority of the projects listed in Table 4-1. Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on potable water supply. (DEIR p. 4-20.)

The geographic scope of the cumulative wastewater analysis is the City of Redlands Wastewater Treatment Plant service area, which collects wastewater from Redlands. Those projects listed in Table 4-1 that lie in the City of Redlands have the potential to combine with the Project to exert cumulative impacts. (DEIR pp. 4-20 to 4-21.)

All future projects would be required to demonstrate that sewer service is available to ensure that adequate sanitation can be provided. The estimated wastewater generation of the Project is 4,910 gallons of wastewater on a daily basis. The existing wastewater flows for the City's Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) are between 6 and 6.5 mgd. The overall capacity of the WRF is 9.5 mgd. Consequently, implementation of the Project will increase wastewater generation by approximately 0.001 percent over the existing 6.5 mgd, which is well below the 9.5 mgd overall capacity of the WRF. Based on current growth projections that include buildout of the Projects in Table 4.1, the WRP will have adequate capacity for the City (including the Project). Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with other planned

and approved projects, would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on wastewater. (DEIR p. 4-21.)

The geographic scope of the cumulative storm drainage analysis is the City of Redlands' storm drainage system, which generally encompasses lands within the city limits. (DEIR p. 4-21.) All future development projects in the Project vicinity would be required to provide drainage facilities that collect and detain runoff such that off-site releases are controlled and do not create flooding. The Project would be served by on-site drainage facilities that impound runoff and ensure that it is released at a rate no greater than the pre-development condition at the site. As such, the Project would ensure that no net increase in stormwater would leave the Project site and would avoid cumulatively considerable contribution of stormwater to downstream waterways. During construction, the Project would implement standard pollution prevention measures to ensure that downstream water quality impacts are minimized to the greatest extent possible. In addition, the Project would provide water quality measures to prevent pollution during store operations. Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on storm drainage. (DEIR p. 4-21.)

The geographic scope of the cumulative solid waste analysis comprises those projects contributing to the California Street Landfill and the San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill. (DEIR p. 4-21.) The California Street Landfill and San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill have a combined remaining capacity of more than 16 million cubic yards. Future development projects would generate construction and operational solid waste and, depending on the volumes and end uses, would be required to implement recycling and waste reduction measures. The Project is anticipated to generate 1,068 tons of solid waste annually during operations. Consequently, the potential impact associated with the solid waste generated from the Project is less than significant in comparison to the total remaining capacity of landfill sites. (DEIR p. 4-21.)

In addition, actual solid waste generation would be expected to be less than 661 tons per annum as Walmart stores are generally equipped with recycling facilities and are designed to limit waste of recyclable material by implementing innovative strategies. (DEIR p. 4-22.)

Walmart stores are equipped to recycle the following materials:

- Aluminum;
- Plastic (including bottles, bags, garment bags, shrink wrap, and bubble pack);
- Glass;
- Cardboard;
- Vegetable oil;
- Single-use cameras;
- Electronic waste; and
- Silver (from photo processing).

In addition, actual solid waste generation would be expected to be less than 661 tons per annum as Walmart stores are equipped with recycling facilities and are designed to limit waste of recyclable material by implementing innovative strategies. (DEIR p. 4-22.)

Walmart stores are equipped to recycle the following materials:

- Aluminum;

- Plastic (including bottles, bags, garment bags, shrink wrap, and bubble pack);
- Glass;
- Cardboard;
- Vegetable oil;
- Single-use cameras;
- Electronic waste; and
- Silver (from photo processing).

(DEIR p. 4-22.)

Similarly, followings are some of the innovative strategies implemented to limit waste as standard features:

- All cardboard generated from delivery packages is segregated and sent to a recycling center.
- Each new store has an indoor tank used to collect oil from cooking processes for recycling.
- All Walmart photo-processing centers recycle single-use cameras after photo processing.
- Walmart collects and segregates all recyclable bottles and cans.
- Walmart currently implements a chain wide program for "sandwich bale" recycling of plastics, e.g., bags, garment bags, shrink wrap, bubble pack, etc.
- Walmart photo labs capture silver from the photo processing.

(DEIR p. 4-22.)

Therefore, as discussed above the landfill sites serving the Project has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal need and accordingly, the Project, in conjunction with other future projects, would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on solid waste. (DEIR p. 4-23.)

