City of Loma Linda Official Report

Floyd Petersen, Mayor
Stan Brauer, Mayor pro tempore
Robert Christman, Councilmember
Robert Ziprick, Councilmember
Charles Umeda, Councilmember

COUNCIL AGENDA: June 14, 2005

TO: City Council

VIA: Dennis R. Halloway, City Manager

FROM: Deborah Woldruff, AICP, Community Development Director

SUBJECT: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NOS. 02-02 AND 02-05, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NOS. 02-02 AND 02-05, SPECIFIC PLAN (SP) NOS. 02-08 AND 02-13 (UNIVERSITY VILLAGE AND ORCHARD PARK)

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is for the City Council to hear the presentation on the Draft Final Environmental Impact Report (DFEIR) by staff and the environmental consultant (RBF Consulting), and open the public hearing to take public testimony. Following the public hearing, staff recommends that the City Council continue the two projects to either June 28, 2005 or July 26, 2005 to complete the review of the specific plans.

BACKGROUND

On May 24, 2005, staff provided a presentation and overview of the two projects. The two applicants provided PowerPoint presentations that highlighted the key features and characteristics of their respective projects. Following the presentations, the public hearing was opened and the Council received public testimony. After some discussion, the City Council continued both projects to the June 14th agenda for the review of the DFEIR [prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)].

ANALYSIS

For the June 14, 2005 meeting, the City Council had agreed to limit the review of the two projects to the Draft Final Environmental Impact Report (DFEIR), which includes DEIR, Mitigation Monitoring Program, Response to Comments, and Technical Appendices (Compact Disk). The DFEIR was previously distributed to the City Council on June 2, 2005 as a separate transmittal. A brief summary of the environmental process and the results of the environmental analysis are outlined below.

Summary of the Environmental Process

In October 2001, the City Council determined that both projects should be analyzed jointly in one environmental document for consistency and cohesiveness. The City retained the services of RBF Consulting to prepare a joint Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for both projects in April 2002. The CEQA mandatory 30-day public review period for the Notice of Preparation (NOP) began on September 21, 2002 and ended on October 21, 2002. A public Scoping Meeting, held on October 10, 2002, helped to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, methods of assessment, and mitigation measures to be analyzed in depth. The written comments received during the NOP public review period were used to determine the environmental scope and copies are contained in Appendix J of the DFEIR.

On April 2, 2004, the NOP was redistributed due to several project delays that resulted in an eighteen (18) month time lapse. The DEIR was completed during the latter part of August 2004 and released with the Notice Of Completion and Availability (NOC/A) for public review on September 8, 2004. Pursuant to the CEQA, the 45-day public review period for the NOC/A began on Wednesday, September 8, 2004, and ended on Friday, October 22, 2004. The comments received during the NOC/A public review period are contained and addressed in the DFEIR, Section 13.0: Comments and Responses. Copies of the Draft Comments and Responses have been distributed to those persons and organizations that submitted comments during the public review period.

Results of the Environmental Analysis

Section 2.0 of the DFEIR summarizes the environmental impacts, identifies mitigation measures, and explains that the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plan Projects will result in some significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to Aesthetics/Light and Glare, Air Quality, and Noise. The analysis of environmental impacts is contained in Section 5.0 Description of Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Section 6.0 Long-Term Implications of Proposed Projects, Section 7.0 Alternatives to the Proposed Projects, Section 8.0 Significant Environmental Effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed projects are implemented, and Section 9.0 Effects Found Not To Be Significant. Because certain impacts to Aesthetics/Light and Glare, Air Quality, Land Use and Relevant Planning, and Noise cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, Findings (Attachment A) for a statement of overriding considerations have been prepared for the two projects by the consultant (pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines Sections 15043, 15091, 15092, and 15093). In order for the two projects to be approved, the City Council would need to adopt the Findings as part of the certification of the FEIR.

Regional Congestion Management (CMP) Plan

The University Village and Orchard Park projects are subject to the requirements of the Regional CMP. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was prepared to analyze the traffic impacts and identify appropriate mitigations and fair share contributions toward roadway improvements necessary resulting from these projects. It was determined that with implementation of mitigation measures, the two projects will comply with the CMP. The TIA was based on the Draft TIA

prepared for the General Plan Update that was reviewed and accepted by San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG).

ENVIRONMENTAL

Please refer to the Analysis section of this report.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Other than the costs associated with the preparation of the Draft Final Environmental Impact Report and revenue from the sale of the City's land to Lewis Operating Corporation, the financial impacts of the University Village/Orchard Park Specific Plan Projects are not known at this time. However, staff anticipates that the collection of plan check fees, building and construction permits, and Development Impact Fees for future projects within the Specific Plan areas will be substantial.

ATTACHMENTS

A. (Draft) Findings Regarding the Environmental Effects for the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans

I:\UV-OP\Staff Reports\City Council\CCSR 06-14-05.doc

ATTACHMENT A

FINDINGS REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOR THE UNIVERSITY VILLAGE AND ORCHARD PARK SPECIFIC PLANS

SCH # 2002091096

Lead Agency:

CITY OF LOMA LINDA
25541 Barton Road
Loma Linda, California 92354
Contact: Ms. Deborah Woldruff
909.799.2831

Consultant:

RBF CONSULTING
14725 Alton Parkway
Irvine, California 92618
Contact: Mr. Glenn Lajoie, AICP
Ms. Collette Morse, AICP
949.472.3505

June 2005

JN 10-102132

EXHIBIT A
STATEMENT OF FACTS AND FINDINGS

I. INTRODUCTION

The following statement of facts and findings has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Public Resources Code Section 21081. CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 provides that:

> *No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless the public agency makes one or more of the following findings:*

The following potential significant impacts of the proposed projects have been separated into three categories:

1) Those potential impacts that have been determined to be less than significant, based on review of available information in the project record, and in consideration of existing standard development review requirements and existing codes and regulations;

2) Those potential impacts that could be mitigated to a level that is considered less than significant with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures; and

3) Those potential impacts that could not be reduced to a less than sig nificant level with the implementation of the existing policies and standards and the recommended mitigation measures.

For potentially significant impacts (categories (2) and (3) above), the City of Loma Linda has made one of the following three findings for each potentially significant impact and provides facts in support of each finding in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

> *(a) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.*
>
> *(b) Those changes or alterations required in the project to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.*
>
> *(c) Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final environmental impact report.*

The Final EIR for the proposed University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans identifies certain significant environmental effects, which may occur as a result of the projects. Therefore, findings are set forth herein pursuant to Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines. Mitigation Measures are based in part on the requirements contained in Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code. A Mitigation Monitoring Program will be adopted as part of the Project Resolution.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The development concept for both the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans is to create a master planned community that incorporates the latest planning techniques in a sustainable community that is vibrant and pedestrian-friendly. In order to achieve this type of community, the Specific Plans would provide for a neo-traditional development that would include specific development characteristics resulting in a compact, mixed-use, pedestrian oriented community. The mixed-use element of the Specific Plans would provide for a flexible land use program in order to achieve a balanced live-work environment. Approximately 1,769 housing units and 172,000 square feet of commercial and mixed uses would be included in the University Village Specific Plan. Approximately 1,259 housing units and 962,676 square feet of commercial and mixed uses would be included in the Orchard Park Specific Plan. Both communities would incorporate a variety of land uses and residential types.

As a mixed-use community, the Project Area is divided into the following land uses:

- Neighborhood Commercial;
- Mixed Use;
- Multiple-Family Housing;
- Single-Family Housing;
- School (Elementary);
- Institutional (Church);
- Parks/Open Space; and
- Historic Preservation Areas.

UNIVERSITY VILLAGE

University Village proposes to develop a master planned community on approximately 170 acres utilizing traditional planning techniques in order to create a "small town" environment that is pedestrian friendly and community oriented.

Multi-family and commercial uses would be located south of Redlands Boulevard. Additional multi-family (senior and for rent) residential uses are proposed directly south of the multi-family and commercial uses south of Redlands Boulevard. Five single-family residential neighborhoods occupy the central and southern portions of the University Village Project site. Not less than 15 percent of the total residential uses would be affordable. An elementary school (Kindergarten through 5th grade) and joint use park is planned in the central portion of the project site, adjacent to the Orchard Park project site. The school/park are intended to be focal point for both University Village and Orchard Park, which can be easily accessible so that local students could walk or ride their bicycles to school.

ORCHARD PARK

The Orchard Park Specific Plan provides a comprehensive master plan for development of the approximately 138-acre site. The land use plan for Orchard Park is designed to be compatible with adjacent development and provide opportunities for future development around the site.

Orchard Park has been divided into 13 planning areas. Planning Areas 1 and 2 are designated for commercial uses. Planning Areas 3 through 6 are designated for mixed use. Planning Areas 7 and 8 are designated for multi-family residential uses. Planning Areas 9 and 10 are designated for single-family residential uses. Planning Area 11 is designated for open space, Planning Area 12 for school uses and Planning Area 13 for institutional uses. Not less than 15 percent of the total residential uses would be affordable.

III. FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

The City of Loma Linda, as Lead Agency and decision-maker for the projects, has reviewed and considered the information contained in both the Draft and Final EIRs prepared for the proposed University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and the public record. The Lead Agency makes the following finding pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines:

- The City of Loma Linda, as Lead Agency and decision-maker, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Draft and Final EIRs prepared for the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and public records, finds that changes or alterations to the projects will avoid or substantially lessen potentially significant environmental impacts. These changes or alterations are related to the implementation of the mitigation measures detailed in this document.

- The City of Loma Linda, as Lead Agency and decision-maker, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Draft and Final EIRs prepared for the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and the public record, finds that there are specific economic, social, or other considerations which make the mitigation measures for Land Use and Relevant Planning, Aesthetics/Light and Glare, Air Quality, and Noise with development of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans in the Draft and Final EIRs infeasible.

- The City of Loma Linda, as Lead Agency and decision-maker, finds that significant and unmitigable impacts on Land Use and Relevant Planning, Aesthetics/Light and Glare, Air Quality, and Noise may occur with future development in conjunction with implementation of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans. This finding requires that the Lead Agency issue a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" under Section 15093 and 15126(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines if the Lead Agency wishes to proceed with approval of the proposed projects.

IV. FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The City of Loma Linda, acting as Lead Agency for the environmental review of the projects, makes the following findings with regard to the environmental review process undertaken to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the projects:

1. In accordance with Section 15063(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, as amended, the City of Loma Linda, as Lead Agency, undertook the preparation of an Initial Study. The completed Initial Study determined that a number of environmental issue areas might be impacted by the construction and operation of the proposed University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans. Furthermore, the Lead Agency determined that an EIR would be prepared to address the projects' potential impacts on those environmental issue areas identified in the Initial Study requiring further analysis.

2. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, as amended, the City of Loma Linda, as Lead Agency, circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to public agencies, special districts, and members of the public requesting such notice for a 30-day period commencing on September 23, 2002 and concluded on October 22, 2002. The Initial Study was circulated with the NOP. Due to a change in the projects description, a second NOP was circulated from April 2, 2004 to May 3, 2004. Based on the Initial Study and NOP process, no impacts upon mineral resources were anticipated upon implementation of the projects, and as a result, this issue was not studied in the Draft EIR.

3. During the circulation period for the NOP, the City of Loma Linda, as Lead Agency, advertised and held a public scoping meeting on October 10, 2002.

4. A Draft EIR was prepared which analyzed project-related impacts in the following environmental issue areas: land use and relevant planning, aesthetics/light and glare, traffic and circulation, air quality, noise, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and drainage, public health and safety, and public services and utilities. Project alternatives, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative effects were also analyzed in the Draft EIR.

5. During the Draft EIR's public review period, which began on September 8, 2004 and concluded on October 22, 2004, the City of Loma Linda held a noticed public hearing on October 20, 2004 and April 20, 2005, regarding the Draft EIR. The public was afforded the opportunity to orally comment on the Draft EIR at the public hearing, and the decision-makers considered the testimony. Upon the close of the public review period, the Lead Agency proceeded to evaluate and prepare responses to all written comments received from both citizens and the public agency during the public review period.

6. The aforementioned comments and responses and other information consistent with the requirements of Section 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines, as amended, comprise the Final EIR. Following completion of the Response to Comments document, the Lead Agency's responses to the comments received from the public agencies were transmitted to those public agencies for consideration at least 10 days prior to the Final EIR's certification.

V. FINDINGS REGARDING IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IN THE INITIAL STUDY/NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The City of Loma Linda conducted an Initial Study in October 2002 and re-issued the NOP in April 2004, to determine significant effects of the projects. The City of Loma Linda finds that based on substantial evidence appearing in the Final EIR, Technical Appendices and in the administrative record, that the proposed projects would not have significant impacts in the following areas:

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The majority of the Project Area is agricultural, however the General Plan designation for the Project Area is Business and Research Park with Support Uses, Elementary School and Community Park. Development of this site is the natural result of the expansion of existing development to the north, east and west of the Project Area. The General Plan anticipates the development of this site and recognizes the loss of farmland as a result of urban development. The Project Area is not a part of the Williamson Act Land Contract and is not zoned for agricultural use. Therefore, there is no conflict with existing zoning or any Williamson Act contract provisions.

AIR RESOURCES

Commercial uses on-site may have the potential for creating odors. These emissions would be comparable to those anticipated with any type of commercial activity (e.g., food service activities). Some businesses, such as restaurants with exhaust vents, are considered "stationary point sources" and may be subject to further regulatory requirement above and beyond any requisite CEQA mitigation. While the emissions from these activities are common and not identified as being particularly hazardous, they may be subject to permitting requirements that call for the use of "best available control technology" in order to eliminate or reduce the levels of emissions. Any potential nuisance related to odor that may occur with these activities would be mitigated under the SCAQMD's permitting requirements. Therefore, impacts in this regard are considered less than significant.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The biological study conducted by Glenn Lukos Associates concluded that no federally protected wetlands occur on-site. Therefore, impacts in this regard are considered less than significant. There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the Project Area.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

An earthquake event on a local fault may trigger movement of earth or rock materials on slopes within the southern portion of Loma Linda, where slopes steeper than 25 degrees have a moderate to high susceptibility for earthquake-induced landslides. However, the Project Area consists of relatively flat topography and the surrounding areas are flat with no unusual geographic features. Impacts associated with landslides or mudslides are not anticipated.

The projects propose to install on-site sewer lines. It would not be necessary to install septic tanks or other alternative types of wastewater disposal systems. No significant impacts are anticipated in this regard.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The Loma Linda Emergency Operations Plan identifies the City's emergency planning, organization, and response policies and procedures. The purpose of Emergency Preparedness is to protect the health, safety and welfare of the general public during and after natural, man-made (technological), or attack-related emergencies. Such emergencies include flooding, high winds, earthquakes, other geologic hazards, hazardous material and attack-related incidents, and wildlife. Evacuation of the Project Area would be on California Street and Redlands Boulevard with easy access to I-10. The projects do not propose land uses or substantial alterations in the circulation system that would interfere with the established evacuation plan.

The Project Area is located outside the hazardous fire area as identified in the General Plan (City of Loma Linda General Plan, page 8-23). Additionally, the Project Area is surrounded by development with no potential of wildland fires reaching the site.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

There are no large bodies of open water located on or adjacent to the Project Area that may result in seiche or tsunami hazards. Hazards involving tsunamis, seiche, or mudflows are not expected to affect the development.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

The Project Area is surrounded by residential and commercial uses. In this regard, development of the proposed projects would provide unity to the area by extending the residential neighborhoods that already exist and providing commercial services to the residents in the area. Therefore, impacts in this regard are considered less than significant.

There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the subject property.

MINERAL RESOURCES

There are no mineral resources that would be of value located within the Project Area. It is further noted that no oil fields are located within a five-mile radius of the site. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

NOISE

The Project Area is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The Project Area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, implementation of the proposed projects would not expose people residing or working in the Project Area to excessive noise levels.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The proposed projects would not affect air traffic patterns and would not result in safety risks to air traffic.

Parking requirements for the projects would be subject to City standards and requirements, as well as any standards established in the Specific Plans. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

VI. FINDINGS REGARDING EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE INSIGNIFICANT OR LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT FOLLOWING PREPARATION OF THE FINAL EIR

The City of Loma Linda finds that based on substantial evidence appearing in the Final EIR, Technical Appendices and in the administrative record that the proposed projects would have less than significant impacts in the following areas:

LAND USE AND RELEVANT PLANNING

CITY OF LOMA LINDA ADOPTED GENERAL PLAN

IS 5.1-1 *The proposed projects would not conflict with the policies and goals contained in the City's Adopted General Plan. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. The City of Loma Linda identified goals and policies that are relevant to the proposed projects.

University Village

The University Village Specific Plan would be consistent with the relevant goals and policies based on the factors identified in the paragraphs below.

Goal 3: An identified objective of the University Village Project is to promote education and lifelong learning by establishing a link between the project and Loma Linda University Medical Center.

Goal 4: As evaluated in the Final EIR, the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans propose land uses that are compatible with each other, as well as with surrounding land uses. In addition, both Specific Plans detail not only the infrastructure (circulation, water, sewer, and storm drain) necessary to support the proposed development, but also the school site and parks that would be provided with the proposed projects. Thus, the City's goal of providing quality living would be furthered by the proposed projects.

Goal 5: Four parks would be provided throughout the University Village Project site, providing open space for passive and active recreational activities and preserving historical resources. Additionally, a network of open space areas linked by trails with smaller community parks would be provided. Garden courtyards would provide residents with private open space areas.

Goal 6: An identified objective of the University Village Project is to provide diverse housing opportunities responsive to local needs, incomes, and lifestyles, including for-sale, for-rent, market-rate and affordable products.

Policy 3(c): The University Village Specific Plan includes circulation design that would accommodate traffic, public safety, security, public transportation needs, and local foot

and bicycle traffic. The Specific Plan also includes conceptual infrastructure plans for water systems, sewer systems, drainage, and dry utilities. The infrastructure plans would ensure that there would be sufficient infrastructure to support the demand in services and utilities that would be created through implementation of the proposed projects.

Policy 5(b): Refer to the discussion of Goals 5 and 6.

Policy 5(c): Refer to the discussion of Goal 6.

Policies 6a, 6b and 6c: The University Village Project proposes a total of 1,769 dwelling units including 60 low-density units (1 to 4 dwelling units per acre), 276 medium-density units (5 to 10 dwelling units per acre) and 1,433 high-density units (11 to 20 dwelling units per acre). Refer also to the discussion of Goal 6.

Policy 7b: Refer to the discussion of Goal 6.

Policy 8a: The traffic impact analysis conducted for the University Village Project, per City of Loma Linda guidelines, shows no significant traffic impacts on intersections within the study area, including the freeway-street interchanges at Mountain View Avenue and California Street (refer to Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation).

Residential–Medium–Density: The University Village Project proposes 276 medium–density units (5 to 10 dwelling units per acre). Throughout the University Village Project site, homes would be oriented toward the Central Park, school and park, and the Community Park. Refer also to the discussion of Goals 5 and 6.

Residential–High–Density: The University Village Project proposes 1,433 high– density units (11 to 20 dwelling units per acre). The University Village Specific Plan establishes the type of land uses and development standards for each planning area. These Regulations create additional guidelines so that development of the mixed-use planned community would be cohesive in design. Refer also to the discussion of Goal 6.

Orchard Park

The Orchard Park Specific Plan would be consistent with the relevant goals and policies based on the factors identified in the paragraphs below.

Goal 3: The City's goal of development with a "consciousness of the importance of education" would be supported by the Orchard Park Specific Plan. Approximately 2.3 acres located in Planning Area 12, would be dedicated for park space next to the elementary school site within University Village. Bicycle and pedestrian trails would be placed throughout the project site to link the residential areas with the school.

Goal 4: Refer to the University Village Goal 4 discussion.

Goal 5: There would be two five-acre "floating parks," one within each of the two single-family residential planning areas (Planning Areas 9 and 10). The neighborhood floating

parks would accommodate passive and active recreation uses, and would be available for use by the Orchard Park Community and the entire City of Loma Linda. Pocket parks would also be incorporated within the housing development to give residents open space opportunities. Bicycle and pedestrian trails would be placed throughout the project site, linking the various areas.

Goal 6: The Orchard Park Project would offer a variety of housing choices, so that the young and old, singles and families, and those of varying economic ability may find places to live. Refer to Table 3-2, Proposed Uses for Orchard Park, which outlines the proposed residential land uses and their corresponding densities.

Policy 3(c): Refer to the University Village Policy 3(c) discussion. Also, Planning Areas 1 and 2 within Orchard Park would incorporate approximately 23 acres of local service and retail uses at the Redlands Boulevard/California Street intersection.

Policy 5(b): Refer to the discussion of Goals 5 and 6.

Policy 5(c): Refer to the discussion of Goal 6.

Policies 6a, 6b and 6c: The Orchard Park Project proposes a total of 1,259 dwelling units, including 276 medium-density units (5 to 10 dwelling units per acre) and 983 high-density units (11 to 20 dwelling units per acre). Refer also to the discussion of Goal 6.

Policy 7b: Refer to the discussion of Goal 6.

Policy 8a: Refer to the University Village Policy 8a discussion.

The Orchard Park Specific Plan would be consistent with the established land use distribution and standards of the Land Use Element of the adopted General Plan, based on the following factors:

Residential–Medium–Density: The Orchard Park Project proposes 276 medium-density units (5 to 10 dwelling units per acre), incorporating conveniently located neighborhood parks, trails, and open space. Refer also to the discussion of Goals 5 and 6.

Residential–High–Density: The Orchard Park Project proposes 983 high- density units (11 to 20 dwelling units per acre). The Orchard Park Specific Plan establishes the type of land uses and development standards for each planning area. The intent of the regulations is to provide a level of standard for development that is compatible with the character of the area and enhances the integrity of the overall community design.

As the analysis demonstrates, the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would be consistent with the goals, policies, and land use distribution and density/intensity of the adopted General Plan.

CITY OF LOMA LINDA DRAFT GENERAL PLAN

IS 5.1-2 *The proposed projects would not conflict with the policies and goals contained in the City's Draft General Plan. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. As illustrated in Table 5.1-2, *University Village/Orchard Park Consistency with the City of Loma Linda General Plan*, of the Final EIR, the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would be consistent with the General Plan policies regarding Land Use, Community Design, Noise, Economic Development, Housing, Transportation/Circulation, Public Services and Facilities, Conservation and Open Space and Public Health and Safety.

CITY OF LOMA LINDA ZONING CODE

IS 5.1-3 *The proposed projects would not conflict with the City's Zoning Ordinance. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. Upon adoption of the Draft General Plan, the Project Area will be zoned Planned Community District (PC). Analysis has concluded that the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would not conflict with the land use plan, policies, and regulations of the City of Loma Linda Zoning Ordinance. Further, in consideration of the existing on-site and surrounding uses, the existing and proposed buffers, the proposed setbacks and landscape treatments, as well as the distances separating existing and proposed land uses, the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would not result in significant land use impacts to adjacent residential uses. Less than significant impacts are anticipated in this regard with adoption of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and the requirement that all future development be in compliance with the specified guidelines and standards/regulations.

REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE LOMA LINDA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

IS 5.1-4 *The proposed projects would not conflict with the goals of the Loma Linda Redevelopment Plan. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. The University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would work to accomplish the redevelopment goals and would therefore be consistent with the Redevelopment Plan. The proposed projects would enhance the aesthetic value of the Project Area while providing additional employment opportunities and affordable housing for the area. Therefore, the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would be consistent with the goals of the Redevelopment Plan and impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

IS 5.1-6 *The proposed projects, combined with other future development, could increase the intensity of land uses in the area. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. Development of the Project Area as proposed would not result in any cumulative significant land use impacts, because other projects would be implemented in the area. To preclude potential land use compatibility issues and planning policy conflicts, each proposed project would undergo the same project review process as the proposed projects. It is assumed that cumulative development would progress in accordance with the criteria of the jurisdiction within which the cumulative project is located. Each project would be analyzed independent of other land uses, as well as within the context of existing and planned developments, to ensure that the goals, objectives and policies of the General Plan are consistently upheld.

NOISE

LONG-TERM (MOBILE) NOISE IMPACTS

IS 5.5-2 *The proposed projects would generate additional vehicular travel on the surrounding roadway network, thereby resulting in noise level increases. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. An increase of 5 A-weighted decibels (dBA) or greater in noise levels occurring from project-related activities would be significant when the "No Project" noise level is below 65 dBA. Additionally, an increase of 3 dBA or greater in noise levels occurring from project-related activities would be significant when the "No Project" noise level is above 65 dBA.

Under the "2025 With Projects" scenario, noise levels at a distance of 100 feet from centerline would range from approximately 56 to 69 dBA. The highest noise increase would occur along California Street, between Mission Road and Barton Road, which would have a noise increase of 3.0 dBA. Under the "2025 Without Projects Scenario," noise on this roadway segment would be 59.1 dBA at 100 feet from the roadway centerline.

Since the largest traffic noise increase due to project-related traffic is 3.0 dBA (along California Street) where the traffic noise level without the projects is 59.1 dBA (less than 65 dBA), a less than significant impact would occur as a result of implementation of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

IMPACTS ON WILDLIFE MOVEMENTS

IS 5.6-3 *The proposed projects would impact native habitat. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. No drainages or ridgelines exist on the Project Area to serve as local travel routes for wildlife. The only native habitat on-site, oak woodland, was derived from historic plantings for a windrow and does not constitute an important refuge for wildlife species adapted to this vegetation type. No connection exists to either naturally occurring or planted oak woodland off the Project Area. Other on-site habitats consist of non-native vegetation and offer little value to native wildlife species.

Because the Project Area is surrounded by agricultural fields, orchards and both low- and high-density development, there are no defined corridors of wildlife movement. Although construction of the proposed projects would contribute to habitat fragmentation in the vicinity, the proposed projects would not substantially deter wildlife movement within the Project Area because of the already high degree of disturbance and development surrounding the Project Area. Therefore, impacts on wildlife movement and habitat fragmentation are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

IS 5.6-5 *The proposed projects, combined with cumulative projects, may impact the area's biological resources. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. When viewed in conjunction with other major developments planned within the project vicinity, the loss of coast live oak trees and raptor-nesting habitat could be considered an adverse cumulative effect. Potential impacts would be site-specific and an evaluation of potential impacts would be conducted on a project-by-project basis. Each incremental development would be required to comply with all applicable State, Federal and City regulations concerning the preservation of biological resources. In consideration of these regulations, potential cumulative impacts upon biological resources would not be considered significant.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

IS 5.7-4 *The proposed projects, combined with cumulative projects, may adversely affect cultural resources. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. Potential impacts would be site-specific and an evaluation of potential impacts would be conducted on a project-by-project basis. This would be especially true of those developments located in areas that contain prehistoric archaeological/historical resources. Each incremental development would be required to comply with all applicable State, Federal and City regulations concerning preservation, salvage, or handling of cultural resources. In consideration of these regulations, potential cumulative impacts on cultural resources would not be considered significant.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

IS 5.8-3 *The proposed projects, combined with future development, may result in an increase in development areas that would be affected by geologic impacts. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. Cumulative effects related to geology resulting from implementation of the proposed projects and development in the vicinity of the surrounding areas could expose more persons and property to potential impacts because of adverse soil conditions and seismic activity. However, seismic impacts on the Project Area and surrounding vicinity are limited to the ground shaking potential due to the moderate seismic activity in the area. In addition, adverse soil conditions would be mitigated to a less than significant level on a project-by-project basis. Therefore, the cumulative effects of development within the project vicinity related to geologic conditions would be mitigated to a less than significant level.

HYDROLOGY AND DRAINAGE

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

IS 5.9-5 *The proposed projects along with other future development may result in increased hydrology and drainage impacts in the area. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. Development projects have the potential to increase runoff flows and volumes at a site because of the increase of impervious area. The proposed projects would improve hydrologic conditions in the area, and other projects in the vicinity would be reviewed by local and regional jurisdictions regarding project approvals. Therefore, the proposed projects would not by themselves, or in combination with other reasonably foreseeable projects, cause a significant impact on water quality. The proposed projects would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact on water quality.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

EMERGENCY OPERATIONS PLAN

IS 5.10-4 *The proposed projects could impair or physically interfere with an adopted response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. The proposed development of commercial, institutional, residential and recreational uses and would not impair or physically interfere with the City's Emergency Operations Plan. The Plan does not identify any emergency access routes; however, Redlands Boulevard is a major arterial through the City and therefore would be considered a major exit route. Additionally, it is anticipated that traffic flow would be temporarily impacted along Redlands Boulevard, California Street and Mission Road during construction of the proposed projects. Any street closures or temporary obstruction would be subject to all emergency access standards and requirements, and/or reviewed by the City and County Fire Department, and would thus reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

IS 5.10-5 *The proposed projects, in combination with other cumulative projects, could increase exposure to the public of hazardous substances. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. Compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations would ensure that potential contamination or exposure to hazardous substances is avoided or controlled to minimize the risk to the public on a case-by-case basis, as the cumulative projects are constructed.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

POLICE SERVICES

IS 5.11-2 *The proposed projects may result in significant physical impacts with respect to police protection. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. Currently, the deputy to citizen ratio is 1:2,483 persons. In order to maintain this ratio, implementation of the University Village Specific Plan would require an additional 1.78 deputies and the Orchard Park Specific Plan would require an additional 1.27 deputies. Overall, three Deputy Sheriffs would need to be added to the current deployment (with full buildout of the proposed projects). The proposed projects would require additional patrol vehicles to accommodate the addition of deputies, as well as, additional supervision and other services as needed. Assuming the three Deputy

sheriffs would have rotating shifts, the existing facility would be able to accommodate the increase of three Deputy Sheriffs. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be considered less than significant.

SCHOOL

IS 5.11-3 *The proposed projects could result in significant physical impacts to existing school facilities. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. Based upon student generation rates provided by the Redlands Unified School District (RUSD), the proposed projects would involve a net increase of 913 students into the RUSD. The new middle school that is anticipated to open for the 2004/2005 school year and development of a new high school in 2008 would provide enough capacity within the RUSD to accommodate the increase in middle school within the Project Area and high school students as a result of implementation of the proposed projects. In addition, the RUSD's plans to either build a new elementary school or redevelop the Mission School would provide adequate capacity for the increase in elementary students associated with the proposed projects. Finally, all future development in the University Village and Orchard Park Project sites would be subject to Level 1, School Impact Fees, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

LIBRARY

IS 5.11-4 *The proposed projects may increase the demand for library facilities and may contribute to an existing need for construction of new facilities or alteration of existing facilities. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. Expansion of the Loma Linda Library is anticipated to be completed by 2007. Development of the expanded library facilities would be sufficient to accommodate the approximate 7,573 person increase as a result of development of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans, which would require an additional 3,030 square feet. Therefore, the Loma Linda Library would have sufficient capacity upon buildout of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans, resulting in less than significant impacts in this regard.

ELECTRICITY

IS 5.11-9 *The proposed projects would result in an increase in the demand for electrical service beyond existing conditions and may require expansion of the existing electrical system. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. Implementation of the proposed projects would result in an increased demand for electricity service to the Project Area. Although total system demand is expected to increase annually, Southern California Edison (SCE) has indicated that their plans for new distribution resources would be adequate to serve all customer loads in accordance with SCE rules and tariffs. SCE has advised that electrical loads resulting from implementation of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would be within the parameters of projected load growth that SCE is planning to meet in the area. Upon project implementation, the developers would be required to underground all electric lines in accordance with Sections 17.06.060 of the Loma Linda Municipal Code. Significant impacts regarding electrical service are not anticipated.

NATURAL GAS

IS 5.11-10 *The proposed projects would result in an increase in the demand for natural gas service beyond existing conditions and may require expansion of the existing gas system. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. Implementation of the proposed projects may result in an increased demand for natural gas service to the Project Area. According to Southern California Gas (SCG), there are no known existing service deficiencies at the present capacity, including the Project Area and adjacent areas. SCG does not anticipate any project-related or cumulative impacts to the natural gas provisions or gas facilities in the service area. In addition, SCG does not anticipate any construction related impacts to the service area as a result of project implementation. Implementation of the proposed projects would not result in a significant impact with respect to natural gas services, as it would not significantly impact SCG's system capacity or ability to provide service.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

IS 5.11-11 *The proposed projects, combined with future development, would result in an increase in the demand for public services and an increase in the consumption rates for public utilities, potentially requiring expansions of the existing utility systems. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Facts Supporting Finding. The proposed projects would cumulatively contribute to an increased demand for fire, schools, library, water, sewer, solid waste and energy utilities. The proposed projects and cumulative projects would add to the cumulative demand for such services through the introduction of new residents and patrons of the proposed facilities. The proposed projects are located in an area that is easily served by all utilities (i.e. water, sewer and storm drains) due to the developed nature of the surrounding area and other public services (i.e., police, fire, schools and solid waste). All of these existing facilities can be readily extended into the area to serve proposed development. All projects would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code

and other reviewing agencies requirements, ensuring impacts to fire protection, schools, parks and recreation, solid waste, water, wastewater and electric facilities would be reduced to a less than significant level. In addition, mitigation measures would be required of all projects to ensure that impacts to public services and utilities would be less than significant.

VII. FINDINGS REGARDING EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE MITIGATED TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVELS

The City of Loma Linda having reviewed and considered the information contained of the Final EIR, the Technical Appendices and the administrative record, finds, pursuant to California Public Resources Code 21081 (a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines 15091 (a)(1) that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed projects which would mitigate, avoid, or substantially lessen to below a level of significance the potentially significant environmental effects identified of the Final EIR in the following categories: Aesthetics/Light and Glare, Traffic and Circulation, Noise, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Drainage, Public Health and Safety, and Public Services and Utilities.

The potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of the projects that can be mitigated are listed below. As described in more detail below, and based on the information contained of the Final EIR, the Technical Appendices and the administrative record, the City of Loma Linda finds that the following potentially significant adverse impacts can be mitigated to a level that is considered less than significant after implementation of mitigation measures identified below.

AESTHETICS/LIGHT AND GLARE

SHORT-TERM (CONSTRUCTION) AESTHETIC AND LIGHT AND GLARE IMPACTS

IS 5.2-1 *The proposed projects would result in grading and construction activities, which would temporarily alter the existing visual character and quality of the Project Area and the surrounding area and may introduce new sources of light/glare. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Project construction activities would alter views across portions of the Project Area from surrounding locations. With implementation of the recommended mitigation pertaining to equipment staging areas and the use of screening, impacts in this regard are concluded to be less than significant. Further, construction-related activities are not considered significant, as they are anticipated to be short-term.

Short-term light and glare impacts associated with construction activity would likely be limited to nighttime lighting necessary for security purposes. Nighttime and security construction lighting could impact the residents located south along Mission Road and the multifamily residents east of the University Village Project site. Although this is considered a short-term impact, mitigation is identified to reduce the significance of impact.

Mitigation Measures 5.2-1a and 5.2-1b of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.2-1a Construction equipment staging areas shall be located away from existing residential uses and appropriate screening (i.e., temporary fencing with opaque material), shall be used to buffer views of construction equipment and material, when feasible. Staging location shall be indicated on project Final Development Plans and Grading Plans.

MM 5.2-1b All construction-related lighting shall be located and aimed away from adjacent residential areas and consist of the minimal wattage necessary to provide safety at the construction site. A construction safety lighting plan shall be submitted to the City for review concurrent with Grading Permit applications for the subdivision of the lots.

LONG-TERM LIGHT AND GLARE

IS 5.2-3 *The proposed projects would create a new source of light/glare, which may affect day and/or nighttime views in the area. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Project implementation would result in increased utilization of the property with development of the Project Area with commercial, institutional, mixed use and residential uses. The proposed uses would require lighting of building interior and exterior spaces (i.e., entryways and signs). In addition, the proposed projects would include lighting for activity areas involving nighttime uses, parking, lighting around the structures (security lighting, walkways) and lighting for interiors of buildings. Light sources from on-site commercial, institutional, mixed-use and residential uses have the potential to have a significant impact on adjacent residential areas and roadways. Recommended mitigation, which includes providing low-intensity lighting that is shielded from adjacent sensitive receptors, would reduce light and glare impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures 5.2-3a through 5.2-3c of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.2-3a All exterior lighting shall be designed and located as to avoid intrusive effects on adjacent residential properties and undeveloped areas adjacent to the project site. Low-intensity street lighting and low-intensity exterior lighting shall be used throughout the development to the extent feasible. Lighting fixtures shall use shielding, if necessary to prevent spill lighting on adjacent off-site uses.

MM 5.2-3b Development projects shall use minimally reflective glass and all other materials used on exterior buildings and structures shall be selected with attention to minimizing reflective glare.

MM 5.2-3c Landscaped buffers shall be used to reduce light intrusion on residential developments located adjacent to the Project Area.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

TRAFFIC GENERATION – UNIVERSITY VILLAGE

IS 5.3-1 *The proposed projects would cause a significant increase in traffic when compared to the traffic capacity of the street system and would exceed an established LOS standard. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village Specific Plan and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. The proposed University Village Specific Plan is forecast to generate approximately 18,531 daily trips, which includes approximately 1,104 AM peak-hour trips and approximately 1,740 PM peak-hour trips. Based on the level of service (LOS) thresholds of significance for each jurisdiction, the addition of project-generated trips is forecast to result in a significant impact under forecast year 2009 with project conditions at Mountain View/Mission (AM peak-hour). To lessen the project's impact at the Mountain View/Mission intersection under forecast year 2009 with project peak-hour conditions, mitigation is recommended.

With the addition of project-generated trips, the following ten intersections forecast to operate at a deficient LOS under forecast Year 2009 without project conditions would, under forecast Year 2009 with project conditions, continue to operate at a deficient LOS and would have an incremental increase in delay due to the projects:

- Waterman/I-215 (PM peak-hour);
- Waterman/Washington (PM peak-hour);
- Tippecanoe/I-10 WB (PM peak-hour);
- Mountain View/I-10 WB (AM peak-hour);
- Mountain View/I-10 EB (AM and PM peak-hours);
- Mountain View/Mission (PM peak-hour);

- California/Redlands (AM and PM peak-hours);
- California/Mission (AM peak-hour only);
- Alabama/I-10 WB (AM and PM peak-hours); and
- Alabama/Redlands (PM peak-hour).

Thus, at its opening year in 2009, the University Village Specific Plan would contribute additional traffic to these deficient intersections; however, the proposed project would not cause the intersections listed above to worsen from an acceptable to an unacceptable level. Assuming implementation of the necessary improvements, all intersections for forecast year 2009 with project conditions would operate at an acceptable LOS based on the LOS criteria for each jurisdiction. The University Village Specific Plan would be required to contribute its fair-share to implementation of the improvements to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures 5.3-1a and 5.3-1b of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.3-1a The University Village Project shall contribute towards the cost of recommended mitigation (refer to Table 5.3-7) on a fair-share basis as outlined in Table 5.3-9, *Fair-Share Responsibility – Study Intersections*.

MM 5.3-1b The University Village Project shall contribute towards the cost of necessary improvements (refer to Table 5.3-10) on a fair-share basis as outlined in Table 5.3-9, *Fair-Share Responsibility – Study Intersection*.

TRAFFIC GENERATION – ORCHARD PARK

IS 5.3-2 *The proposed projects would cause a significant increase in traffic when compared to the traffic capacity of the street system and would exceed an established LOS standard. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the Orchard Park Specific Plan and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. The proposed Orchard Park Specific Plan is forecast to generate approximately 41,122 daily trips, which includes approximately 1,382 AM peak-hour trips and approximately 2,732 PM peak-hour trips. Based on the LOS thresholds of significance for each jurisdiction, the addition of project-generated trips is forecast to result in a significant impact under forecast year 2015 with project conditions at the following four intersections:

- Waterman / I-215 On-ramp (AM peak hour);

- University / Barton (PM peak hour);
- California / Mission (PM peak hour); and
- California / Barton (PM peak hour).

Assuming implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the project's traffic impact at the mitigated intersections is reduced to a less than significant level for forecast year 2015 with project conditions.

With the addition of project-generated trips, the following 15 intersections that are forecast to operate at a deficient LOS under forecast Year 2015 without project conditions would continue to operate at a deficient LOS under forecast Year 2015 with project conditions, and would have an incremental increase in delay due to the project:

- Waterman/I-215 (PM peak hour);
- Waterman/Redlands (PM peak hour);
- Waterman/Washington (PM peak hour);
- Tippecanoe/I-10 WB (PM peak hour);
- Anderson/I-10 EB (PM peak hour);
- Mountain View/I-10 WB (AM and PM peak hours);
- Mountain View/I-10 EB (AM and PM peak hours);
- Mountain View/Mission (PM peak hour);
- California/I-10 WB (PM peak hour);
- California/I-10 EB (AM and PM peak hours);
- California/Redlands (AM and PM peak hours);
- California/Mission (AM peak hour);
- Tippecanoe/San Bernardino (PM peak hour);
- Alabama/I-10 WB (AM and PM peak hours); and
- Alabama/Redlands (PM peak hour).

Thus, at its opening year in 2015, the Orchard Park Specific Plan would contribute additional traffic to the deficient intersections listed above; however, the proposed

project would not cause these intersections to worsen from an acceptable to an unacceptable level. Assuming implementation of the necessary improvements, all intersections for forecast year 2015 with project conditions would operate at an acceptable LOS based on the LOS criteria for each jurisdiction

Mitigation Measures 5.3-2a and 5.3-2b of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.3-2a The Orchard Park Project shall contribute towards the cost of recommended mitigation (refer to Table 5.3-12) on a fair-share basis as outlined in Table 5.3-9, *Fair-Share Responsibility – Study Intersections*.

MM 5.3-2b The Orchard Park Project shall contribute towards the cost of necessary improvements (refer to Table 5.3-14) on a fair-share basis as outlined in Table 5.3-9, *Fair-Share Responsibility – Study Intersections*.

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP) ANALYSIS

IS 5.3-3 *The proposed projects would not exceed standards established by the San Bernardino County CMP. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding.

University Village

The addition of project-generated trips at the CMP study segments would contribute additional traffic to existing deficient freeway segments; however, the proposed project would not cause these segments to worsen from an acceptable to an unacceptable level. Although freeway segment improvements are not identified for the interim years (2009 and 2025), the University Village Project would be required to contribute its fair-share to implementation of necessary freeway improvements identified for 2025 with University Village and Orchard Park conditions.

Orchard Park

The addition of project-generated trips at the CMP study segments would contribute additional traffic to existing deficient freeway segments; however, the project would not cause these segments to worsen from an acceptable to an unacceptable level. Although freeway segment improvements are not identified for the interim years (2009 and 2025), the Orchard Park Project would be required to contribute its fair-share to implementation of necessary freeway improvements identified for 2025 with University Village and Orchard Park conditions.

Mitigation Measure 5.3-3 of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measure is as follows:

MM 5.3-3 The University Village and Orchard Park Projects shall contribute towards the cost of necessary improvements to freeway segments on a fair-share basis as outlined in Table 5.3-22, *Forecast Year 2025 Freeway Segment Improvements and Fair-Share Responsibility*.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

IS 5.3-4 *The proposed projects would cause a cumulatively significant increase in traffic when compared to the traffic capacity of the street system and would exceed an established LOS standard. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. The proposed University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans are forecast to generate approximately 59,653 daily trips, which includes approximately 2,486 AM peak-hour trips and approximately 5,567 PM peak-hour trips.

Based on the LOS thresholds of significance for each jurisdiction, the addition of project-generated trips is forecast to result in a significant impact under forecast year 2025 with project conditions at the following four intersections:

- Waterman/I-215 On-ramp (AM peak hour);
- Waterman/Redlands (AM peak hour);
- Mountain View/Redlands (PM peak hour); and
- Mountain View/Mission (AM peak hour).

Assuming implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the projects' traffic impact at the mitigated intersections is reduced to a less than significant level for forecast year 2025 with project conditions.

With the addition of project-generated trips, the following 18 intersections that are forecast to operate at a deficient LOS under forecast Year 2025 without project conditions would continue to operate at a deficient LOS under forecast Year 2025 with project conditions, an incremental increase in delay due to the projects:

- Waterman/I-215 (PM peak hour);

- Waterman/Redlands (PM peak hour);
- Waterman/Washington (AM and PM peak hours);
- University/Barton (PM peak hour);
- Tippecanoe/I-10 WB (PM peak hour);
- Anderson/I-10 EB (PM peak hour);
- Mountain View/I-10 WB (AM and PM peak hours);
- Mountain View/I-10 EB (AM and PM peak hours);
- Mountain View/Mission (PM peak hour);
- California/I-10 WB (AM and PM peak hours);
- California/I-10 EB (AM and PM peak hours);
- California/Redlands (AM and PM peak hours);
- California/Mission (AM and PM peak hours);
- California/Barton (PM peak hour);
- Tippecanoe/San Bernardino (PM peak hour);
- Alabama/San Bernardino (PM peak-hour);
- Alabama/I-10 WB (AM and PM peak hours); and
- Alabama/Redlands (PM peak hour).

Thus, at their opening year in 2025, the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would contribute additional traffic to these deficient intersections. However, the Specific Plans would not cause these intersections to worsen from an acceptable to an unacceptable level. Assuming implementation of the necessary improvements, all intersections for forecast year 2025 with projects conditions would operate at an acceptable LOS based on the LOS criteria for each jurisdiction.

Mitigation Measures 5.3-4a and 5.3-4b of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.3-4a The University Village and Orchard Park Projects shall contribute towards the cost of recommended mitigation (refer to Table 5.3-18) on a fair-share

basis as outlined in Table 5.3-9, *Fair-Share Responsibility – Study Intersections*.

MM 5.3-4b The University Village and Orchard Park Projects shall contribute towards the cost of necessary improvements (refer to Table 5.3-20) on a fair-share basis as outlined in Table 5.3-9, *Fair-Share Responsibility – Study Intersections*.

CUMULATIVE CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP) ANALYSIS

IS 5.3-5 *The proposed projects would not cumulatively exceed standards established by the San Bernardino County CMP. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. The addition of project-generated trips at the CMP study segments would contribute additional traffic to existing deficient freeway segments; however, the projects would not cause these segments to worsen from an acceptable to an unacceptable level. To lessen the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans' impact at the study segments under forecast year 2025 with projects conditions, necessary improvements are recommended consisting of the addition of one or more general mixed-flow lanes, or the addition of a high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane or a combination of both as identified in Table 5.3-22, *Forecast Year 2025 Freeway Segment Improvements and Fair-Share Responsibility*, of the Final EIR.

Assuming implementation of the necessary improvements, all CMP study segments for forecast year 2025 with projects conditions would operate at an acceptable LOS based on CMP LOS criteria. The University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would be required to contribute their fair-share to implementation of improvements.

Mitigation Measure 5.3-5 of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measure is as follows:

MM 5.3-5 The University Village and Orchard Park Projects shall contribute towards the cost of necessary improvements (refer to Table 5.3-22) to freeway segments on a fair-share basis as outlined in Table 5.3-22.

NOISE

LONG-TERM (STATIONARY) NOISE IMPACTS

IS 5.5-3 *The proposed projects would result in the generation of on-site noise associated with commercial activities that include loading/unloading*

activities, mechanical equipment and activities occurring in parking lots. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Noise typically associated with operation activities of commercial uses would be generated by the following sources:

- Mechanical equipment (air conditioners, trash compactors, emergency generators, etc.);
- Slow-moving delivery trucks traveling on the site, to and from loading docks;
- Loading docks;
- Typical parking lot activities;
- Landscape maintenance; and
- Parks, recreation areas, and playgrounds.

Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance and recommended mitigation would reduce stationary noise impacts to a less than significant level. With the preparation of a noise analysis and adherence to the recommended mitigation measures, long-term stationary noise impacts generated within the Project Area would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures 5.5-3a through 5.5-3c of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.5-3a Prior to Building Permit issuance, subsequent noise assessments shall be prepared, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Services, which demonstrates that the site placement of stationary noise sources would not exceed criteria established in the City of Loma Linda Noise Ordinance. The analysis shall verify that loading dock facilities, rooftop equipment, trash compactors and other stationary noise sources are adequately shielded and/or located at an adequate distance from residential areas in order to comply with the City's noise standards.

MM 5.5-3b Directional speakers shall be shielded and/or oriented away from off-site residences to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Services.

MM 5.5-3c Walls shall be provided along the western border of Planning Area C of the University Village project site, which shall be of sufficient height (at

least 6 feet) to mitigate noise and light/glare impacts on the adjacent single-family and multi-family residential communities, located west of the Project Area.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

IMPACTS ON PLANT AND VEGETATION TYPES AND WILDLIFE SPECIES

IS 5.6-1 *The proposed projects would impact plant and vegetation types and wildlife species within the Project Area. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding.

Plant and Vegetation Types

A total of six plant and vegetation types were identified within the Project Area, including mule fat scrub, coast live oak woodland, non-native grassland, agriculture, agriculture/non-native grassland and ornamental landscaping. A total of 305.99 acres of native and non-native vegetation types, including urban areas, would be impacted by the proposed projects.

Impacts to mule fat scrub would be considered adverse, but not significant because of the relatively small amount of this vegetation type impacted relative to the distribution of this vegetation type in southern California. Therefore, no mitigation would be necessary under CEQA. Impacts on coast live oak woodland would be considered significant because the resource agencies (California Department of Fish and Game [CDFG] and United States Fish and Wildlife Services [USFWS]) consider oak woodland to be an important wildlife resource. Impacts to oak trees would be mitigated to below a level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measure. Impacts on non-native grassland, agriculture, agriculture/non-native grassland and ornamental landscaping are concluded to be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.6-1g.

Wildlife Species

Results of the general wildlife survey indicate that the Project Area does not support fish, amphibians, or reptiles due to the lack of suitable habitat. A total of 13 resident birds were observed in the Project Area along with two birds of prey. Because of the coast live oak tree located within the Project Area, the red-shouldered hawk, barn owl and great horned owl are also expected to occur in the Project Area. A total of nine mammals (ranging from ground- dwelling to larger mammals) were identified during the

general wildlife survey, including three types of bats. Construction of the proposed projects would result in the loss of approximately 2.60 acres of native habitat on the University Village Project Site and 0.36 acres of native habitat on the Orchard Park Project Site. Direct impacts on the Project Area would be less than significant, because they would not significantly reduce wildlife populations in the region. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures 5.6-1a through 5.6-1p of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.6-1a Prior to grading, orange snow fencing shall be installed around trees (outside the dripline) that would not be impacted by construction. Fencing shall be in place and inspected by the project biologist prior to commencement of grading. This fencing shall remain in place throughout construction in the vicinity of the fenced trees until the projects' biologist determines that the fences can be removed without placing the trees in jeopardy of damage from construction.