18. Urban Decay

Cumulative Urban Decay impacts are addressed in Section 3.18 of this EIR. Analysis in this section of the EIR determined that cumulative Urban Decay impacts would be less than significant. (DEIR p. 4-23.)

E. Project Alternatives

Section 6.1.2 of the Draft EIR analyzed the following four alternatives to the Project as proposed, and evaluated these alternatives for their ability to meet the Project's goals and objectives. CEQA requires the EIR include in its evaluation a No Project Alternative. Additionally, CEQA requires an EIR to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project, which would feasibly attain the basic Project objectives, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the proposal. Thus, in order to develop a range of reasonable alternatives, the Project objectives must be considered when the City evaluates the alternatives.

Alternatives sites were considered and rejected as either infeasible or having similar potentially significant impacts. Examples of such available sites would include the vacated former Mervyn's building, which did provide sufficient space to accommodate the proposed development, an available site within the City of Loma Linda along Redlands Boulevard, and across the I-210 freeway in the "donut hole" area. While the Donut hole site could accommodate the proposed development, the project

impacts would remain nearly identical given the roadway limitations and proximity to the current proposed site. The potential site in the City of Loma Linda would result in similar air quality impacts and have potentially greater impacts with regard to traffic. Furthermore, the City of Redlands would not benefit or receive the potential tax revenue for out-of-jurisdiction sites.

1. No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the Project site would remain in its existing condition and no development would occur. The Project site would remain in its existing condition and no changes would occur. Currently, the Project site is undeveloped. If developed, the likely alternative is that the site would be built out as another type of commercial center that is consistent with current General Plan and zoning designations; the scenarios that are evaluated under Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 are representative of this buildout. (DEIR p. 6-4.)

Finding: The No Project Alternative would avoid all of the Project's significant unavoidable impacts and have less impact on all environmental topical areas. However, this alternative would not advance any of the project objectives. Furthermore, this alternative would not realize the project benefits of increased retail opportunities, additional employment opportunities, and new tax revenues. Accordingly, this alternative is rejected by the City as infeasible. (DEIR p. 6-5.)

2. Ten Percent Reduction Alternative

The 10-Percent Reduction Alternative would reduce the proposed Redlands Crossing Center total square footage from 275,500 square feet to 247,950 square feet for the Project. This alternative would represent a net reduction of 27,550 square feet, or approximately 10 percent relative to the Project. Table 6-1 in the Draft EIR provides a summary of the 10-Percent Reduction Alternative. Under this alternative each building footprint would be reduced by approximately 10%, including each of the outparcels and the major tenant (Walmart). (DEIR p. 6-5.)

Finding: The 10-Percent Reduced Density Alternative would result in the same significant unavoidable impacts as those of the Project (i.e., cumulative Air Quality and cumulative Freeway ramp and mainline traffic impacts). However, the severity of the significant unavoidable traffic impacts would be less, because fewer daily and peak-hour trips would be generated. In addition, the severity of impacts associated with air quality, noise, hydrology, public services and utilities, transportation, and urban decay would be less. Otherwise, this alternative would have impacts similar to the Project. (DEIR p. 6-14.)

This alternative would not achieve most of the basic Project objectives, or would not achieve them to the same degree, as the Project. Sales revenue is dependent on many factors, including the type of retail store and the density of the retail goods presented to the public. Nonetheless, a general rule for retail sales is that a reduction in the square footage of retail establishments for a store that can support the identified gross floor area will have a proportional reduction in overall retail sales. A reduction in 10% of the floor area typically translates to fewer goods easily presented to the retail customers, translating into a store that is less attractive to retail users. Therefore, as a general rule, a 10% reduction in the size of the retail development would mean the store would not generate as much sales, thereby resulting in less positive contribution to the local economy, generating less tax revenue. The reduction in sales and tax revenues would prevent achievement of Objective 1, as such revenues would not be maximized. It would not fully achieve Objective 2 as the reduction in square footage of sales area represented by this alternative would likely result in a narrowing of the range of goods and services that would be provided to the currently underserved community as compared to the Project. Likewise, this alternative would not fully meet Objective 4 since the range of goods and services would be narrowed as compared to the

Project. Also, since the building area is reduced by 10% under this alternative Objective 8 is not met because the full development potential of the site is limited as compared to the Project. (DEIR p. 6-14.)