MM 5.6-1b Mitigation shall include relocation of impacted oak trees at a minimum replacement ratio of 3:1. All trees shall be located within the approximately 23.6 acres of park/open space provided within the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans. A mitigation plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist prior to issuance of grading plans that includes a five year maintenance program for relocated trees.

MM 5.6-1c Recommendations regarding the need for planting amendments and drainage system shall be based on soil tests of the projects and approved by the City.

MM 5.6-1d Any City approved work within the driplines of saved trees, including branch removal, shall be under the inspection of a qualified arborist.

MM 5.6-1e Landscaping requiring irrigation shall not be planted within the dripline of oaks because of the susceptibility of native oaks to root rot caused by excessive unseasonable irrigation. The design and installation of landscape irrigation systems outside the dripline of the oaks shall be such that the area within the dripline is not wetted during operation of the system. In addition, surface runoff from impermeable surfaces shall be directed away from oaks; where natural topography has been altered, provisions shall be made for drainage away from trunks of oaks so that water shall not pond or collect within the dripline of any oak.

MM 5.6-1f The Applicant and its contractors shall comply with the City of Loma Linda Heritage Tree Ordinance.

MM 5.6-1g All work performed within the protected zone of any oak tree on-site shall be monitored by a qualified arborist, at all times throughout the proposed project.

MM 5.6-1h The oak trees identified as transplants shall be professionally "boxed" and relocated on-site in the designated final location. A qualified tree transplanting contractor shall perform the relocations. Each tree proposed for transplanting shall remain side-boxed for a period of time recommended by a qualified arborist (but no less than 90 days) before being under-cut and relocated to the final transplant location.

MM 5.6-1i The Applicant shall be required to provide mitigation for the relocated oak trees for a period of five years. Mitigation shall include proper maintenance (as recommended by the projects' arborist), monthly reports, documentation and photos. All transplanted oak trees shall be in good health and receive an acceptable condition rating before being accepted for final approval of mitigation.

MM 5.6-1j The applicant shall be required to submit bi-annual reports on the status of all encroachment oaks and all mitigation oaks for a period of five years. Reports shall include status documentation and photos of each tree. All documentation shall correspond with the appropriate photo. Where feasible, group photos of mitigated oak trees may be submitted.

MM 5.6-1k The Applicant and its contractors shall be required to professionally box the oak trees proposed for relocation in the largest box possible, or as recommended by the projects' arborist. All box sizes shall be approved by the City Oak Tree Specialist. All necessary root pruning that is required for side-boxing and under-cutting on proposed relocated oak trees shall be completed during the optimal time and conditions as recommended by the project arborist and shall be monitored by the projects' arborist. Side-pruning during any spring or summer months will not be permitted unless waived by the City Oak Tree Specialist.

MM 5.6-1l All transplanted oak trees shall have a 3-inch layer of natural organic woodchips installed under the tree's canopy once the tree has been planted in its permanent location. At no time shall the planting of any form of vegetation, regardless of native or non-native material, be permitted within the protected zone of the tree unless waived by the City Oak Tree Specialist.

MM 5.6-1m All transplanted oak trees and replacement oak trees shall be irrigated with approved irrigation systems separate from all other landscape around the oak trees. At no time shall any oak tree on-site have spray-type irrigation within the protected zone of the tree. Irrigation under any oak tree shall consist of drip- or bubbler-type irrigation only. Irrigation for all mitigation oak trees and relocated oak trees shall be shut off once the trees root system has been established or re-established (transplants). Irrigation shall remain in working condition for supplemental water during drought conditions. All irrigation shall be approved by the City Oak Tree Specialist.

MM 5.6-1n Prior to grading permit approval, the Applicant shall be required to post a bond for the entire International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) dollar amount for all oak trees proposed for relocation. Upon completion of the required five-year mitigation and final approval of the said project, the entire dollar amount of the bond shall then be returned to the Applicant.

MM 5.6-1o No construction debris, building materials, equipment, or vehicles shall be placed or stored within the protected zone of any oak tree at any time. At no time shall the cleaning of tools, rinsing of concrete, or any other contaminants be permitted to enter the soil within the protected zone of any oak tree.

MM 5.6-1p Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Area shall be inspected by the Vector Control Program of the County of San Bernardino Department of Health Services (DEHS), in order to determine whether any vermin, vectors, or pests are present, which may cause a health hazard or nuisance once grading begins. If it is determined that such an outcome is possible, the Applicant shall engage an environmental management or pest control company to control the problem before grading. Once this is completed, a report shall be provided to the Vector Control Program who will provide a vector clearance permit to the City of Loma Linda Community Development Department.

IMPACTS ON SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES

IS 5.6-2 *The proposed projects would impact special-status species located within the Project Area. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Development of the University Village Project Site would impact 2.13 acres of coast live oak woodland and development of the Orchard Park Project Site would impact 0.12 acres of coast live oak woodland. However, impacts on oak trees would be mitigated to below a level of significance with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 5.6-1a through MM 5.6-1o.

Impacts on any active raptor nest (common or special-status species) would be considered a violation of the California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513. Therefore, any impact on the nest of a raptor species would be significant. Potential impacts on raptor nesting would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measures 5.6-2a and 5.6-2b of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.6-2a Thirty days prior to the onset of construction activities, a qualified biologist shall survey within the limits of project disturbance for the presence of any active raptor nests. Any nest found during survey efforts shall be mapped on the construction plans. If no active nests are found, no further mitigation shall be required. Results of the surveys shall be provided to the CDFG.

MM 5.6-2b If nesting activity is present at any raptor nest site, the active site shall be protected until nesting activity has ended to ensure compliance with Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code. Nesting activity for raptors in the region of the Project Area normally occurs from February 1 to June 30. To protect any nest site, the following restrictions on construction are required between February 1 and June 30 (or until nests are no longer active, as determined by a qualified biologist):

- Clearing limits shall be established at a minimum of 300 feet in any direction from any occupied nest (or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the monitoring biologist);
- Access and surveying shall not be allowed within 100 feet of any occupied nest (or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the monitoring biologist). Any encroachment into the 300/100 foot buffer area around the known nest shall be allowed only if it is determined by a qualified biologist that the proposed activity will not disturb the nest occupants; and
- Construction during the non-nesting season can occur at the sites only if a qualified biologist has determined that fledglings have left the nest.

INDIRECT IMPACTS ON BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

IS 5.6-4 *The proposed projects would result in an increase in the noise level within the Project Area due to construction activities that would result in indirect impacts on biological resources. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Noise levels on the Project Area would increase over present levels during construction of the proposed projects. During construction, temporary

noise impacts have the potential to disrupt foraging, nesting, roosting, and denning activities for a variety of wildlife species. These impacts are not significant because the proposed projects do not occur adjacent to any natural open space areas that support high wildlife value. However, nesting raptors if present in the vicinity of the Project Area, may potentially incur temporary short-term impacts from construction noise, and may be temporarily displaced by these disturbances. Indirect noise impacts on nesting raptors would be significant because these species are protected by State wildlife agencies. Impacts on these species would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. Mitigation measures include protection of all raptor nest sites by establishing minimum buffer areas and limiting construction periods during nesting activity.

Mitigation Measure 5.6-4 (which references Mitigation Measures 5.6-2a and 5.6-2b) of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.6-2a Thirty days prior to the onset of construction activities, a qualified biologist shall survey within the limits of project disturbance for the presence of any active raptor nests. Any nest found during survey efforts shall be mapped on the construction plans. If no active nests are found, no further mitigation shall be required. Results of the surveys shall be provided to the CDFG.

MM 5.6-2b If nesting activity is present at any raptor nest site, the active site shall be protected until nesting activity has ended to ensure compliance with Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code. Nesting activity for raptors in the region of the Project Area normally occurs from February 1 to June 30. To protect any nest site, the following restrictions on construction are required between February 1 and June 30 (or until nests are no longer active, as determined by a qualified biologist):

- Clearing limits shall be established at a minimum of 300 feet in any direction from any occupied nest (or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the monitoring biologist);

- Access and surveying shall not be allowed within 100 feet of any occupied nest (or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the monitoring biologist). Any encroachment into the 300/100 foot buffer area around the known nest shall be allowed only if it is determined by a qualified biologist that the proposed activity will not disturb the nest occupants; and

- Construction during the non-nesting season can occur at the sites only if a qualified biologist has determined that fledglings have left the nest.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

HISTORICAL/ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

IS 5.7-1 *The proposed projects may impact archaeological and/or historical resources on-site. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Thirteen of the 21 properties identified and evaluated in the University Village and Orchard Park Project sites qualify as "historical resources." In addition, the Guachama Ranchería site, the Mill Creek Zanja, the San Bernardino-Sonora Road/Mission Road, and the Mission Historic Overlay District were identified as significant historical resources. Any substantial adverse change that the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans may potentially cause to any of these resources would be considered a "significant effect on the environment." However, implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures 5.7-1a through 5.7-1u of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

UNIVERSITY VILLAGE

Mission Historic Overlay District (P1063-46H)

MM 5.7-1a The overall projects design shall be consistent with the design guidelines for the Mission Historic Overlay District, as specified in the *Mission Historic Overlay District, Loma Linda, California; Final Report,* dated May 22, 2002, which includes the following;

Design Guidelines for Existing Residences along Mission Road

- Guidelines for the establishment of consistent standards for preservation, rehabilitation and new construction.

Sites Adjacent to Historic Sites

- Architectural style, landscaping and setbacks should strengthen the historic character of the Mission Road district and not distract from the historic sites. The property width at the street frontage should be generous and the landscaping should reinforce the rural character of Mission Road. Garage locations should conform to the placement of garages from the time period associated with the historic architectural

styles of Mission Road when garages were relegated to the rear of the yard and did not usually face the street.

Design Guidelines for New Residences along Mission Road

- Define minimum lot sizes, densities and setbacks for properties both north and south side of Mission Road. Provide for larger lot sizes that are wider along the street frontage for properties adjacent to historically significant sites.

- Houses shall be in an appropriate architectural style related to the time period and style existing, or that once existed, along Mission Road (such as Mission influence, Craftsman style, American Adobe, Victorian, Queen Anne, etc.).

MM 5.7-1b Due to the high sensitivity of the University Village Project site for subsurface archaeological remains, a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor of Gabrielino and/or Serrano heritage shall monitor all earth-moving operations associated with the project.

MM 5.7-1c In the event subsurface archaeological remains are discovered during on-site excavation or grading activities, the contractor shall cease all work and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the finding and determine the appropriate course of action. Salvage operation requirements of Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines shall be followed.

Site CA-SBR-2311/H (Guachama Ranchería)

MM 5.7-1d The southwestern portion of the University Village Project site shall be protected from ground disturbances to preserve any subsurface archaeological deposits associated with the Guachama Ranchería.

MM 5.7-1e If any ground disturbance cannot be avoided in that area, a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor of Gabrielino and/or Serrano heritage shall monitor the earth-moving operations.

MM 5.7-1f In the event cultural resources (archaeological, paleontological, or historical) are discovered during on-site excavation or grading activities, the contractor shall cease all work and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the finding and determine the appropriate course of action. Salvage operation requirements of Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines shall be followed.

Site CA-SBR-8092H (Mill Creek Zanja)

MM 5.7-1g To accomplish the goals of impact mitigation and public interpretation through project design, the following measures shall be applied:

- Prior to approval of grading plans, the presence, location, and condition of the subsurface remains of the Zanja should be established. This has been accomplished on the former Lyen parcels and documented in this study. It remains to be done Project Areas to the northwest and southeast.

- In locations where the Zanja is preserved subsurface and it is feasible from a design and engineering perspective, the Zanja alignment should be incorporated into a linear corridor and used for a hiking trail or other tangible linkage between park areas. Such a corridor should be at least 15–20 feet wide and should ideally not be disturbed at depths more than 4 feet below the current ground surface.

- Sections of the Zanja alignment that cross private lands that are not a part of either specific plan should be linked together if possible using "detours" around such properties along Mission Road or the back lot lines of such parcels.

- Consideration should be given in the development of public parks or other facilities to include accurate historical information in displays and other interpretive materials that conveys the history of all cultural groups and historical period represented in the Project Areas.

- Because unrecorded archaeological materials of Native American and Euroamerican origin could occur as unanticipated discoveries during project grading, all rough grading between Mission Road and the Zanja alignment, and extending for a minimum of 200 feet north of the Zanja or other identified historical resources, including the Guachama site, should be monitored by a qualified archaeologist.

- At least 30 days prior to any grading in the areas noted above, the City shall notify the tribal councils of the San Manuel and Morongo Bands that such grading will take place, and arrange for Native American participation if requested by the tribal councils.

- In the event that human remains are encountered during project grading, all provisions of state law requiring notification of the County Coroner, contacting the Native American Heritage Commission, and consultation with the Most Likely Descendant, shall be followed.

Site PSBR-1H (San Bernardino-Sonora Road/Mission Road)

MM 5.7-1h Refer to Mitigation Measure 5.7-1a.

Cole House

MM 5.7-1i As a *primary* contributor the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- The Cole House shall be preserved *in situ*; or
- The Cole House shall be relocated to the Heritage Park (Planning Area K), and a comprehensive documentation program shall be completed to preserve the architectural, structural and historical data on the building, which shall include the following:
  - Textual documentation of the history and current condition of the buildings, which has in fact been partially accomplished through the present study;
  - Scaled drawings of the buildings' floor plans; and
  - Systematic photo-recordation of the buildings' structural and architectural characteristics, including interior and exterior details.

Frink Adobe Residence

MM 5.7-1j As a *primary* contributor, the Frink Adobe residence shall be preserved *in situ* (within Planning Area M) with a park developed around the residence, protecting the historic citrus groves that are located on-site.

Opal Van Leuven House

MM 5.7-1k As a *primary* contributor the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- The Opal Van Leuven House shall be preserved *in situ*; or
- If due to project design plans, this is infeasible, a historic architect shall confirm the structural integrity of the building for relocation; or
- If physical impact, such as demolition, is unavoidable, a comprehensive documentation program shall be completed to preserve the architectural, structural and historical data of the building, which shall include the following:
  - Textual documentation of the history and current condition of the buildings, which has in fact been partially accomplished through the present study;
  - Scaled drawings of the buildings' floor plans; and

- Systematic photo-recordation of the buildings' structural and architectural characteristics, including interior and exterior details.

Victorian Farm House

MM 5.7-1l As a *secondary* contributor the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- The Victorian Farm House shall be preserved *in situ*; or
- If due to project design plans, this is infeasible, a historic architect shall confirm the structural integrity of the building for relocation to a the Historic Park (Planning Area M); or
- If physical impact, such as demolition, is unavoidable, a comprehensive documentation program shall be completed to preserve the architectural, structural and historical data of the building, which shall include the following:
  - Textual documentation of the history and current condition of the buildings, which has in fact been partially accomplished through the present study;
  - Scaled drawings of the buildings' floor plans; and
  - Systematic photo-recordation of the buildings' structural and architectural characteristics, including interior and exterior details.

Stone Carriage House

MM 5.7-1m As a *secondary* contributor the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- The Stone Carriage House shall be preserved *in situ*; or
- If due to project design plans, this is infeasible, a historic architect shall confirm the structural integrity of the building for relocation; or
- If physical impact, such as demolition, is unavoidable, a comprehensive documentation program shall be completed to preserve the architectural, structural and historical data of the building, which shall include the following:
  - Textual documentation of the history and current condition of the buildings, which has in fact been partially accomplished through the present study;
  - Scaled drawings of the buildings' floor plans; and

- Systematic photo-recordation of the buildings' structural and architectural characteristics, including interior and exterior details.

Helen Hinckley House

MM 5.7-1n As a *secondary* contributor the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- The Helen Hinckley House shall be preserved *in situ*; or
- If due to project design plans, this is infeasible, a historic architect shall confirm the structural integrity of the building for relocation to a the Historic Park (Planning Area M); or
- If physical impact, such as demolition, is unavoidable, a comprehensive documentation program shall be completed to preserve the architectural, structural and historical data of the building, which shall include the following:
  - Textual documentation of the history and current condition of the buildings, which has in fact been partially accomplished through the present study;
  - Scaled drawings of the buildings' floor plans; and
  - Systematic photo-recordation of the buildings' structural and architectural characteristics, including interior and exterior details.

Tractor Barn

MM 5.7-1o As a *secondary* contributor the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- The Tractor Barn shall be preserved *in situ*; or
- If due to project design plans, this is infeasible, a historic architect shall confirm the structural integrity of the building for relocation to a the Historic Park (Planning Area M); or
- If physical impact, such as demolition, is unavoidable, a comprehensive documentation program shall be completed to preserve the architectural, structural and historical data of the building, which shall include the following:
  - Textual documentation of the history and current condition of the buildings, which has in fact been partially accomplished through the present study;

- Scaled drawings of the buildings' floor plans; and
- Systematic photo-recordation of the buildings' structural and architectural characteristics, including interior and exterior details.

Milton Frink Residence

MM 5.7-1p As a *secondary* contributor the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- The Milton Frink Residence shall be preserved *in situ*; or
- If due to project design plans, this is infeasible, a historic architect shall confirm the structural integrity of the building for relocation; or
- If physical impact, such as demolition, is unavoidable, a comprehensive documentation program shall be completed to preserve the architectural, structural and historical data of the building, which shall include the following:
  - Textual documentation of the history and current condition of the buildings, which has in fact been partially accomplished through the present study;
  - Scaled drawings of the buildings' floor plans; and
  - Systematic photo-recordation of the buildings' structural and architectural characteristics, including interior and exterior details.

Orchard Park

Mission Historic Overlay District (P1063-46H)

Refer to Mitigation Measures MM 5.7-1a through MM 5.7-1c.

Site CA-SBR-8092H (Mill Creek Zanja)

Refer to Mitigation Measure MM 5.7-1g.

Site PSBR-1H (San Bernardino-Sonora Road/Mission Road)

Refer to Mitigation Measure MM 5.7-1h.

Mission School

MM 5.7-1q As a *primary* contributor the Mission School shall be preserved in situ for adaptive reuse.

Curtis Residence

MM 5.7-1r As a *primary* contributor the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- The Curtis Residence shall be preserved *in situ*; or
- If due to project design plans, this is infeasible, a historic architect shall confirm the structural integrity of the building for relocation; or
- If physical impact, such as demolition, is unavoidable, a comprehensive documentation program shall be completed to preserve the architectural, structural and historical data of the building, which shall include the following:
  - Textual documentation of the history and current condition of the buildings, which has in fact been partially accomplished through the present study;
  - Scaled drawings of the buildings' floor plans; and
  - Systematic photo-recordation of the buildings' structural and architectural characteristics, including interior and exterior details.

Nat Hinckley House

MM 5.7-1s As a *primary* contributor the following mitigation measures shall be implemented.

- The Nat Hinckley House shall be preserved *in situ*; or
- If due to project design plans, this is infeasible, a historic architect shall confirm the structural integrity of the building for relocation; or
- If physical impact, such as demolition, is unavoidable, a comprehensive documentation program shall be completed to preserve the architectural, structural and historical data of the building, which shall include the following:
  - Textual documentation of the history and current condition of the buildings, which has in fact been partially accomplished through the present study;
  - Scaled drawings of the buildings' floor plans; and
  - Systematic photo-recordation of the buildings' structural and architectural characteristics, including interior and exterior details.

Raymond Curtis House

MM 5.7-1t As a *secondary* contributor the following mitigation measures shall be implemented.

- The Raymond Curtis House shall be preserved *in situ*; or
- If due to project design plans, this is infeasible, a historic architect shall confirm the structural integrity of the building for relocation; or
- If physical impact, such as demolition, is unavoidable, a comprehensive documentation program shall be completed to preserve the architectural, structural and historical data of the building, which shall include the following:
  - Textual documentation of the history and current condition of the buildings, which has in fact been partially accomplished through the present study;
  - Scaled drawings of the buildings' floor plans; and
  - Systematic photo-recordation of the buildings' structural and architectural characteristics, including interior and exterior details.

Howard Vander Wall House

MM 5.7-1u As a *secondary* contributor the following mitigation measures shall be implemented.

- The Howard Vander Wall House shall be preserved *in situ*; or
- If due to project design plans, this is infeasible, a historic architect shall confirm the structural integrity of the building for relocation; or
- If physical impact, such as demolition, is unavoidable, a comprehensive documentation program shall be completed to preserve the architectural, structural and historical data of the building, which shall include the following:
  - Textual documentation of the history and current condition of the buildings, which has in fact been partially accomplished through the present study;
  - Scaled drawings of the buildings' floor plans; and
  - Systematic photo-recordation of the buildings' structural and architectural characteristics, including interior and exterior details.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

IS 5.7-2 *The proposed projects may impact paleontological resources that may exist on-site but have not been documented. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Surficial soils in the Project Area are Holocene in age and have been assigned a low potential to adversely impact significant nonrenewable fossil remains. However, Pleistocene deposits may be present at lower depths in the Project Area and these deposits have a high sensitivity for paleontologic fossils. Therefore, monitoring of earth-moving activities for paleontological resources during grading that will exceed five feet in depth and a program to mitigate impacts to the resources that might be exposed or unearthed during such excavation is recommended.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-2 of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measure is as follows:

MM 5.7-2 A paleontological mitigation monitoring program shall be developed in accordance with the provisions of CEQA as well as the proposed guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology and shall include, but not be limited to the following:

- Monitoring of excavations that will exceed five feet in depth in the Project Area by a qualified paleontologic monitor. Paleontologic monitors should be equipped to salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays and to remove samples of sediments, which are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. The monitor must be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large specimens.

- Preparation of recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including washing of sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates.

- Identification and curation of specimens into a museum repository with permanent retrievable storage. The paleontologist should have a written repository agreement in hand prior to the initiation of mitigation activities.

- Preparation of a report of findings with an appended itemized inventory of specimens. The report and inventory, when submitted to

the appropriate Lead Agency, would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontologic resources.

BURIAL SITES

IS 5.7-3 *The proposed projects may disturb unknown locations of human remains. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Human remains in a previously unknown burial site could potentially be encountered during construction activities associated with the proposed projects. The Project Area is a sensitive area because it is a village site and there are Native American burials in the vicinity. Any alterations to human remains associated with implementation of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would be considered a significant adverse impact. Therefore, a Native American monitor should be present during all phases of the projects, as well as a qualified archaeologist. Implementation of the mitigation which details the appropriate actions necessary in the event human remains are encountered would reduce impacts in this regard to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-3 of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measure is as follows:

MM 5.7-3 As part of normal field procedures, if suspected human remains are encountered during the field survey, all work in the area shall cease and the San Bernardino County Coroner's Office will be contacted immediately. The Coroner's Office needs to be notified of the presence of human remains at archaeological sites in order to determine the age of the remains and whether it is prehistoric or modern in origin. If the remains are considered Native American, then the Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento will be contacted. The Commission determines which Indian tribe would serve as the "most likely descendant," and will notify the group so that the remains are properly treated. Also, refer to Mitigation Measures MM 5.7-1d through MM 5.7-1f, *Guachama Rancheria.*

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

SOIL

IS 5.8-1 *The proposed projects could affect development on-site due to compressible soils and effects from soil erosion. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the*

University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. The predominant soil identified within the Project Area is Alluvium and Older Alluvium, which is mapped as covering the majority of the Project Area. The soil conditions of the Project Area could impact grading activities and construction due to their compressibility and susceptibility to erosion. Therefore, implementation of the recommended mitigation measures and compliance with the City's Municipal Code would reduce soil erosion impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures 5.8-1a through 5.8-1f of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.8-1a All surfaces to receive compacted fill shall be cleared of existing vegetation, debris, and other unsuitable materials which should be removed from the Project Area. Soils that are disturbed during site clearing shall be removed and replaced as controlled compacted fill under the direction of the Soils Engineer.

MM 5.8-1b In excavations deeper than four feet but less than ten feet, a slope no steeper than 1.5 to 1 (horizontal to vertical) shall be provided or utilization of appropriate trench and shoring methods shall occur. Steeper slopes or deeper excavations shall be provided with trench shoring and/or trench shields for stability and protection. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) safety requirements shall be adhered to throughout the entire duration of Project Area earthwork.

MM 5.8-1c All grading procedures, including soil excavation and compaction, the placement of backfill, and temporary excavation shall comply with City of Loma Linda standards.

MM 5.8-1d Permanent cut and fill slopes shall not exceed 2 to 1 (horizontal to vertical).

MM 5.8-1e Loose and soft alluvial soils and all existing uncertified fill materials shall be removed and replaced with compacted fill during site grading in order to prevent seismic settlement, soil erosion and differential compaction.

MM 5.8-1f During grading, tests and observations shall be performed by the Soils Engineer or his representative in order to verify that the grading is being performed in accordance with the project specifications. Field density testing shall be performed in accordance with applicable ASTM test standards. The minimum acceptable degree of compaction shall be 90 percent of the maximum dry density as obtained by the ASTM D1557-91

test method. Where testing indicates insufficient density, additional compactive effort shall be applied until retesting indicates satisfactory compaction.

SEISMIC IMPACTS

IS 5.8-2 *The proposed projects may expose people/structures to effects associated with seismic activity (ground shaking, liquefaction, etc.). Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Implementation of the proposed projects may result in the exposure of people/structures to potential substantial adverse effects associated with rupture of an earthquake fault. Moderate to severe ground shaking can be expected within the Project Area due to moderate to large earthquakes on nearby fault zones. However, impacts would be reduced following compliance with the recommended mitigation and applicable City and State standards.

Ground lurching and seismically induced settlement may occur where deposits of loose alluvium exist within the Project Area. Since all loose alluvium would be removed and replaced as engineered fill beneath all structures, impacts regarding ground lurching would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures 5.8-2a through 5.8-2d of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.8-2a Engineering design for all structures shall be based on the probability that the Project Area would be subjected to strong ground motion during the lifetime of development. Construction plans shall be subject to the City of Loma Linda Municipal Code and shall include applicable standards, which address seismic design parameters.

MM 5.8-2b Mitigation of earthquake ground shaking shall be incorporated into design and construction in accordance with Uniform Building Code requirements and site specific design.

MM 5.8-2c The potential damaging effects of regional earthquake activity shall be considered in the design of each structure. Structural design criteria shall be determined in consideration of building types, occupancy category, seismic importance factors and possibly other factors.

MM 5.8-2d Conformance with the latest Uniform Building Code and City Ordinances can be expected to satisfactorily mitigate the effect of seismic ground

shaking. Conformance with applicable codes and ordinances shall occur in conjunction with the issuance of building permits in order to insure that over excavation of soft, broken rock and clayey soils within sheared zones will be required where development is planned.

HYDROLOGY AND DRAINAGE

WATER QUALITY - CONSTRUCTION

IS 5.9-1 *The proposed projects would result in grading, excavation and construction activities that may impact water quality due to sheet erosion of exposed soils and subsequent deposition of particles and pollutants in drainage areas. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Pollutants of concern, as they relate to land development projects, would include silt and sediment, oil and grease, floatable trash, nutrients (such as fertilizers), heavy metals, pathogens (such as coliform bacteria) and other substances. These are referred to as "controlled pollutants," and their discharge into waters of the United States, are prohibited. In anticipation of construction-related impacts, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) adopted a Final General Construction Permit that requires the applicant of any project over five acres to file for a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and abide by its conditions. Prior to construction, completion of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required for the construction activities on-site. Implementation of the specified requirements (i.e., compliance with the NPDES requirements and completion of a SWPPP) would reduce construction-related impacts to water quality to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5.9-1 of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measure is as follows:

MM 5.9-1 Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits, the applicant shall prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, which demonstrates compliance under California's General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity by providing a copy of the Notice of Intent (NOI) submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board and a copy of the subsequent notification of the issuance of a Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) Number or other proof of filing in a manner meeting the satisfaction of the City Engineer. A copy of the current SWPPP shall be kept at the Project Area and be available for City review on request.

HYDROLOGY AND DRAINAGE

IS 5.9-2 *The proposed projects would affect on-site and off-site drainage systems. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding.

University Village

Due to the increase in impervious areas, there is an expected increase in the amount of storm water leaving the developed site. For the 10-year storm, runoff is expected to increase from 46.1 cubic feet per second (cfs) (the on-site area-weighted portion of the 61.5 cfs) to 224.4 cfs before mitigation. For the 100-year storm, runoff is expected to increase from 106.6 cfs (the on-site area-weighted portion of the 142.1 cfs) to 369.7 cfs before mitigation.

Portions of on-site runoff would be conveyed via the Bryn Mawr Avenue storm drain system to Mission Zanja Creek Channel and portions of on-site runoff would be conveyed from the University Village Project site via Redlands Boulevard street flow. However, should the Mission Zanja Creek Channel connection prove infeasible, three discharge points would be constructed along Redlands Boulevard. Mission Zanja Channel and the proposed storm drain capacities limit the proposed runoff peak flows in the future Bryn Mawr Avenue storm drain to 155.9 cfs for University Village.

Storm water runoff leaving the University Village Project site via Redlands Boulevard would be constrained to 90 percent of pre-development values, taking into account changes (due solely to changes in the flow path and concentration time) in the existing Orchard Park runoff. The on-site runoff to Redlands Boulevard would be constrained by an on-site detention/retention facility in the northwest corner of the University Village Project site, which would receive an estimated peak flow of 74.5 cfs during the 100-year storm and would meter out a maximum flow of 56.9 cfs.

Another on-site detention/retention facility would detain the flow to the proposed Bryn Mawr Avenue storm drain. The peak flow into the basin during the 100-year storm event is projected to be 204.6 cfs, while the outflow in the storm drain system during the peak of the storm would be limited to 65.3 cfs.

Orchard Park

There would be a net increase of 92.53 cfs in the 10-year storm event and 252.33 cfs in the 100-year storm event onto Redlands Boulevard. Based on the preliminary drainage design, there were no storm drain or catch basins proposed on the Orchard Park Project

site to prevent flooding and erosion on-site. The potential for hydraulic impacts to Redland Boulevard would require mitigation as the addition of more buildings and impervious areas would change the watershed. Storm drains and catch basins would be required to mitigate erosion downstream of the development. The proposed storm drain system would tie into the University Village system, and the two systems would flow down Bryn Mawr Avenue and tie into the Mission Zanja Creek Channel. However, should the Mission Zanja Creek connection prove infeasible, the flows would be treated and directed onto Redlands Boulevard.

Additional mitigation for increased flows from the Orchard Park Project site would involve the installation of detention basins. Two detention basins would be placed on-site to reduce the peak flow leaving the Orchard Park Project site. The flow leaving the basin must be equal to or less then existing condition. Additionally, the outlets must be sized to allow no more then 133.21 cfs to flow out of the two basins at any given time. The analysis assumes that the Orchard Park Project site does not increase runoff by more then 127.6 cfs as this is the allocated flow capacity for Orchard Park in the Bryn Mawr Avenue system. Another option would be to reconfigure the facilities on Orchard Park Project site and provide a multiple mini detention basin within the main portion of the site. The basins would be designed as a water quality/storm water detention basin.

Mitigation Measures 5.9-2a through 5.9-2d of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

University Village

MM 5.9-2a The applicant shall submit a hydrology and hydraulic study, prepared by a qualified engineer, for review and approval by the Director of Public Works. The study shall illustrate that on-site flows would be conveyed via proposed streets and storm drain pipes, with detention of flows as required. Additionally, portions of on-site runoff shall be conveyed via the Bryn Mawr Avenue storm drain system (to be constructed as a separate project) to Mission Zanja Creek Channel and portions of on-site runoff would be conveyed from the site via Redlands Boulevard street flow. Should The Mission Zanja Creek Channel connection prove infeasible, treated flow onto Redlands Boulevard should also be addressed within the hydrology and hydraulic study.

MM 5.9-2b Prior to the issuance of any grading permits subject to approval by the City Engineer, the applicant shall design storm water runoff leaving the site via Redlands Boulevard to be constrained to 90 percent pre-development values, taking into account changes (due solely to changes in the flow path and concentration time) in the existing Orchard Park area runoff. Another on-site detention/retention facility shall be constructed to detain the flow to the proposed Bryn Mawr Avenue storm drain.

Orchard Park

MM 5.9-2c The applicant shall submit a hydrology and hydraulic study, prepared by a qualified engineer, for review and approval by the Director of Public Works. The study shall illustrate that increased flows from the site shall involve the installation of a detention basin. Two-detention basins shall be placed on-site to reduce the peak flow leaving the site. The flow leaving the basin must be equal to or less than existing condition. The outlets must be sized to allow no more than 133.21 cfs to flow out of the two basins combined at any given time. Another option shall be to reconfigure the facilities on-site and provide a multiple mini detention basin within the main portion of the development. The basins shall be designed as a water quality and storm water detention basin.

MM 5.9-2d Prior to the issuance of any grading permits subject to approval by the City Engineer, the applicant shall design storm water runoff leaving the site via Redlands Boulevard shall be constrained to 95 percent pre-development values.

WATER QUALITY – NON-POINT SOURCE POLLUTANTS

IS 5.9-3 *The proposed projects would result in impacts to water quality. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. A net effect of urbanization can be to increase non-point pollutant export over naturally occurring conditions. Receiving waters can assimilate a limited quantity of various constituent elements, but there are thresholds beyond which the measured amount becomes a pollutant and results in an undesirable impact. The receiving water is Mission Zanja Creek.

With implementation of recommended mitigation, which includes a SWPPP and structural and non-structural BMPs, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures 5.9-3a and 5.9-3b of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.9-3a The University Village Project and Orchard Park Project shall obtain coverage under the NPDES Statewide Stormwater Permit for General Construction Activities form the State Water Resources Control Board. Evidence of receipt of permit approval must be presented to the Director of Public Works.