In addition, a 10% reduction in the size of the outparcels would impact the overall marketability of the Project. The outparcel retail pads have been designed and sized so as to attract compatible uses to the shopping center, including smaller retailers, banks, fast food and sit down restaurants, and other such uses. Most retailers have a particular size of parcel that is required in order to meet their operational needs. The determination of size requirements has been determined through numerous developments in similar shopping centers throughout the State. Therefore, a further reduction in the already small pad sizes for these uses decreases their marketability to potential businesses and reduces the ability to attract stable tenants. (DEIR p. 6-14.) In fact, a 10% reduction on the outparcels creates a greater impact on the viability of such retail operations, as opposed to a larger store with greater flexibility, due to the specific nature of the retailers that would be interested in such outparcels.

Also, although it will lessen the magnitude of cumulative air quality and freeway traffic impacts, these impacts would remain significant, adverse and unavoidable under this alternative. Therefore, for the above discussed reasons, this alternative is rejected by the City as infeasible. (DEIR p. 6-14.)

3. Walmart Standalone Alternative

The Walmart Standalone Alternative would eliminate the proposed commercial and retail buildings in the Redlands Crossing Center, except for the Walmart. The Standalone Walmart would operate 24 hours per day. The total square footage would be reduced from 275,500 square feet to 215,000 square feet. The Walmart Standalone Alternative would represent a net reduction of 60,500 square feet, or approximately 22 percent relative to the Project. Table 6-3 in the Draft EIR provides a summary of the Walmart Standalone Alternative. (DEIR p. 6-14.)

Finding: The Walmart Standalone Alternative would result in the same significant unavoidable impacts as the Project. However, the severity of traffic impacts would be less because fewer daily and peak hour trips would be generated. In addition, the severity of impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services and utilities, and transportation would be lessened relative to the Project. (DEIR p. 6-23.)

The Walmart Standalone Alternative would not meet most of the basic Project objectives, or would not further them to the same degree as the Project. In general, the elimination of the outlots would result in fewer sales, thereby resulting in less positive contribution to the local economy, and generating less tax revenue for local agencies. DEIR p. 6-23.)

The reduction in sales and tax revenues would prevent achievement of Objective 1, as such revenues would not be maximized. This alternative also fails to meet Objective 3 since the mix of complementary uses is limited because the Project site would only be occupied by the Walmart Store. Likewise, this alternative would not fully meet Objective 4 since the range of goods and services would be narrowed as compared to the Project. Objective 5 is not met because the nationally recognized anchor (Walmart) would not attract other businesses to the Project. Objective 7 is compromised as a major new center would not be developed—only the Walmart store. Since the building area is reduced by approximately 22% under this alternative, Objective 8 is not met because the full development potential of the site is limited as compared to the Project. (DEIR p. 6-23.)

Further, use of the Project site for a stand-alone Walmart would be contrary to *Implementing Policy 11.0l* of the Economic Development Element of the City's General Plan which encourages the location

of commercial centers according to function and scale of the particular development so that centers of different scales complement one another and each is accessible to the primary market it is designed to serve.

In addition, although it will lessen the magnitude of cumulative air quality and freeway traffic impacts, these impacts would remain significant, adverse and unavoidable under this alternative. (DEIR p. 6-24.) Therefore, for the above discussed reasons, this alternative is rejected by the City as infeasible.

4. No Walmart/Medium Size Tenant Alternative

Under this alternative total building area would be the same as the Project and the uses for the parcels other than the Walmart Parcel would also be the same. This alternative would differ from the Project, in that it would not include a "big box," general merchandise anchor, but would include medium- sized, individual tenants with retail space generally in the 15,000 square feet to 50,000 square feet range. This alternative also includes the other types of retail uses than the proposed Walmart would have (grocery store, tire/auto and nursery), except under this alternative they would be independent, freestanding tenants. Unlike big box discount/general merchandise stores such as Walmart, Target, Costco or K-Mart, medium sized stores tend to concentrate on certain type of product types such as clothing, books and music, electronics, office supplies/equipment, etc. Consequently, shopper visits to these types of establishments tend to be more limited-purpose in nature than a visit to a general merchandise business (such as Walmart) where a shopper may purchase many types of goods. Table 6-5 in the Draft EIR shows uses that were assumed to replace the 215,000 square foot floor area occupied by the Walmart store for the Project and are typical types of commercial uses for shopping centers. Table 6-5 also shows the aggregate figures for the freestanding uses, comprising 60,500 square feet, which would remain the same for both the Project and this alternative. (DEIR p. 6-24.)