MM 5.9-3b The University Village Project and Orchard Park Project shall submit for approval by the City a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) specifically identifying the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be used on-site to control predictable run-off. The WQMP shall identify structural and non-structural measures detailing implementation of BMPs, assignment of long-term maintenance responsibilities and reference the location(s) of structural BMPs.

FLOOD HAZARDS

IS 5.9-4 *The Project Area may be subject to flood hazards as a result of San Timoteo Wash. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. The current FEMA map shows the northern portion of the Project Area within Zone "X", with the remainder of the Project Area within Zone "A99." Zone "X" is defined as "500-year flood; areas of 100-year with average depths less the one foot or with drainage area less the none square mile; and areas protected by a levees from 100-year flood." Zone "A99" is defined as "protected 100-year flood by Federal flood protection system under construction, no base flood elevations developed." Therefore, the southern portion of the Orchard Park Project site is susceptible to flooding.

Project planning, design, and construction measures can reduce the potential flooding hazard to less than significant levels. Additionally, improvements to the San Timoteo Wash are anticipated be completed by mid-2004 by the San Bernardino County Flood Control Department and Army Corp of Engineers thereby removing the flooding potential on the Orchard Park Project site.

Mitigation Measure 5.9-4 of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measure is as follows:

MM 5.9-4 If the improvements to San Timoteo Creek are not completed prior to the construction of Orchard Park, a Conditional Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (CLOMR-F) and Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) would need to be processed with FEMA prior to the issuance of certificates of use and occupancy for any building. The applicant shall complete Section "E" of the Elevation Certificate, identifying the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) and certifying the as built lowest floor, including basements, as constructed, is at least one (1) foot above the BFE, in a manner meeting the approval of the City Engineer. (NOTE: To eliminate

FEMA requirements for flood insurance, the lowest elevation of any part of the structure, not only the lowest floor, must be above the BFE.)

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

IS 5.10-1 *The proposed projects would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the release of hazardous materials. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Due to the current and historical agricultural use of the site, agricultural pesticides may have resulted in pesticide residues in soil at concentrations that are considered to be hazardous according to established Federal regulatory levels. In addition, miscellaneous debris/storage piles were noted throughout the Project Area, which may have contaminated the soil. Therefore, soil sampling should occur throughout the Project Area prior to development of individual projects, including within any known pesticide mixing areas.

The Project Area is located within an area that has reported groundwater contamination (DBCP) per the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Therefore, should construction require dewatering activities or if groundwater is expected to be encountered, further investigation consisting of a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) should be conducted to review groundwater documents regarding regional groundwater quality with respect to DBCP.

Due to the fact that the removal of a fuel dispenser associated with the former diesel above ground storage tank (AST) is planned for the near future, it is recommended that the removal be witnessed by an environmental professional to visually assess whether sampling should be conducted to further evaluate whether there has been any impact to the soil from the past usage of the pump and pipe.

Finally, the existence of underground storage tanks (USTs) and septic tanks (and water wells) within the Project Area could pose additional soil contamination concerns. Therefore, the actual location and status of reported USTs (specifically at 10852 California Street) and septic tanks should be verified. If present, the USTs and/or septic tanks should be removed and a visual inspection of the areas beneath and around the removed tank(s) should be performed. Any stained soils observed underneath the tanks should be sampled.

Implementation of the following mitigation measures, including measures for the removal/relocation of transformers and demolition/construction activities would reduce hazardous materials impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures 5.10-1a through 5.10-1j of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.10-1a All miscellaneous vehicles, maintenance equipment and materials (i.e., fertilizer, lubricants, grease, waste-oil, gasoline), construction/irrigation materials, miscellaneous stockpiled debris, storage tanks, smudge pots, and 5-gallon buckets, shall be removed off-site and properly disposed of at an approved landfill facility. Once removed, a visual inspection of the areas beneath the removed materials shall be performed. Any stained soils observed underneath the removed materials should be sampled. Results of the sampling (if necessary) shall indicate the level of remediation efforts that may be required.

MM 5.10-1b The storage and debris piles identified on-site shall be removed from the property and properly disposed. Once removed, a visual inspection of the areas beneath the removed materials shall be performed. Any stained soils observed underneath the removed materials shall be sampled. Results of the sampling (if necessary) shall indicate the level of remediation efforts that may be required.

MM 5.10-1c The interior of individual on-site structures and storage trailers within the Project Area shall be visually inspected prior to demolition or renovation activities, with particular attention to all garage/farm equipment maintenance uses. Should hazardous materials be encountered with any on-site structure, the materials shall be tested and properly disposed of in accordance with State and Federal regulatory requirements. Any stained soils or surfaces underneath the removed materials shall be sampled. Results of the sampling would indicate the appropriate level of remediation efforts that may be required.

MM 5.10-1d The majority of the Project Area has been utilized for agricultural purposes, for several decades and may contain pesticide residues in the soil. Soil sampling shall occur throughout the Project Area, including any known pesticide mixing areas. The sampling will determine if pesticide concentrations exceed established regulatory requirements and will identify proper handling procedures that may be required.

MM 5.10-1e Should construction require dewatering activities or groundwater is expected to be encountered, a qualified hazardous materials consultant with Phase II and Phase III experience shall review groundwater documents regarding regional groundwater quality with respect to DBCP.

MM 5.10-1f The actual location and status of reported underground storage tanks (USTs) at 10852 California Street shall be verified. If present, the USTs

shall be removed and properly disposed of at an approved and permitted landfill facility. Once the USTs are removed, a visual inspection of the areas beneath and around the removed UST shall be performed. Any stained soils observed underneath the UST shall be sampled. Results of the sampling, if necessary, shall indicate the level of remediation efforts required.

MM 5.10-1g Building Division Records shall be reviewed to indicate any documented septic tanks. If present, the septic tanks shall be removed and properly disposed of at an approved landfill facility. Once the tanks are removed (if any), a visual inspection of the areas beneath and around the removed tank(s) shall be performed. Any stained soils observed underneath the septic tank(s) shall be sampled. Results of the sampling, if necessary, shall indicate the level of remediation efforts required.

MM 5.10-1h Water wells located within the Project Area shall be properly removed and abandoned pursuant to the latest procedures required by the local agency with closure responsibilities for the wells. Any associated equipment (i.e. diesel fuel tank, concrete, piping, and associated materials) shall be removed off-site properly disposed of at a permitted landfill. A visual inspection of the areas beneath the removed materials (if present) shall be performed.

MM 5.10-1i Any transformers to be removed/relocated during site construction/ demolitions shall be conducted under the purview of the local utility purveyor to identify proper handling procedures regarding potential PCBs.

MM 5.10-1j If unknown wastes or suspect materials are discovered during construction by the contractor, which he/she believes may involve hazardous waste/materials, the contractor shall:

- Immediately stop work in the vicinity of the suspected contaminant, removing workers and the public from the area;
- Notify the Project Engineer of the implementing Agency;
- Secure the areas directed by the Project Engineer; and
- Notify the implementing agency's Hazardous Waste/Materials Coordinator.

ASBESTOS CONTAINING MATERIALS

IS 5.10-2 *The proposed projects could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the release of asbestos containing materials into the environment. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard*

Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Given the age of some of the buildings within the Project Area (built prior to 1978), it is likely that these buildings could contain asbestos containing materials (ACMs). The National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) mandates that building owners conduct an asbestos survey to determine the presence of ACMs prior to the commencement of any remedial work, including demolition. If ACM material were found, abatement of asbestos would be required prior to any demolition activities. Compliance with the recommended mitigation regarding the requirement for an asbestos survey and asbestos abatement, as well as compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1403, would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures 5.10-2a through 5.10-2c of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.10-2a Prior to demolition activities, an asbestos survey shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of asbestos. The results of the survey shall be submitted to the City of Loma Linda.

MM 5.10-2b In the event asbestos containing materials are located, abatement of asbestos shall be completed prior to any demolition activities that would disturb asbestos containing material or create airborne asbestos hazard.

MM 5.10-2c Asbestos removal shall be performed by a State certified asbestos containment contractor in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 1403. Rule 1403 regulations require the following measures:

- A survey of the facility shall be conducted prior to issuance of a permit by SCAQMD;
- SCAQMD shall be notified prior to construction activity;
- ACMs shall be removed in accordance with prescribed procedures;
- Collected ACMs shall be placed in leak-tight containers or wrapping; and
- ACMs shall be properly disposed.

Also refer to Mitigation Measure MM 5.10-1b.

LEAD-BASED PAINT

IS 5.10-3 *The proposed projects could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the release of lead-based paints into the environment. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Lead-based paint would likely be found in existing buildings constructed prior to 1978. If during demolition of the structures, paint is separated from the building material (e.g., chemically or physically), a potential health hazard could occur for building occupants. This potential impact is considered significant unless mitigated. Following compliance with mitigation requiring an independent evaluation and paint abatement, as well as compliance with California Code of Regulation Title 8, Section 1532.1, potential impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5.10-3 of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measure is as follows:

MM 5.10-3 During demolition of the structures, paint is separated from the building material (e.g., chemically or physically), the paint waste shall be evaluated independently from the building material to determine its proper management. According to the Department of Substances Control, if paint is not removed from the building material during demolition (and is not chipping or peeling), the material could be disposed of as construction debris (a non-hazardous waste). It is recommended that the landfill operator be contacted in advance to determine any specific requirements they may have regarding the disposal of lead-based paint materials.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

FIRE PROTECTION

IS 5.11-1 *The proposed projects could result in significant physical impacts with respect to fire protection. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. According to the Department of Public Safety's Fire and Rescue Division, any development within the area, including the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans, would create greater demands on existing fire protection resources. While the potential fire problem can be mitigated to a great extent by the installation of fire sprinkler systems in all structures, there would still be the challenge of delivering EMS responses within an acceptable time frame to prevent serious physiological damage or death due to cardiac arrest or stroke. Proposed development would be required to pay Fire Protection Fees as outlined in the Loma Linda Municipal Code and as required by new development in an amount proportionate to the demand created by the proposed projects. Further, the proposed projects would be required to obtain approval from the Loma Linda Fire Department as a Standard Condition of Approval from the City of Loma Linda, which would require that street widths be adequate to allow for emergency equipment. Finally, the proposed projects would be subject to fire flow requirements which require a minimum of 1,500 gallons per minute (gpm) minimum for residential and 2,500 gpm minimum for commercial/industrial (possibly more depending on individual structure size, construction and use). Following compliance with the requirements of the Department of Public Safety and the Loma Linda Municipal Code, the proposed projects would result in a less than significant impact with respect to fire protection services.

Mitigation Measures 5.11-1a through 5.11-1d of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.11-1a Individual projects shall be subject to Development Impact Fees assessed for fire protection services. Total fees shall be adequate to provide for either the construction, equipment and staffing of a fire station or a Type 2 engine.

MM 5.11-1b Specific street design features shall be included to control vehicular parking and movement and to facilitate fire apparatus access in the neotraditional areas.

MM 5.11-1c All structures shall be provided with full fire sprinkler coverage (i.e., including garages and other enclosed combustible spaces).

MM 5.11-1d All development shall comply with fire flow requirements: 1,500 gallons per minute minimum for residential and 2,500 gallons per minute minimum for commercial/industrial uses.

PARKS AND RECREATION

IS 5.11-5 *The proposed projects would result in the construction of a park facility and may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Based on an estimate of 2.5 persons per household (State of California Department of Finance), the development of 1,259 residential units for the Orchard Park Project would result in a population increase of 3,148 persons requiring approximately 15.7 acres of parkland. The development of 1,769 residential units for the University Village Project would result in a population increase of 4,423 persons requiring approximately 22.1 acres of parkland.

The University Village Specific Plan would provide approximately 13.6 acres for parks and open space. In order to comply with the Loma Linda Municipal Code, Section 17.20, *Dedication of Park and Recreation Land,* the proposed project would be required to provide an additional 2.1 acres of parkland. The Orchard Park Specific Plan would provide approximately 10.0 acres for parks and open space. In order to comply with the Loma Linda Municipal Code, the proposed project would be required to provide an additional 12.1 acres of parkland. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM 5.11-5 would ensure the proper dedication of parkland, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5.11-5 of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measure is as follows:

MM 5.11-5 Development of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans shall comply with Section 17.20.020(A), *Dedication of Payment or Fees Required When*, of the Loma Linda Municipal Code. As required under Section 17.20.020, the developer shall be required to dedicate a site or sites for a neighborhood park, sufficient in size and topography to serve the immediate and future needs of the residents of the developed area, based on an adopted ratio of 5.0 acres of park per one thousand persons. Such dedication shall be shown on the tentative and final maps or parcel map submitted by the developer and the necessary lands will be offered for dedication to the City at the time of filing the final map(s).

SOLID WASTE

IS 5.11-6 *The proposed projects would result in increased solid waste generation. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Proposed construction and demolition activities would generate construction debris from development of the Project Area. Post development

operations resulting from increased residential, commercial, institutional and recreational land uses would further increase the volume of solid waste generated from the Project Area. Assuming a waste generation factor of 4.5 pounds per day (lbs/day) per resident, the proposed projects would result in an additional 34,079 lbs/day or a total of approximately 15.5 tons per day. The total permitted throughput for the landfills serving the City of Loma Linda is 28,481 tons per day. Therefore, the proposed projects total solid waste would equal approximately 0.05 percent of the permitted throughput for the landfills serving Loma Linda. However, the volume of the proposed projects' solid waste ultimately disposed of at the Loma Linda landfills would be reduced due to the requirements of AB 939. Adherence to the requirements of AB 939 and implementation of the recommended mitigation measure would reduce solid waste impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5.11-6 of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measure is as follows:

MM 5.11-6 The Construction Contractor shall reduce construction-generated waste according to state law by 50 percent. The applicant or contractor shall submit a construction waste management plan explaining the practices that would be used to achieve this level of reduction. This plan shall be reviewed and accepted by the City's Solid Waste Management Coordinator prior to the issuance of grading permits.

WATER

IS 5.11-7 *The proposed projects would increase the demand for water beyond current conditions. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. The annual demand calculated for the proposed projects is 1,009 acre feet per year (AF/year). The City of Loma Linda's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) takes into account the future demands for proposed development projects. The University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans were accounted for in the City's 2002 UWMP.

The City of Loma Linda continues to meet the water demands of its customers. The City currently meets water demands through groundwater pumping, but is pursuing additional sources to make up for groundwater capacity losses, gain reliability in supply, and plan for future demands. Therefore, since the proposed University Village and Orchard Park Projects were included in the City's UWMP, which identifies the City's ability to meet current and future water demand, impacts would be less than significant. Mitigation measures are recommended to ensure that adequate infrastructure and water

conservation measures have been included to reduce impacts below a level of significance.

Mitigation Measures 5.11-7a and 5.11-7b of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.11-7a In order to ensure adequate service to the proposed subdivision and the individual building structures, plans for the proposed public water and wastewater systems shall be approved by the City Engineer of the City of Loma Linda prior to the recordation of the final tract map. A condition on the tentative map shall state that all public infrastructure improvement plans, including sewer, water, streets, traffic signals, and grading shall be approved by the City Engineer prior to recordation of the tract map. This is in conformance with the subdivision map act and approval authority of the City Engineer.

MM 5.11-7b In order to ensure proper usage of water, development shall be required to implement the Best Management Practices (BMPs) and conservation practices identified in the City's adopted UWMP 2002 and the California Urban Water Conservation Council.

WASTEWATER (SEWER)

IS 5.11-8 *The proposed projects would generate additional wastewater beyond current conditions and may require an incremental expansion of the existing sewerage system and expansion of the water treatment facility. Analysis has concluded that a less than significant impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.*

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Based on the City's Sanitation Districts' generation rates, implementation of the University Village Specific Plan would result in wastewater generation of approximately 457,583 gallons per day (gpd) of sewage and the Orchard Park Specific Plan would result in the generation of approximately 398,394 gpd of sewage, resulting in a total of 855,977 gpd from the Project Area. The City of Loma Linda is currently utilizing only one-half of its assigned seven million gallons per day (mgd) to the San Bernardino Wastewater Reclamation Plan (WRP). Therefore, the addition of approximately 855,997 gpd created by the proposed projects represents approximately 2.6 percent of the total capacity for the San Bernardino WRP, which is 33 mgd, and therefore would not impact the WRP.

The sewer line along Redlands Boulevard ranges from 8 inches to 15 inches. Due to the reduction of the size of the line within the Project Area, the line has been identified as capacity deficient and has been recommended for replacement prior to development of

the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans. Therefore, the proposed projects would be required to pay sewer connection fees equivalent to the projects' fair share of developing a sewer line with sufficient capacity to service both projects. Payment of the development impact fees sufficient to address the capacity of the sewer line along Redlands Boulevard would ensure impacts to wastewater services would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 5.11-8 (which references Mitigation Measure 5.11-7a) of the Final EIR, reduces impacts below a level of significance. The measure is as follows:

MM 5.11-7a In order to ensure adequate service to the proposed subdivision and the individual building structures, plans for the proposed public water and wastewater systems shall be approved by the City Engineer of the City of Loma Linda prior to the recordation of the final tract map. A condition on the tentative map shall state that all public infrastructure improvement plans, including sewer, water, streets, traffic signals, and grading shall be approved by the City Engineer prior to recordation of the tract map. This is in conformance with the subdivision map act and approval authority of the City Engineer.