The total weekday average daily trips (ADT) for the Project at 19,481 ADT would be slightly higher than the estimated 19,106 ADT resulting from this alternative. However, that ADT would vary substantially depending on what specific commercial use is assumed to be in the mix. For example, if this alternative is reduced in area to 240,500 (by 35,000 square feet) and, instead of 70,000 square feet devoted to two clothing apparel stores a single 35,000 book/media store (ITE Code 868) is included (such as a Barnes and Noble) the weekday ADT for the alternative would be 2,1074 ADT, despite the 35,000 square feet reduction in floor area. (DEIR p. 6-24.)

Finding: The alternative would result in the same significant unavoidable impacts as those of the Project (i.e. cumulative Air Quality and Freeway ramp and mainline traffic impacts). However, the severity of these significant unavoidable traffic and air quality impacts would be slightly less since this alternative would create somewhat less (375) average daily trips than the Project which will, in turn, result in slightly less traffic and emissions. Likewise, under this alternative cumulative impacts to Air Quality and Freeway facilities would be slightly less but still remain significant adverse and unavoidable. Otherwise, this alternative would have impacts similar to the Project. (DEIR pp. 6-31 to 6-32.)

This alternative does not meet most of the Project Objectives, including Objective 2 in that it does not provide for the wide range of uses that is typical of "big box" general merchandise discount stores, nor does it provide for the convenience of providing these goods and services within a single store. Since the types of uses that would occupy the Project site is more limited, Objective 3 would not be fully achieved due to the narrow, focused nature of the uses, which are also not likely to be as complementary to one another as compared to the Project., The potential for "one-stop shopping" is limited which also hinders achievement of Objective 3. Objective 4 is not met by this alternative because the range of

goods and services provided would be limited, and few if any of the stores identified under this alternative would be open 24 hours, thus hindering convenience. Since a nationally recognized, general merchandise anchor is not included for this alternative Objective 5 would not be met. (DEIR p. 6-32.)

Further, this alternative is inconsistent with the City's development and planning preferences as reflected in the City's June 8, 2010 defeat of Measure O (Yes 44.96%, No 55.04%,), a measure which would have prohibited retail establishments such as the proposed Project.

Therefore, for the above discussed reasons, this alternative is rejected by the City as infeasible.

5. Environmentally Superior Alternative

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(e)(2) requires an EIR to identify an "environmentally superior alternative." If the no project alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives. The no project alternative is environmentally superior because it avoids significant and adverse impacts to regional air quality and traffic impacts. (DEIR p. 6-33.)

The Walmart Standalone Alternative would be the most environmentally superior among the other three alternatives. Among the three alternatives, it would result in the greatest reductions in terms of traffic, noise, air quality and climate change, utilities and public services. However, it does not meet most of the basic Project objectives. Table 6-6 in the Draft EIR summarizes the impacts of the Project compared to the four alternatives discussed in this section. Table 6-7 of the Draft EIR summarizes the ability of the alternatives to meet the basic Project objectives. (DEIR p. 6-33.)

F. Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

The environmental effects associated with the development of the Project are summarized in Table ES-1 and in Section 4, Project and Cumulative Impacts, of this document. Implementation of the Project will require a long-term commitment of land as discussed below. More specifically, if the Project is approved, and subsequently implemented, new structures would be built, additional utilities would be constructed, and circulation improvements would be made. Nonrenewable resources would be committed, primarily in the form of fossil fuels, and would include fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline used by vehicles and equipment associated with the construction of the Project. The consumption of other nonrenewable or slowly renewable resources would result from development of the Project. These resources would include, but not be limited to, lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, petrochemical construction materials, steel, copper, lead, and water. Because alternative energy sources such as solar or wind energy are not currently in widespread local use, it is unlikely that a real savings in nonrenewable energy supplies (i.e., oil and gas) could be realized in the immediate future. (DEIR p. 5-3)

VI. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The City of Redlands as the Lead Agency hereby declares that, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the City has balanced the benefits of the proposed Project against any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts in determining whether to approve the proposed Project. If the benefits of the proposed Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, those impacts are considered "acceptable."

The City hereby declares that the EIR has identified and discussed significant effects that may occur as a result of the Project. With the implementation of the mitigation measures discussed in the EIR, these impacts can be mitigated to a level of less than significant except for the unavoidable and significant impacts discussed in the findings herein.

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

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

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

The City hereby declares that, having reduced the adverse significant environmental effects of the Project, to the extent feasible by adopting the proposed mitigation measures, having considered the entire administrative record on the Project and having weighed the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable significant impact after mitigation, the City has determined that the social, economic and environmental benefits of the Project outweigh the potential unavoidable significant impacts and render those potential significant impacts acceptable based upon the following considerations, each of which the City declares to be independently sufficient to outweigh the potential significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project:

- Maximize retail commercial property and sales tax revenues that would be accrued to the various agencies within the City of Redlands from the development of the Project site. The Project as proposed will develop approximately 275,500 square feet of commercial retail space in an existing vacant lot within the City of Redlands. This includes the Redlands Crossing Walmart consisting of approximately 215,000 square feet of full service retail goods, open 24-hours per day, seven days a week.
- Facilitate customer convenience by providing a full range of goods and services (including grocery, gardening, dry goods, automotive, and other uses) within a single store. As discussed within the Draft EIR, the entire shopping center will include the Redlands Crossing Walmart which sells both groceries and general retail merchandise. The store will also offer a Tire & Lube Express, pharmacy, banking center, food service, a photo center, garden center, and similar services. The Walmart will be open 24-hours per day, seven days a week.
- Develop the Project site with a high-quality mix of retail, grocery, restaurant and commercial uses that will complement each other and encourage one stop shopping thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled and vehicle trips in the community. As discussed above, the Walmart will include a variety of one-stop shopping services at the one store. Additionally, the outparcels on lots 1 through 9 will contain complementary retail and commercial establishments including drive-through food service restaurants and a gas station.
- Provide convenient and affordable shopping opportunities to the residents of the City of Redlands and surrounding areas for a wide range of retail goods and services, including the provision of such goods and services on a 24-hour basis.
- Provide the Redlands Crossing Center with a nationally recognized general-merchandise anchor to attract consumers and other businesses to the Project. Walmart is one of the largest retail

companies in the world, with a strong and loyal customer base that will ensure the center remains a vibrant shopping center for the City of Redlands.

- Provide an additional grocery outlet in the North Redlands Community to minimize travel, as well as provide convenient shopping opportunities for City residents. The Redlands Crossing Walmart, in addition to general retail merchandise, will include the sale of groceries to the surround community on a 24-hour, seven days per week, basis providing the surrounding community with enhance grocery options.
- Develop a new major retail and commercial center along Major Arterial streets and in close proximity to the 210 Freeway/San Bernardino Avenue Interchange in order to facilitate regional public access and promote the Project as a regional shopping destination. The Redlands Crossing Center will be located on vacant land adjacent to the 210 Freeway and in close proximity to the Interstate 10 located to the south of the Project site. Additionally, the site is bordered by the existing Tennessee Street and San Bernardino Avenue, providing excellent access to and from the 210 Freeway.
- Develop the vacant unused parcels comprising the Project site for retail-commercial uses in a manner that fully utilizes their development potential.
- Provide off-site improvements within the Project area, including storm drain facility improvements related to the construction of New York Street, a block wall immediately to the West of Karon Street and mass-grading to "match" grade elevations between Karon Street and future New York Street.
- Promote and implement the following policies of the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan:
    - *Guiding Policy: East Valley Corridor – 4.62g* Promote high quality development in the East Valley Corridor by protecting and enhancing existing amenities in the area, creating an identifiable community character, and adopting development standards and guidelines to ensure aesthetically pleasing design and maximum land use compatibility.
    - *Implementing Policy: East Valley Corridor – 4.62l* Maximize generation of employment opportunities in a region, which has a significant imbalance of housing versus employment opportunities. (See DEIR Table 3.91-1 at p. 3.9-11.)
    - *Implementing Policy: East Valley Corridor – 4.62m* Facilitate location in the project area of a wide range of commercial uses to serve the region, local industry, and residential neighborhoods. (See DEIR Table 3.91-1 at p. 3.9-11.)
- Promote and Implement the following policies of the Economic Development Element of the City's General Plan:
    - *Guiding Policy 11.0a* Promote a climate conducive to economic growth and rejuvenation to enhance employment and investment opportunities without sacrificing environmental standards.
    - *Implementing Policy 11.0e* Attract business and industry by providing a wide range of urban amenities and services throughout the City.
    - *Implementing Policy 11.0l* Encourage the location of commercial centers according to function and scale of the particular development so that centers of different scales complement one another and each is accessible to the primary market it is designed to serve.
- Promote and Implement the following policies of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan (see DEIR Table 3.9-2 at p. 3.9-12):
    - *Goal EV2.0205(a)* Develop the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan so as to promote and facilitate high-quality commercial and industrial development within the corridor area.