VIII. FINDINGS REGARDING INFEASIBILITY OF MITIGATION MEASURES FOR SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The City of Loma Linda, having reviewed and considered the information contained of the Final EIR, Technical Appendices and the administrative record, finds, pursuant to California Public Resources Code 21081 (a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines 15091 (a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the mitigation measures identified of the Final EIR. Therefore, the projects would cause significant unavoidable impacts in the categories of Land Use and Relevant Planning (consistency with SCAG policies), Aesthetics/Light and Glare (long-term, scenic corridors, and cumulative), Air Quality (short-term, long-term, consistency with regional air quality management plan, and cumulative) and Noise (short-term and cumulative) with development of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.

LAND USE AND RELEVANT PLANNING

SCAG'S REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND GUIDE

IS 5.1-5 *The proposed projects would conflict with relevant policies of SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide in regards to growth inducing impacts. Analysis has concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Finding. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures and project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. The consistency analysis of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans with relevant and applicable policies of SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) is provided in Table 5.1-3, *University Village/Orchard Park Consistency with SCAG Policy*, of the Final EIR. As detailed in Table 5.1-3, the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans are considered inconsistent with relevant and applicable policies of the RCPG regarding growth-inducing impacts.

AESHETICS/LIGHT AND GLARE

LONG-TERM AESTHETIC IMPACTS

IS 5.2-2 *The proposed projects would permanently alter the existing visual character and viewshed from surrounding locations. Analysis has concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Finding. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures and project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Development of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would drastically alter the views of and across the Project Area. Development of Planning Areas 1, 2 and 6 of the Orchard Park Specific Plan would convert open space to urban uses, which would obstruct current views of the San Bernardino Mountains, Badlands and South Hills. As identified in the City of Loma Linda General Plan Environmental Impact Report, the obstruction of distant panoramic views as a result of conversion of open spaces to urban uses is a significant and unavoidable impact. Therefore, implementation of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would result in significant long-term aesthetic impacts.

SCENIC CORRIDORS

IS 5.2-4 *The proposed projects would alter views of the San Bernardino Mountains, the Badlands and South Hills from Mission Road and Redlands Boulevard. Analysis has concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Finding. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures and project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. The Loma Linda General Plan identifies Redlands Boulevard as a scenic route and the San Bernardino Mountains, Badlands and South Hills as scenic vistas. The University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would result in significant development along Redlands Boulevard and Mission Road, which also provides scenic views of the surrounding mountains. With building heights ranging from 35 feet to 50 feet, the proposed development would obstruct views of the Badlands and South Hills from Redlands Boulevard. Additionally, existing views from the southeast corner and the uncultivated southwest portion of the Project Area, of the San Bernardino Mountains from Mission Road, would be obstructed with the development of commercial and residential units. Finally, views of the San Bernardino Mountains, Badlands and South Hills from the Mission School campus would be obstructed by the development of commercial buildings. Thus, impacts in this regard would be significant and unavoidable.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

IS 5.2-5 *The proposed projects combined with cumulative projects may result in greater urbanization of the region. Analysis has concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Finding. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures and project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. The University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would contribute to the cumulative reduction of undeveloped land within the City of Loma Linda. Implementation of the proposed projects would develop approximately 300 acres of primarily undeveloped land with residential, commercial and mixed-uses. As a result, views of the San Bernardino Mountains, the Badlands and South Hills would be obstructed. In addition, security and street lighting would introduce new sources of light and glare to the area. Therefore, development of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would contribute to the urbanization of the vicinity, which includes open areas to the south and east. Therefore, the proposed projects would result in an unavoidable significant cumulative aesthetic impact.

AIR QUALITY

SHORT-TERM (CONSTRUCTION) IMPACTS

IS 5.4-1 *The proposed projects would result in temporary construction-related dust and vehicle emissions during site preparation and construction. Analysis has concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Finding. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures and project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. As indicated in Table 5.4-6, *Construction Emissions*, of the Final EIR, emissions associated with construction activities within the Project Area are anticipated to exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) construction thresholds for reactive organic gasses (ROGs), nitrogen dioxide (NO_X), carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter (PM_{10}). Beyond adherence to standard construction practices involving properly tuned equipment, covered haul trucks and reduced speeds on exposed roads, feasible mitigation measures have not been identified by the SCAQMD to reduce the significance of short-term construction ROG, NO_X and PM_{10} emissions to less than significant levels. As such, short-term air emissions for this pollutant would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Despite implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-1a through 5.4-1e of the Final EIR, impacts would be significant and unavoidable. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.4-1a During clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations, excessive fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust preventive measures using the following procedures, as specified in the South Coast Air Quality Management Districts Rules and Regulations.

- On-site vehicle speed will be limited to 15 miles per hour.
- All on-site construction roads with vehicle traffic will be watered periodically.

- Streets adjacent to the project reach will be swept at least daily to remove silt that may have accumulated from construction activities so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust (water sweepers shall use reclaimed water).

- All material excavated or graded will be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering will occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferable in the late morning and after work is done for the day.

- All clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities will cease during periods of high winds (i.e., greater than 25 miles per hour as instantaneous gusts) so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

- All material transported on-site or off-site will be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

- The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations will be minimized so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

- These control techniques will be indicated on project grading plans. Compliance with this measure will be subject to periodic site inspections by the City.

- Visible dust beyond the property line emanating from the project will be prevented in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust. The project proponent shall notify the SCAQMD by submitting Form 403N, implement Rule 403 Table 2 and 3 control actions, and maintain records of control measures implemented if the project meets the requirements of Rule 403 large operations.

- Replace ground cover in disturbed areas inactive for ten or more days.

- Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).

- Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit the construction site onto paved roads or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.

- Appoint a construction relations officer to act as a community liaison concerning on-site construction activity including resolution of issues related to PM_{10} generation.

- Prohibit trucking idling in excess of ten minutes.
- Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interferences.
- Provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow.
- Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow on the arterial system to off-peak hour to the extent practicable.
- Reroute construction trucks away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas.
- When feasible, provide dedicated turn lanes for the movement of construction trucks and equipment on- and off-site.
- When feasible, use electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel generators.
- Give preferential consideration to contractor who use clean fuel construction equipment, emulsified diesel fuels, construction equipment that uses low sulfur diesel and is equipped with oxidation catalysts, particulate traps, or other retrofit technologies.

MM 5.4-1b Project grading plans shall show the duration of construction. Ozone precursor emissions from construction equipment vehicles shall be controlled by maintaining equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specifications, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Compliance with this measure will be subject to periodic inspections of construction equipment vehicles by the City.

MM 5.4-1c All trucks that are to haul excavated or graded material on-site shall comply with State Vehicle Code Section 23114, with special attention to Sections 23114(b)(F), (e)(2) and (e)(4) as amended, regarding the prevention of such material spilling onto public streets and roads.

MM 5.4-1d During site grading and public infrastructure construction phases, construction equipment and supply staging areas shall be located at least 400 feet away from the nearest residence. During structure/building construction, equipment and supply staging areas shall be located at least 400 feet away or as far as practical from the nearest residence.

MM5.4-1e Whenever feasible, the construction contractor shall use precoated or natural colored building materials, water-based or low-VOC coatings, and coating transfer or spray equipment with high transfer efficiency.

LONG-TERM (OPERATIONAL) IMPACTS

IS 5.4-2 *The proposed projects would result in an overall increase in the local and regional pollutant load due to direct impacts from vehicle emissions and indirect impacts from electricity and natural gas consumption. Analysis has concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Finding. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures and project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. As shown in Table 5.4-7, *Long-Term (Operational) Emissions*, of the Final EIR, mobile source and area emissions associated with the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would generate pollutant emissions in excess of SCAQMD thresholds. Thus, implementation of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would create a significant and unavoidable impact from ROG, CO, PM_{10} and NO_X emissions. In addition, the Basin is in non-attainment for ROG, CO and PM_{10} pollutants. As the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would exceed established ROG, CO, $PM_{10}$and NO_X thresholds, the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would create a significant and unavoidable impact to regional levels of these pollutants.

Localized CO Emissions

An impact is potentially significant if the project produces emissions levels that exceed the State or Federal ambient air quality standards (AAQS). The State 1-hour standard is 20.0 parts per million (ppm) and/or the 8-hour standard to 9.0 ppm. The Federal levels are based on 1- and 8-hour standards of 35.0 and 9.0 ppm, respectively. The maximum Year 2025 1-hour CO concentration combined with the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would be 4.1 ppm for the Waterman Street and Hospitality Boulevard intersection. The maximum Year 2025 8-hour CO concentration combined with the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would be 2.9 ppm for the Waterman Street and Hospitality Boulevard intersection. The measured concentrations are well below the State and Federal standard of 20 ppm for the 1-hour standard and 9 ppm for the 8-hour standard. Therefore, the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would not result in adverse CO emissions and impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

Despite implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-2a through 5.4-2d of the Final EIR, impacts would be significant and unavoidable. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.4-2a All non-residential development shall utilize Best Available Technologies (BATs), in order to reduce air quality emissions. Examples of BATs include:

- Use of solar or low-emission water heaters;

- Use of central water heating systems;
- Providing shade trees to reduce building heating/cooling costs;
- Use of energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioning;
- Use of double-glass paned windows;
- Use of energy-efficient low-sodium parking lot lights;
- Providing adequate ventilation systems for enclosed parking facilities;
- Use of lighting controls and energy-efficient lighting;
- Use of light-colored roof materials to reflect heat;
- Increase walls and attic insulation beyond Title 24 requirements; and
- Orient buildings to the north for natural cooling and include passive solar design (e.g., daylighting).

MM 5.4-2b Should a potential end-user be identified whose land use would cause an increase of the volume to capacity ratio (also called the Intersection Capacity Utilization) by 0.02 (2 percent) for any intersection with a LOS of D or worse, a preliminary screening shall be conducted per SCAQMD Rule 1401 and 212 to determine whether a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) shall be prepared.

MM5.4-2c Upon final site design, the following measures shall be investigated for feasibility:

- Provide a minimum buffer zone of 300 meters between truck traffic and sensitive receptors;
- Improve traffic flow by signal synchronization;
- Enforce truck parking restrictions;
- Develop park and ride programs;
- Restrict truck idling;
- Restrict operation to "clean" trucks;
- Electrify service equipment facility;
- Provide electrical hook-ups for truck that need to cool their load;

- Electrify auxiliary power units;
- Use "clean" street sweepers;
- Provide on-site services to minimize truck traffic in or near residential areas, including, but not limited to, the following services; meal or cafeteria service, automated teller machines, etc.;
- Require or provide incentives to use low sulfur diesel fuel with particulate traps; and
- Alternative fueled off-road equipment.

MM5.4-2d All construction projects shall be in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402 – Nuisance.

CONSISTENCY WITH AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

IS 5.4-3 *The proposed projects would conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Analysis has concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Finding. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures and project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. According to the *AQMD Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook* (SCAQMD, 2003), the purpose of the consistency finding is to determine if a project is inconsistent with the assumptions and objectives of the regional air quality plans, and thus if it would interfere with the region's ability to comply with Federal and State air quality standards. The construction of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO_X, CO and PM_{10}, resulting in a significant impact. The operational emissions associated with the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO_X, CO and PM_{10}, resulting in a significant impact. The Basin is designated as non-attainment for O_3, CO and PM_{10}. Since construction and operational emissions associated with implementation of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plan would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for these criteria pollutants, the proposed projects would be inconsistent with the AQMP, resulting in significant and unavoidable impacts.

Despite implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.4-3 (which references Mitigation Measures 5.4-1a through 5.4-1d and 5.4-2b) of the Final EIR, impacts would be significant and unavoidable. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.4-1a During clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations, excessive fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust preventive measures using the following procedures, as

specified in the South Coast Air Quality Management Districts Rules and Regulations.

- On-site vehicle speed will be limited to 15 miles per hour.
- All on-site construction roads with vehicle traffic will be watered periodically.
- Streets adjacent to the project reach will be swept at least daily to remove silt that may have accumulated from construction activities so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust (water sweepers shall use reclaimed water).
- All material excavated or graded will be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering will occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferable in the late morning and after work is done for the day.
- All clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities will cease during periods of high winds (i.e., greater than 25 miles per hour as instantaneous gusts) so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- All material transported on-site or off-site will be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations will be minimized so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- These control techniques will be indicated on project grading plans. Compliance with this measure will be subject to periodic site inspections by the City.
- Visible dust beyond the property line emanating from the project will be prevented in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust. The project proponent shall notify the SCAQMD by submitting Form 403N, implement Rule 403 Table 2 and 3 control actions, and maintain records of control measures implemented if the project meets the requirements of Rule 403 large operations.
- Replace ground cover in disturbed areas inactive for ten or more days.
- Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).

- Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit the construction site onto paved roads or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.
- Appoint a construction relations officer to act as a community liaison concerning on-site construction activity including resolution of issues related to PM_{10} generation.
- Prohibit trucking idling in excess of ten minutes.
- Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interferences.
- Provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow.
- Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow on the arterial system to off-peak hour to the extent practicable.
- Reroute construction trucks away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas.
- When feasible, provide dedicated turn lanes for the movement of construction trucks and equipment on- and off-site.
- When feasible, use electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel generators.
- Give preferential consideration to contractor who use clean fuel construction equipment, emulsified diesel fuels, construction equipment that uses low sulfur diesel and is equipped with oxidation catalysts, particulate traps, or other retrofit technologies.

MM 5.4-1b Project grading plans shall show the duration of construction. Ozone precursor emissions from construction equipment vehicles shall be controlled by maintaining equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specifications, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Compliance with this measure will be subject to periodic inspections of construction equipment vehicles by the City.

MM 5.4-1c All trucks that are to haul excavated or graded material on-site shall comply with State Vehicle Code Section 23114, with special attention to Sections 23114(b)(F), (e)(2) and (e)(4) as amended, regarding the prevention of such material spilling onto public streets and roads.

MM 5.4-1d During site grading and public infrastructure construction phases, construction equipment and supply staging areas shall be located at least 400 feet away from the nearest residence. During structure/building

construction, equipment and supply staging areas shall be located at least 400 feet away or as far as practical from the nearest residence.

MM 5.4-2b Should a potential end-user be identified whose land use would cause an increase of the volume to capacity ratio (also called the Intersection Capacity Utilization) by 0.02 (2 percent) for any intersection with a LOS of D or worse, a preliminary screening shall be conducted per SCAQMD Rule 1401 and 212 to determine whether a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) shall be prepared.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

IS 5.4-4 *The proposed projects would result in impacts to regional air quality resulting from development of cumulative projects would impact existing air quality levels. Analysis has concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Finding. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures and project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. The cumulative study area for air quality impacts encompasses the Basin, which is designated as a nonattainment zone for ozone (O_3), PM_{10} and CO. Both long-term stationary (on-site energy consumption) and mobile (vehicular traffic) sources would contribute to regional criteria pollutant emissions. Since the Basin is a nonattainment zone for O_3, CO and PM_{10}, these emissions would cumulatively contribute to significant regional air quality impacts, resulting in significant and unavoidable impacts.

Despite implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.4-4 (which references Mitigation Measures 5.4-1a through 5.4-1d and Mitigation Measure 5.4-2b) of the Final EIR, impacts would be significant and unavoidable. The measures are as follows:

MM 5.4-1a During clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations, excessive fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust preventive measures using the following procedures, as specified in the South Coast Air Quality Management Districts Rules and Regulations.

- On-site vehicle speed will be limited to 15 miles per hour.
- All on-site construction roads with vehicle traffic will be watered periodically.
- Streets adjacent to the project reach will be swept at least daily to remove silt that may have accumulated from construction activities so

as to prevent excessive amounts of dust (water sweepers shall use reclaimed water).

- All material excavated or graded will be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering will occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferable in the late morning and after work is done for the day.

- All clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities will cease during periods of high winds (i.e., greater than 25 miles per hour as instantaneous gusts) so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

- All material transported on-site or off-site will be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

- The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations will be minimized so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

- These control techniques will be indicated on project grading plans. Compliance with this measure will be subject to periodic site inspections by the City.

- Visible dust beyond the property line emanating from the project will be prevented in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust. The project proponent shall notify the SCAQMD by submitting Form 403N, implement Rule 403 Table 2 and 3 control actions, and maintain records of control measures implemented if the project meets the requirements of Rule 403 large operations.

- Replace ground cover in disturbed areas inactive for ten or more days.

- Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).

- Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit the construction site onto paved roads or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.

- Appoint a construction relations officer to act as a community liaison concerning on-site construction activity including resolution of issues related to PM_{10} generation.

- Prohibit trucking idling in excess of ten minutes.

- Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interferences.
- Provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow.
- Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow on the arterial system to off-peak hour to the extent practicable.
- Reroute construction trucks away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas.
- When feasible, provide dedicated turn lanes for the movement of construction trucks and equipment on- and off-site.
- When feasible, use electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel generators.
- Give preferential consideration to contractor who use clean fuel construction equipment, emulsified diesel fuels, construction equipment that uses low sulfur diesel and is equipped with oxidation catalysts, particulate traps, or other retrofit technologies.

MM 5.4-1b Project grading plans shall show the duration of construction. Ozone precursor emissions from construction equipment vehicles shall be controlled by maintaining equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specifications, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Compliance with this measure will be subject to periodic inspections of construction equipment vehicles by the City.

MM 5.4-1c All trucks that are to haul excavated or graded material on-site shall comply with State Vehicle Code Section 23114, with special attention to Sections 23114(b)(F), (e)(2) and (e)(4) as amended, regarding the prevention of such material spilling onto public streets and roads.

MM 5.4-1d During site grading and public infrastructure construction phases, construction equipment and supply staging areas shall be located at least 400 feet away from the nearest residence. During structure/building construction, equipment and supply staging areas shall be located at least 400 feet away or as far as practical from the nearest residence.

MM 5.4-2b Should a potential end-user be identified whose land use would cause an increase of the volume to capacity ratio (also called the Intersection Capacity Utilization) by 0.02 (2 percent) for any intersection with a LOS of D or worse, a preliminary screening shall be conducted per SCAQMD Rule 1401 and 212 to determine whether a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) shall be prepared.

NOISE

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

IS 5.5-4 *The proposed projects, combined with cumulative projects, would increase the ambient noise levels in the site vicinity. Analysis has concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact would occur with approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans.*

Finding. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures and project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. Table 5.5-7, *Future (2025) Noise Levels Per Roadway Segment*, of the Final EIR, lists the noise levels along roadway segments in the project vicinity under both the cumulative without project conditions and cumulative with projects conditions for Year 2025 (General Plan buildout). As illustrated in Table 5.5-7, all but one roadway segment (Mission Road, between Mountain View Avenue and Barton Road) would have noise levels above 55 dBA without the project conditions, at 100 feet from the roadway centerline (typical distance to midpoint of a rear yard for a receptor adjacent to the roadway). Therefore, any increase along these roadways would result in a significant impact on the cumulative noise level. As such, the proposed University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative noise impacts.

IX. FINDING REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must contain "a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or the location of the project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project", as well as an evaluation of the "comparative merits of the alternatives." The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives that "would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, or would be more costly".

The City of Loma Linda, having reviewed and considered the information contained of the Final EIR, Technical Appendices and the administrative record, finds, pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081 (a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines 15091 (a)(3) that (i) the Final EIR considers a reasonable range of project alternatives and mitigation measures and (ii) specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives as follows:

NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

The No Projects/No Development Alternative assumes the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would not be implemented and land uses and other improvements would not be constructed. The existing Project Area would remain unaltered and in its current condition. All infrastructure improvements including water, wastewater, drainage and circulation facilities identified in the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would not be constructed. The design and development standards for the Specific Plans would not be implemented.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the No Project/No Development Alternative identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in significant, unavoidable land use, aesthetic/light and glare, air quality, and noise impacts. As described in Section 7.0 of the Final EIR, this Alternative would also not implement the goals of the Orchard Park and University Village Specific Plans, which include a mixed-use master planned community based upon a neo-traditional, pedestrian oriented land use plan. Development of this Alternative would not provide for the orderly and efficient development of the Project Area in accordance with the provisions of the City of Loma Linda General Plan. Under this Alternative, the proposed Specific Plans, land use designations, development standards and design guidelines would not be implemented. Therefore, none of the projects' objectives identified Section 3.3, *Project Objectives*, of the Final EIR, would be met.

ORCHARD PARK ONLY ALTERNATIVE

The Orchard Park Only Alternative would involve development of only the Orchard Park Specific Plan and not the University Village Specific Plan. Therefore, compared to the proposed projects, the Orchard Park Only Alternative would involve development of a total of 1,259 residential units and 962,676 square feet of commercial and mixed-uses. Planning Area 12 would not be developed with an elementary school and would be utilized as a park area only. None of the improvements associated with the University Village Specific Plan would occur

including the extension of Park Avenue, Citrus Avenue and Orange Avenue, along with the utility improvements (including development of the Bryn Mawr storm drain system).

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the Orchard Park Only Alternative identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding: The Orchard Park Only Alternative would implement all of the goals and objectives for the Orchard Park Specific Plan. Development of this Alternative would not result in the development of the University Village Specific Plan, which would involve a mixed-use master planned community on 170 acres, based upon a neo-traditional, pedestrian oriented land use plan. This Alternative would not provide a diversity of housing opportunities including single-family, multi-family (for sale and for rent) and senior housing within the University Village Project site. An integrated park/open space/trail/historic preservation program would not be implemented for the University Village Project site. Finally, this Alternative would not result in the unified development theme compatible with the Orchard Park Specific Plan and design guidelines, which would ensure high quality future development. Therefore, none of the University Village Specific Plan objectives would be fulfilled under this Alternative.

UNIVERSITY VILLAGE ONLY ALTERNATIVE

The University Village Only Alternative would involve development of only the University Village Specific Plan and not the Orchard Park Specific Plan. Therefore, compared to the proposed projects, the University Village Only Alternative would involve development of a total of 1,769 residential units and 172,000 square feet of neighborhood commercial uses. Planning Area N would not be developed with an elementary school, but utilized as a park area only. Improvements associated with the Orchard Park Specific Plan would not occur, except for the extension of Park Avenue, Citrus Avenue and Orange Avenue through the Orchard Park Project site.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the University Village Only Alternative identified in the Final EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The University Village Only Alternative would implement all of the goals and objectives for the University Village Specific Plan. However, implementation of this Alternative would not allow for development of the Orchard Park Specific Plan, which would support the efficient use of land resources by locating stores, offices, residences, schools and recreation spaces within walking distance of each other in compact neighborhoods with pedestrian-oriented streets. Since, the compact development associated with the Orchard Park Specific Plan would not occur, traffic impacts would increase, resulting in the increase in pollution and energy consumption. Individual development of the University Village Project site would result in an increase in infrastructure costs associated with low-density fringe development. Therefore, none of the objectives for the Orchard Park Specific Plan would be fulfilled.

REVISED UNIVERSITY VILLAGE SPECIFIC PLAN ALTERNATIVE

The Revised University Village Specific Plan Alternative would involve development of both the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans. However, Planning Area A of the University Village Specific Plan would be developed with a density of 0.13 FAR (45,000 square feet) of neighborhood commercial uses as opposed to a density of 0.50 FAR (172,000 square feet) as provided by the City of Loma Linda General Plan, which represents a reduction of 127,000 square feet of neighborhood commercial uses.

The project applicant will also include an alternative land use plan in the Specific Plan. The total number of dwellings units and commercial square footage remain the same under the alternative as the Revised University Specific Plan: 1,769 dwelling units and 45,000 square feet. Under the alternative land use plan, the acreage for PA-F and PA-I are slightly reduced to create two new planning areas along Mission Road that encompass approximately 4 acres. Single-family detached homes with a lot size of 99 feet by 80 feet are proposed for these two planning areas.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the Revised University Village Specific Plan Alternative identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding: All of the goals and objectives included in the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plan would be realized under this Alternative. However, by reducing the amount of commercial uses along Redlands Boulevard, this Alternative would conflict with the Guiding Policy of the General Plan for Special Planning Area D, which states, "The frontage on Redlands Boulevard is intended for office uses within multi-building complexes."

In addition, this Alternative would conflict with the following Implementing Policies of the City of Loma Linda General Plan for Mixed-Use Area D:

- Anchor centers with multiple buildings (e.g., shopping centers) with large buildings that are set back from the street, but that are entirely or partially screened with "pad" buildings that create a strong street edge and obscure the interior parking area. "Convenience" commercial uses such as service stations should be designed as pad buildings so that they are easily accessible from the street. Shopping areas need not be "traditional" supermarket/drug store center, but can also be made up of low-intensity, specialty shopping facilities featuring boutiques and small shops. Boutiques are small, "in-line" shops that are also encouraged within more traditional shopping centers.

- Except for the village area described below, the appropriate density for the shopping centers and multiple office buildings shall be 0.5 FAR. The appropriate density for small institutional uses (e.g., religious assembly uses and schools) shall be 0.5 FAR. The density for the residential areas shall range from low density (2.1 to 5 dwelling units per acre) to medium density (5.1 to 9 dwelling units per acre). New residential uses in proximity to existing residential uses that will remain along Mission Road shall be compatible in density (generally, low density to medium density residential (2.1 to 9 dwelling units per acre) and scale.

Therefore, while this Alternative would satisfy the objectives for the proposed Specific Plans, it would conflict with the City's objectives for the type and density of development of the Project Area, which has anticipated high density commercial development along Redlands Boulevard.

REVISED ORCHARD PARK SPECIFIC PLAN ALTERNATIVE

The Revised Orchard Park Specific Plan Alternative is based upon an alternative land use plan provided by the project applicants in April 2004. The Revised Orchard Park Specific Plan Alternative would include 15 Planning Areas with a total of 1,333 residential units and 956,143 square feet of commercial and mixed-uses (refer to Table 7-1, *Revised Orchard Park Specific Plan Land Use Table* and Exhibit 7-1, *Revised Orchard Park Land Use Plan*, of the Final EIR). This Alternative represents a decrease of approximately 6,533 square feet of commercial uses, 21 multi-family residential units, 10 acres of park area and 4.5 acres of institutional uses. This Alternative would result in an increase of 95 single-family residential units.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the Revised Orchard Park Specific Plan Alternative identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding: All of the goals and objectives included in the Orchard Park Specific Plan would be realized under this Alternative. However, by reducing the amount of commercial uses within the Orchard Park Specific Plan, this Alternative may not accomplish the goal of implementing redevelopment goals for the University Village Project site since it would develop less commercial uses, which would reduce the amount of tax revenue the City receives which is utilized by the Redevelopment Agency for investment in the City.

REDUCED RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Residential Alternative would eliminate the residential land use designation along California Street and Redlands Boulevard and instead would only provide for commercial development. No residential units would be developed within Planning Area C of the University Village Specific Plan and Planning Areas 3 through 6 of the Orchard Park Specific Plan. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a decrease of 1,046 multi-family residential units and an increase of approximately 1.6 million square feet of commercial uses.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the Reduced Residential Alternative identified in the Final EIR.

Facts Supporting Finding: Development of this Alternative would not fully implement the following goals and objectives of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans by reducing the amount of multi-family residential units:

University Village

- To provide for diversity of housing opportunities responsive to local needs, incomes, and lifestyles, including for sale, for rent, market-rate and affordable products.

Orchard Park

- A variety of housing choices, so that the young and old, singles and families and those of varying economic ability may find places to live.

Therefore, this Alternative would not satisfy the projects' objectives of providing a range of adequate housing opportunities.

X. FINDING REGARDING OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

Growth-inducing impacts fall into two general categories: direct and indirect. Direct growth-inducing impacts are generally associated with the provision of urban services to an undeveloped area. The provision of these services to a site and the subsequent development can serve to induce other landowners in the vicinity to convert their property to urban uses. Indirect, or secondary growth-inducing impacts, consist of growth induced in the region by the additional demands for housing, goods and services associated with the population increase caused by, or attracted to, a new project.

Direct Growth Inducing Impacts

The proposed projects would require the extension of gas and electric lines into the Project Area, which is currently utilized mainly for citrus groves. In addition, water and sewer lines would have to be developed in order to support the increase of demand as a result of the proposed projects. The extension of these public utilities may induce growth within the area, considering the undeveloped nature of the area south of the Project Area. The proposed projects increased demand for public services would require that existing infrastructure be expanded, which may provide additional capacity for development of the undeveloped area surrounding the Project Area. Therefore, the proposed projects would result in direct growth-inducing impacts.

Indirect Growth Inducing Impacts

Overall, implementation of both the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans could result in a direct increase in the City's population with development of residential and employment generating land uses. As a result of developing 3,028 residential units and approximately 1.1 million square feet of commercial and mixed uses, the proposed projects would add approximately 9,307 persons (4,669 persons from the Orchard Park Project and 4,638 persons from the University Village Project) to the City's permanent population. As a result, the City's population would increase to approximately 29,443. This would represent an approximately 46.2 percent increase over the City's 2003 population estimate of 20,136 persons. When comparing the total population increase of 9,307 persons to the anticipated population increase by the year 2020, the proposed projects would represent 61.1 percent of SCAG's projected growth (a population increase of 9,307 persons from the University Village and Orchard Park Project compared to an increase of 15,242 from the City's 2003 population of 20,136 to the City's projected population of 35,378 persons by the year 2020). As a result, the proposed projects would result in indirect growth-inducing impacts.

SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Approval of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would cause irreversible environmental changes. Implementation of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would result in the following changes:

- Permanent commitment of land that would be physically altered to residential, commercial, mixed use and institutional land uses.

- Vegetation removal for grading and construction activities. Landscaping is included with the proposed projects.

- Alteration of the human environment as a consequence of the development process. The proposed projects represents a commitment to residential and commercial uses, which intensifies land uses within the Project Area.

- Utilization of various new raw materials, such as lumber, sand and gravel for construction. The energy consumed in development and maintenance of the Project Area may be considered a permanent investment.

- Incremental increases in vehicular activity in the surrounding circulation system, resulting in associated increases in air emissions and noise levels.

EXHIBIT B
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, decision-makers are required to balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve a project. In the event the benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable." The CEQA Guidelines require that, when a public agency allows for the occurrence of significant effects that are identified in the Final EIR but are not at least substantially mitigated, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons the action was supported. Any statement of overriding considerations should be included in the record of project approval and should be mentioned in the Notice of Determination.

To the extent the significant effects of the project are not avoided or substantially lessened to a level of insignificance, the City of Loma Linda, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR for the project, and having reviewed and considered the information contained in the public record, and having balanced the benefits of the project against the unavoidable effects which remain, finds that such unmitigated effects to be acceptable in consideration of the following overriding considerations discussion.

The City of Loma Linda finds that all feasible mitigation measures have been imposed to lessen project impacts to less than significant, and furthermore, that Alternatives to the projects are infeasible because they have greater environmental impacts, do not provide the benefits of the projects, or are otherwise socially or economically infeasible as fully described in the projects' findings.

The environmental analysis undertaken for the proposed projects indicates that the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans would result in significant and unavoidable impacts in regards to land use and relevant planning (consistency with SCAG policies), aesthetics/light and glare (long-term, scenic corridors, and cumulative), air quality (short-term, long-term, consistency with the regional air quality management plan, and cumulative), and noise (cumulative).

The City of Loma Linda as Lead Agency and decision-maker for the projects has reviewed and considered the information contained in both the Draft and Final EIRs prepared for the proposed projects and the public record. The University Village Specific Plan would provide for a mixed-use master planned community on 170 acres, based upon a neo-traditional, pedestrian-oriented land use plan. This would be achieved by coordinating the land use, intensity, scale and aesthetic characteristics of development with local community needs. The University Village Specific Plan contains land use, development standards and design guidelines, which are intended to implement the goals, objectives and policies of the City's General Plan. The University Village Specific Plan would provide a diversity of housing opportunities responsive to local needs, incomes, and lifestyles, including for sale, for rent, market-rate and affordable products, that would also assist in implementing redevelopment goals for the project site. Finally, the University Village Specific Plan would preserve and enhance historic site resources by maintaining and enhancing the rural character of Mission Road and providing an integrated park/open space/trail/historic preservation program.

The Orchard Park Specific Plan would ensure development of a community that would reflect the area's history and would provide a mixture of commercial, residential, and other uses in order to achieve a walkable community. The Orchard Park Specific Plan supports the efficient use of land resources through compact building forms, infill development and moderation in street and parking standards. The same frugality of land development also supports efficient use of public and private infrastructure. By locating stores, offices, residences, schools and recreation spaces within walking distance of each other, the Orchard Park Specific Plan would promote independence of movement; safety in commercial areas; reduction in auto use; and would support those who work at home through nearby services and parks. The Orchard Park Specific Plan would also include a variety of housing choices, so that the young and old, singles and families and those of varying economic ability may find places to live.

In light of the above, and the substantial evidence included within the Final EIR, the Technical Appendices and the administrative record, the City of Loma Linda hereby declares that the foregoing benefits provided to the public through approval and implementation of the proposed projects outweigh the identified significant adverse environmental impacts of the University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans, which cannot be mitigated. The City of Loma Linda finds that each of the projects' benefits outweighs the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the Final EIR and therefore finds those impacts to be acceptable.