- *Policy EV2.0205(a)(1)* Maximize generation of employment opportunities in a region, which has a significant inbalance of housing versus employment opportunities.
- *Policy EV2.0205(a)(2)* Facilitate location in the project area of a wide range of commercial uses to serve the region, local industry and residential neighborhoods.

(See Project Objectives, DEIR p. 2-26.)

The City's findings set forth in the preceding sections identified all of the adverse environmental impacts and feasible mitigation measures which can reduce impacts to less than significant levels where feasible, or to the lowest feasible levels where significant impacts remain. The findings have also analyzed three alternatives to determine whether there are reasonable or feasible alternatives to the proposed action, or whether they might reduce or eliminate the significant adverse impacts of the Project. The EIR presents evidence that implementing the development of the Project will cause significant adverse impacts, which cannot be substantially mitigated to non-significant levels. These significant impacts have been outlined above and the City makes the following finding:

Finding: Having considered the unavoidable adverse impacts of the Project, the City hereby determines that all feasible mitigation has been adopted to reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts identified in the EIR, and that no additional feasible mitigation is available to further reduce significant impacts. Further, the City finds that economic, social and other considerations of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse impacts described above. The reason for accepting these remaining unmitigated impacts are described below. In making this finding, the City has balanced the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable environmental impacts and has indicated its willingness to accept those effects. The City further finds that the Project's benefits are substantial and override each unavoidable impact of the Project as follows:

1. Findings Related to Air Quality

Operational and Cumulative Exceedance of the SCAQMD's Regional Emission Thresholds: Operation of the Project would violate SCAQMD's regional emission thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM_{10} and result in a significant impact on a regional and cumulative level even after mitigation. The Project may result in cumulative health effects from cumulative exposures from ozone, nitrogen dioxide, and PM_{10}.While the provided Air Quality Mitigation Measures would reduce the emissions impacts, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. However, benefits obtained from the Project are sufficient to justify approval of the Project. These impacts are overridden by Project benefits described above in the findings.

2. Findings Related to Traffic Impacts

Horizon Year 2030 Traffic Conditions: Freeway Ramp and Mainline Improvements would remain significant and unavoidable. There are no additional ramp merge and diverge junctions anticipated to operate at unacceptable levels of service with the addition of Project traffic, with the exception of the SR-210 Westbound on-ramp at San Bernardino Avenue and the I-10 Eastbound off-ramp to the SR-210 Westbound (upstream only). With respect to the significant impacts to the State facilities (mainline and ramp junctions) at the 2030 time horizon, no further mitigation measures or improvements are feasible. The I-10 Freeway and SR-210 Freeway would operate at LOS "F" even without the Project under Horizon Year 2030 traffic conditions. Because the City has no control over State facilities, and because the State facilities funded and planned to be developed under 2030 conditions are already anticipated to operate at LOS "E" and "F" even without the Project, there are no further mitigation measures that can be imposed upon the Project to mitigate its small cumulative contribution to significant impacts to the identified segments of SR-210 Freeway and I-10 Freeway under 2030 conditions. Caltrans has exclusive control over State highway improvements and State highway improvements are by and large a

matter of Statewide control. As such, while the Project will contribute all required fees related to the Project's proportional impacts, any improvements are within the sole responsibility and jurisdiction of Caltrans. Thus, for the aforementioned reasons there are no available and feasible mitigation measures available to mitigate the Project's minor cumulative contribution to traffic on the SR-210 and I-10 Freeways under Horizon Year 2030 traffic conditions.

Mitigation for the cumulative transportation impacts the Project will have on intersections is provided under Mitigation Measure TRANS 2. As such, the Project is required to pay its fair share/DIF amount of the improvement costs of the impacted intersections to mitigate the Project's traffic impacts within the City of Redlands and the County of San Bernardino.

Although these intersections may be improved, there are many uncertainties related to the timing of the full funding and completion of such improvements identified to maintain acceptable LOS in support of the Project. Due to these uncertainties, timely construction of improvements needed to address cumulative impacts cannot be guaranteed. Therefore, impacts in this regard will be significant and unavoidable.

However, benefits obtained from the Project are sufficient to justify approval of the Project. These impacts are overridden by Project benefits described above in the findings.

California Public Resources Code section 21002 provides: "In the event specific economic, social and other conditions make infeasible such Project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects can be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof." Section 21002.1(c) provides: "In the event that economic, social, or other conditions make it infeasible to mitigate one or more significant effects of a project on the environment, the project may nonetheless be approved or carried out at the discretion of a public agency…" Finally, California Code of Regulations, Title 4, 15093 (a) states: "If the benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered 'acceptable.'"

The City hereby declares that the foregoing benefits provided to the public through approval and implementation of the Project outweighs the identified significant adverse environmental impacts of the Project that cannot be mitigated. The City finds that each of the Project benefits outweighs the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIR and, therefore, finds those impacts to be acceptable.

VII. CERTIFICATION OF EIR

The City of Redlands finds that it has reviewed and considered the Final EIR evaluating the proposed Project; that the Final EIR is an accurate and objective statement that fully complies with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines; and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City of Redlands. The City declares that no new significant information as defined by the State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 has been received by the City after circulation of the Draft EIR that would require recirculation. The City certifies the Environmental Impact Report based on the following findings and conclusions:

1. Findings:

a) CEQA Compliance: As the decision-making body for the Project, the City has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Findings and supporting documentation. The City

determines that the Findings contain a complete and accurate reporting of the environmental impacts and mitigation measures associated with the Project, as well as a complete and accurate reporting of the unavoidable impacts and benefits of the proposed Project as detailed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations. The City finds that the EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA and that the City complied with CEQA's procedural and substantive requirements.

b) Independent Judgment of Lead Agency: The EIR for the Project reflects the City's independent judgment. The City has exercised independent judgment in accordance with *Public Resources Code* section 21082.1(c)(3) in managing as appropriate the environmental consultant, and directing the consultant in the preparation of the EIR. The City has independently reviewed and analyzed the EIR and accompanying studies and finds that the report reflects the independent judgment of the City of Redlands.

c) Significant Unavoidable Impacts/Statement of Overriding Considerations: The Project would have the potential for creating significant adverse impacts. These significant adverse environmental impacts have been identified in the EIR and will require mitigation as set forth in the Findings. Significant adverse impacts which cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level after mitigation include traffic and circulation, air quality, and noise, as discussed in the Findings. The City has eliminated or substantially reduced environmental impacts where feasible as described in the Findings, and the City determines that the remaining unavoidable significant adverse impacts are acceptable due to the reasons set forth in the preceding Statement of Overriding Considerations.

2. Conclusions:

- Except as to those impacts stated above relating to air quality and traffic and circulation, all other significant environmental impacts from the implementation of the proposed Project have been identified in the EIR and, with implementation of the mitigation measures identified, will be mitigated to a less than significant level.
- Alternatives to the proposed Project, which could potentially achieve the basic objectives of the proposed Project, have been considered and rejected in favor of the proposed Project.
- Environmental, economic, social, and other considerations and benefits derived from the development of the proposed Project override and make infeasible any alternatives to the proposed Project or further mitigation measures beyond those incorporated into the proposed Project.

VIII. ADOPTION OF MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6, the City of Redlands as the Lead Agency hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached to these Findings. In the event of any inconsistencies between the mitigation measures as set forth herein and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program shall control.

Section 2. Based on the entire record before the City of Redlands, including the above Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations and all written and oral evidence presented to the City, the City of Redlands as the Lead Agency hereby approves the Project with all the mitigation measures and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as set forth in these findings.

Section 3. The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the City of Redlands as the Lead Agency has based the Findings contained herein are located at the City of Redlands, Development Services Department, 210 East Citrus Avenue, Redlands, California 92373.

The custodian for these documents is Robert D. Dalquest, AICP and Assistant Development Services Director for the City of Redlands. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code §21081.6(a)(2) and State CEQA Guidelines §15091(e).

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this ___ day of _____, 2012.

Pete Aguilar, Mayor

ATTEST:

Sam Irwin, City Clerk

I, Sam Irwin, City Clerk of the City of Redlands, hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by the City Council at a regular meeting thereof held on the ____ of _____, 2012 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT: