



**CITY OF LOMA LINDA GENERAL PLAN
ADDENDUM TO THE
PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
SCH NO. 2003101159
San Bernardino County, California**

Prepared for:

City of Loma Linda
25541 Barton Road
Loma Linda, California 92354
(909) 799-2830

Prepared by:

LSA Associates, Inc.
1500 Iowa Avenue, Suite 200
Riverside, California 92507
(909) 781-9310
Project Number: LLD130

LSA

April 8, 2009

The City of Loma Linda has independently reviewed, analyzed, and exercised its judgment in the analysis contained in this Environmental Impact Report and supporting documentation pursuant to Section 21082 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1	PURPOSE AND SCOPE	1-1
1.2	PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION	1-1
1.3	EXISTING DOCUMENTS TO BE INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE	1-3
1.4	CONTACT PERSONS	1-4
2.0	GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS	2-1
2.1	LOCATION AND SETTING	2-1
2.2	THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS	2-1
2.3	ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS ASSUMPTIONS METHODOLOGY	2-6
2.4	ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATIONS OF THE 2006 GENERAL PLAN PROGRAM EIR	2-8
3.0	ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	3-1
3.1	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM	3-1
3.2	DISCUSSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM RESPONSES ...	3-15
4.0	REFERENCES AND PREPARERS	4-1
4.1	REFERENCES	4-1
4.2	PREPARERS	4-1

TABLES

2.A	Changes in Residential Land Use Designations from Measure V	2-1
2.B	Summary of Proposed Amendments to the Loma Linda General Plan	2-3
2.C	General Plan Non-Residential Land Uses Allowable Building Square Footage	2-10

APPENDICES

A:	TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (on CD-ROM)	
----	-------------------------------------	--



1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The City of Loma Linda (City) proposes several amendments to its 2006 General Plan. The proposed amendments, which are explained in detail in Chapter 2.0, consist of an update to the General Plan's Housing Element, incorporation of voter-approved Measure V, and other amendments. The 2006 General Plan was analyzed in a Final program Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) in 2004. Because the proposed amendments would modify the 2006 General Plan, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Public Resources Code, §§ 21000, et seq.) requires that the City determine if additional environmental review is necessary to account for any impacts that might result from these modifications.

In order to determine the appropriate level of environmental review, this addendum compares the impacts of the 2006 General Plan with the impacts that would result from the General Plan as modified by the proposed amendments. Based on this comparison, the City has determined that the General Plan as amended would not create any environmental impacts that were not already analyzed in the 2004 EIR for the 2006 General Plan. Therefore, according to the provisions of CEQA, the City has determined that this addendum constitutes adequate analysis of the proposed amendments.

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164, the lead agency may prepare an addendum to an EIR when proposed changes to the project will not result in any new or substantially more severe environmental effects; when no substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken; when no new information of substantial importance arises regarding impacts that might be caused by the project; and when no other substantial revisions to the previous EIR are necessary.

The analysis presented in the Section 3 supports the finding that no additional environmental documentation is required for the proposed project and an Addendum to the EIR for the 2006 General Plan is the appropriate CEQA documentation.

1.2 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The Loma Linda General Plan is the City's blueprint for its ultimate physical, economic, and cultural development. Community issues addressed in the General Plan include: achieving and maintaining a vibrant community in which all residents enjoy a wide range of employment, shopping, and recreational opportunities; achieving a closer balance between jobs and housing; providing opportunities to establish a community downtown; improving the design quality of the community; protecting and appropriately managing hillside areas; enhancing the City's economic viability.

On July 17, 2006, the City of Loma Linda City Council certified an Environmental Impact Report for its General Plan (State Clearinghouse No. 2003101159). The City's certification of the 2004 EIR included the adoption of findings for five environmental issues that could not be sufficiently mitigated to a below a less than significant level. The issues identified significant and unavoidable were:

- **Aesthetics:** Conversion of open space and obstruction of existing open and panoramic views;
- **Air Quality:** Increase in regional pollutant emissions associated with vehicle travel, as well as emissions generated during construction activities;



- **Biological Resources:** Loss of extensive areas of natural habitats;
- **Water Supply:** Increased water demand will continue to diminish local and regional water sources;
- **Transportation and Circulation:** No certainty that required improvements to alleviate level of service impacts in surrounding communities and at freeway interchanges will be completed.

All other impacts were found to be less than significant, or were reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation. A more detailed description of the conclusions reached in the EIR is identified in Section 2.4 of this Addendum.

The Loma Linda General Plan includes an initiative measure (Ordinance 495) enacted by a vote of the people in 1993 to address hillside conservation issues and an amendment to an initiative measure that was adopted by a vote of the people in 1996 (Ordinance 541). Ordinance 541 is codified at Chapter 20.12 of the Loma Linda Municipal Code. Ordinances 495 and 541 are collectively referred to as the "Hillside Conservation Amendments." Measure V is intended to support and expand the Hillside Conservation Amendments as growth management tools and to include areas of land not previously subject to those provisions of law as well as to address other growth management-related issues that affect urban development in the City.

The focus of this Addendum is a comparison of the environmental impacts associated with the 2006 General Plan and impacts associated with General Plan as proposed to be amended. The 2004 EIR has already addressed the environmental impacts of implementing the 2006 General Plan, and the Loma Linda City Council certified that the EIR was adequate and met the provisions of CEQA for this purpose.

Pursuant to CEQA, *State CEQA Guidelines*, and the City's CEQA Implementation Guidelines, this addendum is limited to examining the environmental effects associated with the changes between the previously approved project (2006 General Plan) as analyzed in the certified EIR, and the General Plan as amended.

1.2.1 Project Evaluation When Relying on a Previously Certified EIR

CEQA Section 21166 and Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines identify the conditions that require preparation of additional environmental documentation when the lead agency has previously certified an EIR for the project. Depending on the existence and extent of changes in the project, changes in surrounding circumstances, or the discovery of new information, a lead agency may choose to prepare either an EIR Addendum, Supplemental EIR, or Subsequent EIR after a previous EIR has already been certified. As provided by CEQA Guidelines sections 15162 and 15163, a proposed change in a project will require preparation of a Supplemental or Subsequent EIR if:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or a negative declaration due to an involvement of new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of the previously identified significant effects; or
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could have not been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified, shows:



- a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
- b. The significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than identified in the previous EIR;
- c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or
- d. Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

If none of the above conditions occur, CEQA Guidelines section 15164 allows the preparation of an EIR Addendum, rather than a Supplemental EIR or Subsequent EIR. Section 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines states, "The Lead Agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred."

As reflected in this Addendum, the City analyzed the proposed amended General Plan as compared to the 2006 General Plan and the issues addressed in the 2004 General Plan EIR. Based on this analysis, and based on the requirements outlined above, the City has determined that the appropriate CEQA environmental documentation for the proposed amendments is this Addendum to the 2004 General Plan EIR.

1.2.2 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

This Addendum uses an Environmental Checklist Form (Section 3.0 of this Addendum) to compare the anticipated environmental impacts of the amended General Plan with the impacts previously identified in the certified EIR. The Form is used to review the potential environmental effects of the amended General Plan for each of the following areas:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Services
- Cumulative Impacts

There are six possible responses to each of the questions included on the Form. The Form and accompanying evaluation of the responses provide the information and analysis upon which the City of Loma Linda may make its determination. Based on the comparative analysis and the conclusions regarding impacts reflected in the Environmental Checklist Form, the City has determined that none of the conditions set forth in Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines requiring preparation of a Supplemental or Subsequent EIR are met.



1.3 EXISTING DOCUMENTS TO BE INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Section 15150 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* permits an environmental document to incorporate by reference other documents that provide relevant data. The documents outlined in this section are hereby incorporated by reference, and the pertinent material is summarized throughout this Addendum, where that information is relevant to the analysis of impacts of the proposed amended General Plan. All documents incorporated by reference are available for review at the City of Loma Linda Community Development Department.

- City of Loma Linda General Plan, June 2006.
- City of Loma Linda General Plan Update Draft Program Environmental Impact Report, March 22, 2004 (State Clearinghouse No. 2003101159).
- City of Loma Linda General Plan Update Final Program Environmental Impact Report, June 21, 2004 (State Clearinghouse No. 2003101159).

1.4 CONTACT PERSONS

The Lead Agency for this Addendum is the City of Loma Linda. Any questions about the preparation of this document, its assumptions, or its conclusions should be referred to:

Deborah Woldruff, Community Development Director
City of Loma Linda, Community Development Department
25541 Barton Road
Loma Linda, California 92354
(909) 799-2830
(909) 799-2894 (fax)

Loma Linda City Hall Hours of Operation

Monday-Thursday 7:00 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.



2.0 2006 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS

2.1 LOCATION AND SETTING

The proposed amendments to Loma Linda's 2006 General Plan encompass the City limits, planning areas, and the sphere of influence. The City of Loma Linda is located within western San Bernardino County approximately 60 miles east of the City of Los Angeles, California. The City was incorporated in 1970. Jurisdictions that border the City of Loma Linda include the Cities of Redlands and San Bernardino to the north; the City of Redlands and unincorporated portions of San Bernardino County to the east; unincorporated portions of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties to the south; and unincorporated portions of San Bernardino County and the Cities of Colton and San Bernardino to the west.

The total Planning Area covers approximately 9.43 square miles. Of this area, approximately 8.0 square miles are currently within the City limits. This Planning Area boundary is intended to recognize the interrelationships between land use and other issues affecting the City of Loma Linda and surrounding lands.

The 2006 *Loma Linda General Plan* is the current blueprint for the City's future. It describes the future growth and development within the City through build-out in 2030. It acts as a constitution for public and private development, the foundation upon which City authorities will make growth and land use-related decisions. The General Plan encapsulates the community's goals with respect to human-made and natural environments, and to set forth the policies and implementation measures to achieve them for the welfare of those who live, work, and do business in the City of Loma Linda.

2.2 THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

This addendum analyzes several proposed amendments to the 2006 General Plan. These amendments would: incorporate Measure V into the General Plan; update the City's Housing Element and reducing General Plan residential buildout; add policies to the 2006 General Plan to reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the City, conserve water, and reduce waste; strengthen environmental and traffic mitigation policies; provide for increased hospitality uses in a way that applies to a proposed hotel on Redlands Boulevard; ensure the 1996 Hillside Initiative is properly incorporated into the General Plan; provide for a broader range of uses for Special Planning Area "B"; move certain existing General Plan provisions from the former Growth Management Element into the Public Services and Facilities Element; and clarify how "consistency" with the General Plan is determined. The provisions of Measure V reduce maximum allowable density in certain land use categories, restrict development in certain parts of the City, and modify the traffic level of service standards in the City. The updated Housing Element identifies measures for increasing the City's housing supply, such as providing for student housing at Loma Linda University and modifying the City's development review process. All proposed amendments are described in more detail below and are summarized in Table 2.A.

Table 2.A: Changes in Residential Land Use Designations from Measure V

2006 General Plan – Residential Designations	Proposed Amendments – Residential Designations
	Hillside Conservation (0–1 dwelling unit per 10 acres)
	Low Density Hillside Preservation (0–1 dwelling unit per 10 acres)
	Medium Density Hillside Preservation (0–1 dwelling unit per 5 acres)



Table 2.A: Changes in Residential Land Use Designations from Measure V

2006 General Plan – Residential Designations	Proposed Amendments – Residential Designations
	Rural Estates (0–1 dwelling units per acre)
	Very Low Density (0–2 dwelling units per acre)
Low Density Residential (2.1–5 dwelling units per acre)	Low Density (0–4 dwelling units per acre)
Medium Density Residential (5.1–9 dwelling units per acre)	Medium Density (0–9 dwelling units per acre)
Medium High Density Residential (9.1–13 dwelling units per acre)	Medium High (0–13 dwelling units per acre)
High Density Residential (13.1–20 dwelling units per acre)	High Density (0–13 dwelling units per acre)
	Very High Density (0–20 dwelling units per acre)
	Senior Citizen Housing (0–25 dwelling units per acre)
South Hills (0–1 dwelling unit per 10 acres)	South Hills (0–1 dwelling unit per 10 acres); designation now only applies to areas exempted in Measure V

2.2.1 Measure V

On November 7, 2006, the voters of the City of Loma Linda passed Ballot Measure V, which establishes policies to manage growth and to preserve and protect the quality of life in the City. The primary intent of Measure V is the protection of hillside areas, preservation of open space, and maintenance of safe, quiet residential areas. The proposed amendments would not directly result in physical changes to the environment; rather they would alter the extent, location, density, and type of development that could occur in selected areas of the City, which would, in turn, influence the extent to which future development has an impact on the environment. Overall, restrictions on development in the southern portion of the planning area and the establishment of a minimum lot size would reduce the amount of residential development predicted to occur at build-out of the currently adopted General Plan.

Measure V became effective in December 2006, following its approval by City voters in November 2006. The enactment of Measure V by the voters was exempt from CEQA, and therefore did not require CEQA analysis at that time. However, the City has determined that further discretionary amendments to the 2006 General Plan are desirable both to simplify the document and to fully implement the intent of Measure V. Therefore, the proposed General Plan text amendments include the addition of the main provisions of Measure V as Chapter 2A to the General Plan, and various parallel text amendments to other General Plan elements with regard to residential land use densities, planned residential developments and communities, hillside conservation, and open space both within the City and within its planning areas and sphere of influence. These amendments are fully identified in Table 2.B. Measure V and the proposed amendments limit development densities within hillside areas of the City and will minimize the need for and costs of extension of City services. Measure V and related amendments establish principles of managed growth that will preserve, enhance, and maintain the quality of life, protect hillside areas, preserve open space, and maintain safe and quiet residential areas.



Table 2.B: Summary of Proposed Amendments to the Loma Linda General Plan

Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate provisions of Measure V into Section 1.2.2, Guiding Principles for Managed Growth. • Incorporate discussion of Measure V and its relationship to the General Plan into Section 1.3. • Modify text to ensure the 1996 Hillside Ordinance is appropriately incorporated. • Add discussion as to where growth management provisions are found in the General Plan into Section 1.7, General Plan format.
Land Use Element	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate land use designations established by Measure V into the Land Use Element. • Revise the text of the South Hills designation to reflect its application only to areas exempted from Measure V. • Revise the General Plan land use map to reflect changes required by Measure V in the southern hillside areas of the City and adjacent lands. • Add provisions for student housing and employee housing to be developed within the university campus and on hospital sites consistent with the provisions of the updated Housing Element. • Incorporate information on maximum allowable residential development within individual special planning areas. • Delete the text of Special Planning Area H to reflect The City Council's previous action to use standard land use designations for that area. • Modify Text for Special Planning Area "B" to provide for a broader range of uses. • Provide for increased FAR (0.75) for hospitality uses that apply to proposed hotel on Redlands Boulevard. • Add goal to preserve and protect designated hillside areas in a portion of the south hills of the City designated as "Hillside Conservation." • Modify Section 2.2.1.1 to provide criteria, the meeting of which allows potential bonus of one dwelling unit per 5 acre in the Hillside Conservation land use designation.



Table 2.B: Summary of Proposed Amendments to the Loma Linda General Plan

Housing Element	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update the Housing Element to reflect HCD comments on the previously adopted Element, comply with recently enacted state housing laws, and reflect the new housing period (2008–2014). • Identify polices to increase special needs housing stock to ensure adequate housing opportunities for all segments of the community is achieved. To accomplish this goal, the following policies have been identified in the updated Housing Element: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide adequate residential sites for the production of new for-sale and rental residential units for existing and future residents of all economic groups (1.1); - Ensure the supply of sale, decent, and sound housing for all resident (1.2); - Provide housing that is affordable to all economic segments of the community (1.3); - Assist and cooperate with nonprofit, private, and public entities to maximize opportunities to develop affordable housing (2.1); - Review and modify, as needed, all standards and application processes to ensure that City standards do not act to unduly constrain the production of affordable housing units (2.2); - Facilitate the development of new housing for all economic segments of the community, including lower, moderate, and above moderate-income households (2.3); - Encourage and support the enforcement of laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination in lending practices and in the sale or rental of housing (3.1). • The stated policies are achieved through the continuation of existing City housing programs, the establishment of higher density land use districts (e.g., “Very High Density” and “Senior Housing”), and provisions allowing the development of residential uses ancillary to established uses in the “Institutional” and “Health Care” land use districts.
Transportation Element	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate roadway performance standards from Measure V to address “existing plus project” conditions. • Incorporate policies from Measure V limiting access within the South Hills area. • Incorporate a long-term roadway level of service standard and concurrency policies for its implementation. • Revise policy to resolve roadway improvement “concurrency.” • Modify policy to provide fair share contribution to traffic signal synchronization along selected impacted roadways.
Noise Element	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify policy to require (where needed) installation of temporary noise barriers.



Table 2.B: Summary of Proposed Amendments to the Loma Linda General Plan

Public Services and Facilities Element	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move adopted fire protection service performance standard from the former Growth Management Element into the Public Services and Facilities Element. • Move adopted police service performance standard from the former Growth Management Element into the Public Services and Facilities Element. • Move adopted school facilities performance standard from the former Growth Management Element into the Public Services and Facilities Element. • Move adopted parks and recreation performance standard from the former Growth Management Element into the Public Services and Facilities Element. • Incorporate water supply and facilities provisions from Measure V into the Public Services and Facilities Element. • Move adopted water storage and distribution facilities performance standard from the former Growth Management Element into the Public Services and Facilities Element. • Move adopted wastewater facilities performance standard from the former Growth Management Element into the Public Services and Facilities Element. • Add “zero waste” policies.
Open Space and Conservation Element	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate hillside protection provisions from Measure V. • Incorporate environmentally sensitive areas provisions from Measure V. • Incorporate agricultural preservation policies from Measure V. • Incorporate waste resource provisions from Measure V. • Incorporate section describing “Hillside Conservation” area and program provisions to preserve and conserve these areas. • Add new water conservation provisions and modify policy that requires disapproval of projects for which assured supply is not available. • Incorporate provisions to reduce greenhouse gases. • Add new policy to limit allowable on-trail activities to those consistent with protection of the environmental values of adjacent lands. • Revise General Plan Figure 9.2 to reflect the South Hills Trail System as adopted by the City Council. • Add new policies to avoid use of invasive species; and preserve streams and creeks in their natural state. • Add a policies addressing landform grading. • Modify policy to disallow projects where adequate flood protection is not demonstrated. • Identify a park standard of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, distributed throughout the community, and where possible, provide open space linkages between parks
Public Health and Safety Element	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move adopted flood control facilities performance standard from the former Growth Management Element into this Element.



Table 2.B: Summary of Proposed Amendments to the Loma Linda General Plan

Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate preparation of a climate action plan to implement greenhouse gas reductions. • Incorporate implementation measures aimed at improving the development review process (adopted provisions moved from the former Growth Management Element). • Incorporate implementation measures of the San Bernardino Association of Governments (SANBAG) sustainable communities strategies for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, coordinating transportation planning and facilities funding; aligning planning for housing, and for creating specified incentives for the implementation of the strategies. • Modify policy to clarify how “consistency” with the General Plan is determined.
Growth Management Element	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the previously adopted Growth Management Element (formerly Chapter 11), adding Chapter 2A (Measure V).

The six principles outlined in Measure V and incorporated into the General Plan in Chapter 2A are:

- Principle One:** New development within the planning area and sphere of influence of the City of Loma Linda are subject to City development standards that promote environmentally sensitive development designed to preserve and enhance the quality of life now experienced in the City.
- Principle Two:** The hillside areas of the City of Loma Linda, its planning area, and sphere of influence are important to the community and shall be preserved in as natural a state as possible consistent with the Hillside Conservation Amendments and the standards set forth in this Chapter 2A.
- Principle Three:** New developments shall be planned and constructed in a manner that preserves natural scenic vistas and protects against intrusion on the viewshed areas.
- Principle Four:** Preservation of open space and agricultural land areas is a priority in the City of Loma Linda, its planning area, and its sphere of influence, and dedication of open space in perpetuity shall be a requirement for certain development as well as the City.
- Principle Five:** Water quality and the availability are critical to the current and future residents of the City of Loma Linda, its planning area, and its sphere of influence. No new development shall be approved that endangers the quality or quantity of water delivered to households within the City.
- Principle Six:** Traffic levels of service throughout the City of Loma Linda shall be maintained at current levels and new development shall be required to fully mitigate any impact on traffic resulting from that development.

Chapter 2A augments and updates provisions of the 2006 General Plan with regard to land use densities, planned residential developments and communities, circulation, housing, conservation, and open space provisions. To implement the principles set out in Measure V, development densities within hillside areas of the City will be minimized to limit the cost and impacts associated with the extension of City services in these areas. Measure V establishes a minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet for single-family dwelling units in any planning area or zone, prohibits development within 200 feet of “blue-line streams,” and restricts the use of and/or construction of roads through the Hillside Conservation Area, the Hillside Preservation Area, and the Expanded Hillside Area.



In addition to certain changes to the text of the Land Use Element, the Transportation and Circulation Element (Chapter 6.0) would be amended to adopt the roadway performance standards identified in Measure V. Measure V requires that, except where the level of service is already lower than LOS C, any new development would be required to maintain LOS C at all affected locations. Where existing LOS is already lower than LOS C, any new development would be required to ensure that the LOS does not degrade below existing LOS. Compliance with these standards would be enforced by review of project-related traffic impacts and background traffic conditions, and changes to the project or adoption of effective mitigation measures where necessary to maintain the required LOS. Within the Hillside Preservation Area, Hillside Conservation Area, and Expanded Hillside Area, Measure V limits traffic on roads branching from San Timoteo and Reche Canyon Roads to emergency vehicles. Additionally, within these areas, connections between existing roadways and San Timoteo and Reche Canyon Roads are prohibited. Where new roadways are required, the amendment requires that such roads be limited in number and be designed to minimize environmental impacts.

2.2.2 Housing Element Update

The proposed Housing Element Update (Chapter 5.0) provides for increasing the City's housing supply by removing barriers to the development of special needs housing (e.g. low income housing, shelters, student housing, second units.) Provisions of the updated Housing Element will modify the City's development review process. These modifications will facilitate the implementation of the General Plan by allowing development at higher densities within selected Land Use designations, accommodating special needs housing, and providing for student housing at Loma Linda University. Additionally, the Housing Element Update reflects and incorporates comments received by the City from the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD); complies with changes in state housing laws; and reflects the 2008–2014 housing period.

2.2.3 Other Amendments

The majority of the proposed changes in the Public Services and Facilities Element (Chapter 8.0) consist of moving performance standards from other elements to this element. To ensure the quantity and quality of water supplies, the amendments include provisions that prohibit any development that would fail to meet State or Federal water quality standards, would result in an increase in residential rates, or result in restriction of water usage. Policies have also been added to encourage composting, waste to energy, and zero waste programs.

Proposed amendments to the Open Space and Conservation Element (Chapter 9.0) include provisions to promote environmentally sensitive development that preserves and enhances the quality of life currently enjoyed in the City. These provisions identify permitted development as well as development standards in hillside areas, prohibit most non-residential development in hillside areas, prohibit development within 200 feet of identified "blue-line" streams, require buffers adjacent to preserved biological resources, and encourage the preservation of existing agricultural areas. Amendments to this element include the incorporation of policies and measures that will reduce the City's generation of greenhouse gases, such as the use of energy-efficient design, devices, and practices in new development and the facilitation of employment opportunities and commercial development that reduce overall vehicle miles traveled.

All proposed amendments are summarized previously referenced in Table 2.B.



2.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS ASSUMPTIONS METHODOLOGY

This addendum compares the impacts of the 2006 General Plan, as disclosed in the 2006 EIR, with the impacts that would result from the 2006 General Plan as modified by the proposed amendments. For convenience sake, the potential impacts associated with these amendments are also referred to in the addendum as the impacts of the proposed General Plan amendments.

The environmental impacts that will result from the General Plan amendments will not occur at a single time, nor will they occur in a single location. As a general matter, the General Plan's impacts on the environment will occur as the result of hundreds of individual private development and public works projects, undertaken in compliance with applicable provisions of the General Plan, through the Horizon year (2030.) Thus, the 2006 EIR for the 2006 General Plan summarized the cumulative impacts that could result from these individual actions and projects. The projections developed for the General Plan, upon which the impact analysis contained in the 2004 EIR are based, represent an estimate of the population, dwelling units, and employment within the City that could exist at build-out of the City General Plan.

A key concept in the 2006 EIR's analysis of the General Plan was that projections reflect a theoretical build-out of all incorporated areas within the City and unincorporated areas of Loma Linda's sphere of influence, which is estimated to occur in 2030, rather than the 20–25-year projections maintained by the SCAG. The actual rate of development is driven by the economy and is not under the total control of government officials.

2.3.1 Estimates Utilized in Environmental Analysis

The 2006 General Plan projects potential population, number of dwelling units, and employment for the City of Loma Linda and its sphere of influence. The General Plan land uses serve as the basis for these projections. The projections reflect *theoretical* build-out of the City, rather than what will actually be developed by 2030. As stated previously, the actual rate of development is driven by the economy and is not under the total control of government officials.

2.3.2 Dwelling Units

The number of acres for each land use designation acres was derived from Geographic Information System (GIS) data. A range of dwelling units per acre for each land use designation that allows residential uses was identified. The dwelling unit per acre (du/ac) factor is based on the anticipated mix of housing types (e.g., single-family, multiple-family) and accounts for roads, rights-of-way, easements, and public facilities typically found in residential areas (e.g., elementary schools and parks). To determine the number of potential dwelling units within each residential land use designation, the number of gross acres was multiplied by the land use designation's du/ac factor. For example, 100 acres of Low Density Residential with a proposed density 2.0 du/acre, 3.5 du/acre, and 5 du/acre would result in 200 dwelling units, 350 dwelling units and 500 dwelling units, respectively.

2.3.3 Households

A household unit consists of all persons who occupy a single dwelling unit, such as a detached house, townhouse, or apartment. A household may consist of one person, unrelated individuals, or a family. The 2006 General Plan identifies 17,231 dwelling units within the Planning Area with an assumed vacancy rate of 5 percent. Therefore, 16,369 households would have occupied the Planning Area at General Plan build-out in 2030. Using the same vacancy assumptions for the proposed



amendments, 13,702 total dwelling units¹ and 13,049 households will be located within the Planning Area at General Plan build-out.

It should be noted that Measure V included two new land use designations: "Senior Citizen Housing" and "Very Low Density Residential." While these land use categories were identified in Measure V, no land on the proposed amended land use map has been designated for these uses. In the absence of any identified acreage, it is not possible at this time to estimate the number of dwelling units that could be developed under these land use designations.

2.3.4 Population

Population is determined by multiplying the projected number of households by average persons per household. Based on the household characteristics cited in the updated Housing Element, the average household size in the city is 2.43 persons.

Based on past growth rates in the City, population increases are anticipated to continue to average approximately 0.04 percent annually. Assuming a Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projected population of 27,797 persons in 2025, the build-out population of the City of Loma Linda, including its sphere of influence would be reached in 2029. Therefore, the projected 2029 population is the year in which General Plan build-out would occur under the amended General Plan and is the assumed build-out year used in the analysis.

The 2006 General Plan and EIR assumed that 16,369 occupied households (applying a 5% vacancy rate) and a population of 37,649 would exist within the City and sphere of influence at build-out. Utilizing the acreages and development densities of the amended General Plan's various land use classifications, and applying a five percent vacancy rate, 13,049 households will be located within the Planning Area at build-out of the amended General Plan. Based on the average person per household factor cited in the updated Housing Element (2.43 persons per household), the 13,049 anticipated households would yield a total population of 31,709 persons at build-out (2030). Implementation of the General Plan (as amended) would result in a population decrease of approximately 5,940 persons from that previously identified in the General Plan EIR.

2.3.5 Employment

Determining the number of jobs resulting from commercial, industrial, office, or institutional uses requires the computation of net acreage, gross square footage, and permitted square footage. For commercial, industrial, and public facility uses, it was first necessary to determine the amount of land available for development. The net acres of each non-residential General Plan land use categories (i.e. commercial, industrial, and public facility) available for development was derived by subtracting from the gross acres (the total amount of land available) the amount of land required for roadways, rights-of-way, easements, and other required features.

To determine the number of net square feet, the net acres are multiplied by 43,560 (the number of square feet per acre). Because the complete coverage of land by buildings is not permitted, floor-to-area ratios (FARs) have been developed to establish the total amount of square footage permitted on any particular parcel. To determine the permitted square footage, the net square footage is multiplied by the FAR.

¹ Total number of dwelling units includes new and existing dwelling units within the Planning Area, which encompasses land within the City and its Sphere of Influence.



The General Plan has established FARs for each land use designation. Based on these FARs, the amount of land designated for various uses, the amount of commercial, industrial, and institutional square footage was identified in the certified EIR. These numbers have changed slightly for commercial land uses by 4.92 acres and are provided below in Table 2.C.

Table 2.C: General Plan Non-Residential Land Uses Allowable Building Square Footage

Build-out Scenario	Acres	FAR	Building Square Footage	Employment
Commercial	172.50	0.5	3,757,051	7,210
Institutional/Office/Business Park	370.94	0.5	8,079,073	19,387
Health Care	98.91	1.0	4,308,510	11,532
Industrial	17.93	0.6	468,618	33
City Facilities	11.75	0.5	213,507	626
Recreation	40.67	0.1	177,159	204
Total	712.73	—	17,003,918	38,992

2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATIONS OF THE 2006 GENERAL PLAN PROGRAM EIR

2.4.1 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The EIR for the 2006 General Plan determined that implementation of the 2006 General Plan would have significant unavoidable impacts related to loss of open space, air quality, biological resources, water supply, and traffic and circulation. The City Council adopted Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations at the time it certified the General Plan EIR that found the economic, social, and other benefits that the General Plan will produce will render the significant effects acceptable. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the General Plan EIR are discussed below.

Aesthetic and Visual Resources. The General Plan EIR determined that implementation of the General Plan would result in the conversion of open space areas to urban land use. The conversion of open space to urban uses would result in a significant and unavoidable impact by causing the obstruction of existing open views as well as potentially obstructing distant panoramic views from existing development

Air Quality. The General Plan EIR determined that the implementation of the General Plan would increase regional emissions associated with vehicular trips, which would generate NO_x emissions that would exceed the project level operations threshold established by the SCAQMD. Additionally, the rate of increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and annual growth percentages resulting from the implementation of the General Plan would result in significant impacts. Implementation of the General Plan policies would reduce impacts associated with the proposed General Plan; however, significant unavoidable impacts would remain.

Implementation of the General Plan would also result in air quality impacts during construction-related activities associated with individual projects, including grading and equipment exhaust. Major sources of fugitive dust are a result of grading and site preparation during construction by vehicles and equipment and generated by construction vehicles and equipment traveling over exposed surfaces, as well as by soil disturbances from grading and filling. The policies in the General Plan contain



standard dust suppression methods that will help reduce PM₁₀ emissions. Mitigation measures were adopted to reduce the effects of blowing dust during grading and construction vehicle emissions. Implementation of the General Plan policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts associated with the General Plan; however, significant unavoidable impacts would remain.

Biological Resources. The EIR determined that implementation of the General Plan would result in the loss of extensive areas of natural habitats and associated biological resources. Even with the implementation of the General Plan policies and the mitigation measures, impacts related to the fragmentation and loss of California gnatcatcher critical habitat would be significant and unavoidable.

Water Supply. Implementation of the General Plan would increase the existing demand for water and thereby reduce water availability to, or interfere with, existing users of well water. Currently, there is enough water production to meet the projected average daily requirements at build-out; however, not enough to supply water on a peak demand day. With increased development in the Planning Area, anticipated with the implementation of the General Plan, water resources will continue to diminish not only for the City of Loma Linda but also for the rest of the communities in Southern California. While the General Plan policies recognize the water supply issues and encourage the use of water conservation measures, they do not ensure the provision of water supplies adequate to support development that may occur as a result of implementation of the General Plan; therefore, significant unavoidable impacts will remain.

Traffic and Circulation. The traffic impact analysis undertaken for the General Plan sets forth a number of measures that, when implemented, will maintain service level standards along all roadways and highways that will be affected by the Loma Linda General Plan. However, the City of Loma Linda cannot ensure that the improvements needed to maintain level of service standards in surrounding communities or at freeway interchanges will actually be completed, even if developments in Loma Linda provide fair-share contributions. In addition, there are no mechanisms in place, nor are any contemplated to be available in the foreseeable future, that would provide for developer contributions to improvements along freeway mainlines. Thus, implementation of General Plan policies and EIR mitigation measures will reduce impacts along roadways, at intersections, and at freeway interchanges to below a level of significance. Implementation of these measures cannot ensure such mitigation for traffic along freeway mainlines, and a significant unavoidable impact will remain.

2.4.2 Effects Found Less Than Significant With Mitigation

The General Plan EIR determined that the General Plan's impacts would be less than significant with mitigation in the following areas: stationary air emissions sources, biological resources, cultural resources and paleontology, geology and soils, groundwater and water for fire flow, noise, and energy resources. All other effects evaluated in the General Plan EIR were determined to be less than significant with implementation of the General Plan policies.

Air Quality. Long-term air emission impacts will occur from stationary sources related to the estimated development proposed through implementation of the General Plan.



Biological Resources. Implementation of the General Plan would have an adverse impact on listed, proposed, or candidate species, or the loss of habitat occupied by such species. In addition, implementation of the General Plan would cause fragmentation of habitat that constricts, inhibits, or eliminates wildlife movement.

Cultural Resources and Paleontology. Build-out within now vacant unincorporated areas of the City will result in an increase in population and residential and non-residential structures, and associated infrastructure. Development associated with the General Plan would require disturbance of vacant lands. Therefore, development as a result of implementation of the General Plan could potentially destroy directly or indirectly a unique paleontological resource or site, and disturb buried human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, and buried archaeological resources.

Geology and Soils. Future development permitted by the General Plan may increase the potential for property loss, injury, or death resulting from development on or adjacent to the San Jacinto Fault and/or as of yet undetected earthquake fault zones and may increase the potential for property loss, injury, or death resulting from this ground shaking hazard. Future General Plan development within Loma Linda would also increase the potential for the placement of structures and facilities in or near areas susceptible to liquefaction.

Groundwater Recharge. Implementation of the General Plan may result in the loss of water recharge areas and hillside watershed resources.

Water Availability for Fire Flow. The new demand for water may affect the water available for emergency fire flow.

Noise. Noise levels from grading and other construction activities would potentially result in noise levels reaching 91 dBA L_{max} at off-site locations 50 feet from the site boundary. This would result in potentially significant noise impacts to off-site sensitive receptors adjacent to the individual construction site.

The implementation of the General Plan would result in potential project-related long-term vehicular noise that would affect sensitive land uses along the roads. New development, particularly residential uses along and adjacent to major transit corridors, could be exposed to excessive traffic-related noise levels. To ensure that all new noise-sensitive proposals are carefully reviewed with respect to potential noise impacts, the City will review new development using noise guidelines in combination with the land use compatibility standards.

Energy Resources. Build-out of the City will result in an increase in population and residential and non-residential structures, potentially increasing the use of and need for electricity and/or natural gas. Due to the growth resulting from implementation of the General Plan, this increase would result in impacts on existing electrical or natural gas generation/transmission facilities.



2.4.3 Effects Found Not To Be Significant

The City of Loma Linda determined that there was no substantial evidence that the General Plan would cause or otherwise result in significant environmental effects in the resource areas discussed below.

- **Land Use and Agriculture**

- *Physically divide an established community.* The General Plan proposed changes to some of the existing land use designations within the City of Loma Linda. The new land use designations would provide better consistency between existing and new uses, resulting in the protection of established communities.
- *Conflicts with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.* The Planning Area is not covered by a habitat conservation plan, or a natural community conservation plan. The southern boundary of the planning area is adjacent to an area covered by the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). As the land uses in the Loma Linda General Plan are consistent with the land uses designated in the Riverside County MSHCP, implementation of the Loma Linda General Plan should have no impact on this conservation plan.

- **Mineral Resources**

- *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.* No known mineral resources are located within the City. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan would not result in the loss of any known mineral resources.
- *Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.* No locally important mineral resource recovery sites are located within the City. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan would not result in the loss of any such resources or recovery sites.

- **Transportation**

- *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks:* The City of Loma Linda does not contain an airport. The San Bernardino International Airport is located 1.5 miles north of the City. Modifications to existing land use designations would not result in any changes to air traffic patterns for the San Bernardino International Airport.
- *Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).* No specific developments are included in the General Plan. While general roadway locations are determined for new highways, no roadway designs are provided. This issue would be addressed at the project level.
- *Result in inadequate emergency access.* No specific developments are included in the General Plan. This issue would be addressed at the project level.
- *Result in inadequate parking capacity.* No specific developments are included in the General Plan. The issue of parking capacity will be addressed at the project level.

- **Public Health and Safety**

- *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.* The nearest airport is the



San Bernardino International Airport, which is located 1.5 miles north of the City. A small portion of the City of Loma Linda is located within the San Bernardino International Airport influence area in the "draft" land use plan. The City is obligated to have its General Plan be consistent with the approved Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. When a project, under jurisdiction of the City of Loma Linda, is proposed within the San Bernardino International Airport influence area, it will be reviewed for compatibility with the provisions of the airport land use plan. At the time of the preparation of the City's General Plan, the San Bernardino International Airport land use plan had not been adopted. Implementation of the General Plan would not result in any safety hazards related to airports.



3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

The following pages contain the Environmental Checklist Form (Form) for the proposed revisions to the 2006 General Plan. The Form and accompanying evaluation of the responses provide the information and analysis upon which the City of Loma Linda makes its determination regarding the appropriate level of environmental review. As explained in Section 1.0, this analysis has been undertaken, pursuant to the provisions of CEQA, to provide the City of Loma Linda with the factual basis for determining, based on the information available, the form of environmental documentation the project warrants. The basis for each of the findings listed in the Form is explained in Section 3.2, Environmental Analysis and Explanation of Checklist Responses.

The Form is marked with findings as to the environmental effects of the amended General Plan. These findings are based on the standards laid out in CEQA Guidelines section 15162, subdivision (a). A checked box () in columns 1, 2, 3, or 4 would require additional environmental analysis in the form of a supplemental or subsequent EIR. A checked box in columns 5 or 6 would require preparation of a mitigated negative declaration, a negative declaration, or an addendum.

Based on the comparative analysis and the conclusions regarding impacts reflected in the Environmental Checklist Form, the City has determined that none of the conditions set forth in Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines requiring preparation of a Supplemental or Subsequent EIR are met, and therefore this addendum is the appropriate level of environmental review.

There are six possible responses to each of the questions included on the Form:

1. **Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major Revision of Previous EIR.** This response is used when the project has changed to such an extent that major revisions of the previous EIR are required due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or an increase in the severity of the previously identified significant effects.
2. **Substantial Change in Circumstances Under Which Project is Undertaken Requiring Major Revision of Previous EIR.** This response is used when the circumstances under which the project is undertaken have changed to such an extent that major revisions of the previous EIR are required because such changed circumstances would result in the project having new significant environmental effects or would substantially increase the severity of the previously identified significant effects.
3. **New Information of Substantial Importance Showing New or Greater Significant Effects than Identified in Previous EIR.** This response is used when new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified, shows that the project would have a new significant environmental effect or more severe significant effect than identified in the previous EIR.
4. **New Information of Substantial Importance Showing Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impacts Identified in Previous EIR.** This response is used when new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows:
 - a. The significant environmental effects of the project could be substantially reduced through imposition of mitigation measures or alternatives that, although previously



- found to be infeasible, are in fact now feasible, but the project proponent declines to adopt them; or
- b. The significant environmental effects of the project could be substantially reduced through imposition of mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR, but the project proponent declines to adopt them.
5. **No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR.** This response is used when (1) the project, as revised, will not have any significant new impacts or substantially more severe impacts than those evaluated in the EIR and (2) there are no changes in the project or circumstances, and no new information that would require the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and Section 15162 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*.
6. **No Impact.** This response is used when the proposed project does not have any measurable environmental impact.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Project Title: | Loma Linda General Plan Addendum |
| 2. Lead Agency Name and Address: | City of Loma Linda
Community Development Department
25541 Barton Road
Loma Linda, California 92354 |
| 3. Contact Person and Phone Number: | Deborah Woldruff, Community Development Director
(909) 799-2830 |
| 4. Project Location: | City limits and sphere of influence |
| 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: | City of Loma Linda
Community Development Department
25541 Barton Road
Loma Linda, California 92354 |
| 6. General Plan Designation: | General Commercial, Office Commercial, Single-Family Residential, Mobile Homes, Multifamily Residential, Rural Residential, Medical, University, Schools, Churches, Public Facilities, Utilities Agriculture, Utilities, Heavy and Light Industrial, Open Space, Vacant, Agriculture, and Recreation. |
| 7. Zoning: | Agricultural Estates Zones (A-1), Single-Family Residence Zone (R-1), Two-Family Residence Zone (R-2), Multiple-Family Residence Zone (R-3), Mobile Home Park Zone (R-4), Administrative and Professional Office Zone (A-P), Neighborhood Business Zone (C-1), General Business Zone (C-2), Commercial Manufacturing Zone (C-M), Restricted Manufacturing Zone (M-R), Light Manufacturing Zone (M-1), Hillside Development Suffix Zone (H), Open Space Conservation Zone (OS), Flood Plain Zone (FP), Institutional Zone (I), Parking Zone (P), Planned Residential Development Overlay Zone (PRD), and |



8. **Project Description:** Geologic Hazards Overlay Zone(GH).
The proposed amendments would incorporate Measure V into the General Plan; update the City's Housing Element; add policies to the 2006 General Plan to reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the City, conserve water, and reduce waste; and move certain existing General Plan provisions from the former Growth Management Element into the Public Services and Facilities Element.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The City and its General Plan study area are bordered by the City of Redlands to the east and unincorporated portions of Riverside County to the south. Direct access to the City is provided by the San Bernardino Freeway (I-10), which forms the northern boundary of the City.
10. **Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):** None required.

Determination: (To Be Completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- The City finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- The City finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- The City finds the proposed project may have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. If the effect is a potentially significant impact or potentially significant unless mitigated an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- The City finds that changes to the project or the circumstances under which the project would be undertaken require major revisions to the previous EIR in order to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the proposed project in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15163. Thus, a SUBSEQUENT EIR shall be prepared.
- The City finds that changes to the project or the circumstances under which the project would be undertaken require only minor revision to the previous EIR in order to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the proposed project in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15163. Thus, a SUPPLEMENTAL EIR shall be prepared.



prepared.

- The City finds that the significant effects that would result from the proposed project have been addressed in an earlier EIR, and that none of the determinations set forth in Public Resources Code Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 can be established. Thus, an ADDENDUM to the *City of Loma Linda General Plan Update Final Program Environmental Impact Report*, July 17, 2006 shall be prepared.

Jim Cahill Day
Prepared by: LSA Associates, Inc.

4-8-09

Date

Reborah Waldruff
Reviewed by: City of Loma Linda

04-09-09

Date



ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

ISSUES:	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	No Changes in the Project or Circumstances /No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS – Would the project:						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:						
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:						
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES:	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	No Changes in the Project or Circumstances /No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Supplemental EIR	No Impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES:	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	No Changes in the Project or Circumstances /No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Supplemental EIR	No Impact
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:						
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES:			Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	No Changes in the Project or Circumstances /No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR	No Impact
ii)	Strong	seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	Seismic-related	ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv)	Landslides?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in	substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES:	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	No Changes in the Project or Circumstances /No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Supplemental EIR	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:						
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES:	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	No Changes in the Project or Circumstances /No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:						
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES:	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	No Changes in the Project or Circumstances /No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR	No Impact
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:						
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. NOISE – Would the project result in:						
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES:	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	No Changes in the Project or Circumstances /No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Supplemental EIR	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:						
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:						
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:						
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES:	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	No Changes in the Project or Circumstances /No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR	No Impact
14. RECREATION – Would the project:						
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:						
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES:	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	No Changes in the Project or Circumstances /No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR	No Impact
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:						
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider who serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES:	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	No Changes in the Project or Circumstances /No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Supplemental EIR		No Impact

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a). Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b). Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c). Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

18. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration (Section 15063[c][3][D]).

- *City of Loma Linda General Plan Update Draft Program Environmental Impact Report*, City of Loma Linda, March 22, 2004.
- *City of Loma Linda General Plan Update Final Program Environmental Impact Report*, City of Loma Linda, July 17, 2006.

3.2 DISCUSSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM RESPONSES

The following Environmental Checklist Responses provide a summary of the findings of the Final EIR (FEIR) and provide a comparison between the approved environmental impacts identified in the FEIR and the impacts that may result from implementation of the proposed amendments to the City of Loma Linda General Plan.



1. Aesthetics

Implementation of the proposed amendments that would have an effect on aesthetics include: the reduction in maximum allowable density in certain land use categories pursuant to Measure V, the restriction of development in certain parts of the City pursuant to Measure V, and the provisions for the development of student housing and employee housing on the university campus and on hospital sites pursuant to the updated Housing Element.

The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, conservation of water, and reduction of solid waste would not result in a physical impact that would have an effect on aesthetics. Furthermore, the movement of certain provisions of the existing General Plan from the former Growth Management Element would not result in a physical change and would therefore not have an effect on aesthetics. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element deal with roadway performance standards and roadway connections within the hillside area. These amendments do not impact aesthetics as a reduction in roadway connections would not impact scenic vistas or resources, increase light/glare, and substantially change the visual character than that identified in the FEIR.

The update of the City's Housing Element would comply with recently enacted state housing laws and would streamline the City's development review process for the construction of special needs housing such as low income, shelters, and student housing. The 2006 General Plan identified that 17,231 dwelling units would have been developed within the Planning Area. With an assumed vacancy rate of 5 percent, build-out of the 2006 General Plan would result in 16,369 occupied households in 2030. Using the same vacancy assumptions, implementation of the proposed amendments would result in the development of 13,702 dwelling units and 13,049 households will be located within the Planning Area at General Plan build-out as no increase in dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out would occur. The incorporation of amendments in the General Plan would not create additional impacts to aesthetics because the proposed amendments include new policies for the preservation of open space and scenic vistas and increased densities are not proposed in areas that would impact scenic vistas/resources.

a. *Would the Amended General Plan have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The City is bounded on the east by the City of Redlands, on the north by the City of San Bernardino, on the west by the City of Colton, and on the south by the unincorporated Badlands of Riverside County. The City's General Plan identifies several structures as visually prominent features including the Loma Linda University Hospital complex and the Jerry L. Pettis Memorial Veterans Medical Center. Additionally, the City's General Plan identifies two natural landmarks that are considered important resources that contribute to a feeling of community identity and visual enjoyment to the City: the San Bernardino Mountains to the north and the Badlands (South Hills) to the south. Additionally, certain streets within the City provide view corridors to the scenic natural landforms described above: Mountain View Avenue, Anderson Street, Barton Road, and Redlands Boulevard. While the City of Loma Linda has no officially designated scenic vistas or views, natural landforms and natural views of adjacent hills and distant mountains are considered important visual resources within the City as evidenced by the 1993 Hillside Preservation Initiative and Amendments (Hillside Conservation Amendments) and adoption of Measure V (Growth Management Initiative).



The Land Use Element, Conservation and Open Space Element, and Community Design Element of the *Loma Linda General Plan* establish policies pertaining to open space development within the City. As identified in the FEIR, these policies of the General Plan related to open space recognize the importance of specific views and natural landforms and provide specific guidance to the location of new development within the hillsides. As identified in the FEIR, compliance with the General Plan policies would reduce impacts on views and unique landforms to a less than significant level. An evaluation of potential impacts of development on views within the City will be conducted on a project-by-project basis. All policies identified in the FEIR would still apply to any future development that may occur under the proposed amendments.

The proposed amendments change the provisions of the City's General Plan with regard to residential land use densities, planned residential developments and communities, hillside conservation, and open space both within the City and within its planning areas and sphere of influence to be consistent with the principles identified in the Measure V Initiative. The Housing Element update ensures adequate housing to meet the demand of all economic segments of the community. The updated Housing Element identifies measures for increasing the City's housing supply by removing barriers to the development of special needs housing (e.g., low income, shelters, student housing, second units). This goal is achieved through modifications of the City's development review process to facilitate development at higher densities within selected Land Use designations to accommodate special needs housing. While the amendments to the Housing Element would allow for higher density senior/student housing, the location of these units are not in the City-identified scenic corridors/vistas; therefore, implementation of the Housing Element amendments would not result in a significant impact. Compared to the 2006 General Plan, the updated Housing Element does not increase the dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out nor does it propose increased densities in areas that would obstruct scenic vistas; therefore, no change in impact in relation to scenic vistas would occur.

The proposed amendments implementing Measure V would limit development densities within hillside areas of the City. Measure V establishes principles of managed growth that will preserve and protect hillside areas and open space in the South Hills. With the adoption of proposed amendments, all future development within hillside areas of the City would be required to comply with the provisions set forth in the Measure V Initiative.

Open space and conservation policies are included in Measure V to preserve environmentally sensitive areas, wildlife habitats (i.e., maximize the permanent preservation of large blocks of unbroken open space and to minimize the loss of habitat, wildlife, and watershed resources), ridgeline setbacks (100 feet horizontally and 100 feet vertically from a Primary ridgeline¹) and to preserve skyline ridgelines. Because the implementation of the General Plan amendments would reduce the amount of residential development forecast to occur at build-out of the 2006 General Plan, maximize the permanent preservation of open space, identifies landform grading policies, and implement strict development guidelines in the South Hills areas, potential impacts related to scenic vistas would not exceed those identified in the FEIR and are considered less than significant. The proposed amendments incorporate the policies and intent of the 1996 Hillside Preservation Initiative.

¹ Primary ridgelines are described by the following characteristics: Ridges that have a difference in elevation of at least 200 feet from the toe of slope of the valley floor or the toe of slope of any canyon floor; ridges which, prior to grading, are visible, or which would be visible but for man-made obstructions such as buildings or houses, from north of Barton Road, Interstate 10, or east of San Timoteo Canyon Road; ridges that form a prominent landform in the foreground, a major skyline ridge in the background, or one of the layers of ridges that may be visible in between, or which would be visible but for man-made obstructions such as buildings or houses; or ridges that frame major visual access when a person is traveling through the Hillside Preservation Area, the Hillside Conservation Area or the Expanded Hillside Area and will provide the first view of valley and canyon areas as a traveler emerges from the other side of the ridge.



Furthermore, the Housing Element Update ensures adequate housing for the different economic segments of the City through the modification of the City's development review process to accommodate special needs housing. As previously identified, the updated Housing Element does not increase the number of dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out nor does it propose increased densities in areas that would obstruct scenic vistas. Additionally, the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, conservation of water, and reduction of solid waste would not result in a physical impact that would have an effect on identified scenic vistas. Furthermore, the movement of certain provisions of the existing General Plan from the former Growth Management Element and would not result in a physical change and would therefore not have an effect on identified scenic vistas. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element would not have an effect on scenic vistas because implementation of the amendments would limit through roadways in the hillside areas of the City. Limiting through roadways in the hillside areas would result in less development occurring along roadways; therefore, less development would be visible in the hillside areas from that analyzed in the FEIR. No greater impact related to scenic vistas would occur with the implementation of the amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. There are no State Scenic Highways within the City. However, as previously described, while the City of Loma Linda has no officially designated scenic vistas or views, natural landforms and natural views of adjacent hills and distant mountains are considered important visual resources within the City as evidenced by the 1993 Hillside Preservation Initiative and Amendments (Hillside Conservation Amendments) and adoption of Measure V (Growth Management Initiative). The FEIR determined that implementation of the General Plan would result in the conversion of open space areas to urban land uses that would result in a significant impact by causing the obstruction of existing views of open space (e.g., South Hills area) as well as potentially obstructing distant panoramic views of the San Bernardino Mountains from existing development.

As previously identified, compared to the 2006 General Plan, the updated Housing Element does not increase the number of dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out nor does it propose increased densities in areas that would damage scenic resources; therefore, amendments to the Housing Element would not have an impact in relation to scenic resources.

While the 2006 General Plan policies address the aesthetic impact of new development, the FEIR identified no mitigation to address the conversion of open space to urban land uses, and this impact remains significant and unavoidable. Implementation of the proposed amendments would limit residential development densities within the hillside areas (minimum single-family residential lot size of 7,200 square feet), and therefore protection of hillside areas and preservation of open space areas would be increased from what was analyzed in the 2006 General Plan. Provisions of Measure V would reduce the development densities within hillside areas thus increasing the amount of open space maintained in the South Hills area. Therefore, while impacts to scenic resources would remain significant and unavoidable because development of residential uses (albeit reduced) within the hillside areas could still occur, impacts would be reduced in extent and/or magnitude as compared to the 2006 General Plan. Therefore, there are no changes in the project or circumstances, or new information that would require additional review beyond an addendum.



c) *Would the Amended General Plan substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As identified in the City's General Plan, the visual character of the City of Loma Linda is described as a scenic suburban residential community with historic landmarks and an agricultural heritage. Natural features that contribute to the City's character include the San Bernardino Mountains to the north and the Badlands (South Hills) to the south.

The General Plan establishes policies pertaining to visual character within the Land Use Element and Community Design Element. As identified in the FEIR, these various policies of the General Plan related to visual character recognize the importance of the specific views and natural landforms described above, and establish design standards for new development that ensure compatibility with existing development. The design standards detail development guidelines for all types of uses to ensure that development does not impact adjacent uses. Compliance with the 2006 General Plan policies reduces the impacts to visual character identified in the 2006 General Plan to a less than significant level. Projects will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for adherence to these design standards. Implementation of proposed amendments would further assure the protection of natural hillsides and the preservation of open space by promoting environmentally sensitive development (e.g., implementing development standards in hillside areas, prohibiting most non-residential development in hillside areas, prohibiting development within 200 feet of identified "blue-line" streams, requiring buffers adjacent to preserved biological resources, and encouraging the preservation of existing agricultural areas). Additionally, the proposed amendments changing the City's LOS standard and requiring full mitigation of project-specific traffic impacts would maintain safe, quiet residential areas and would ensure compatibility with existing development. Potential impacts related to visual character would not exceed those identified in the FEIR and would remain less than significant. Therefore, there are no changes in the project or circumstances, or new information that would require additional review beyond an addendum.

d) *Would the Amended General Plan create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As identified in the FEIR, sources of light and glare that would result from implementation of the General Plan include lighting of parking lots, commercial landscaped areas, interior building lighting, and/or the use of exterior building materials that would be reflective (e.g., glass and metal).

Policies of the General Plan that address light and glare are within the Land Use Element and Community Design Element. As identified in the FEIR, the various policies identified in the General Plan set standards for the screening and the location of new lighting sources to protect adjacent residential sensitive receptors. As explained in the FEIR, compliance with the General Plan policies would reduce light and glare impacts from General Plan development to a less than significant level. In addition, future development projects will require a site-specific development review to ensure compliance with established light and glare standards. Similarly, the policies of the General Plan along with project-specific design review by the City will reduce lighting and glare impacts from the proposed amendments to a less than significant level. The proposed amendments to incorporate Measure V would reduce the development densities within hillside areas thus reducing the total amount of light and glare sources in these areas. Furthermore, the Housing Element Update ensures



adequate housing for the different segments of the City through the modification of the City's development review process to accommodate special needs housing. As previously identified, the update Housing element does not increase the dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out; therefore, no additional development would occur than what was previously analyzed. No greater impact related to lighting and glare would occur than that identified in the FEIR. Therefore, there are no changes in the project or circumstances, or new information that would require additional review beyond an addendum.

Mitigation Measures from the FEIR

The FEIR did not include mitigation measures related to aesthetics.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed amendments; therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to aesthetics.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. Because the proposed amendments would not change the analysis conclusions in the FEIR, there are no new significant aesthetic impacts.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

The foregoing analysis and information indicates that the proposed amendments would not result in a substantial change in circumstances related to aesthetics requiring major EIR revisions.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in FEIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate that a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the Final EIR. Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no substantial new information that would result in greater significant effects related to aesthetics.

New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the FEIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the area of aesthetics or scenic resources, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.



2. Agricultural Resources

The principles set out in Measure V reduce maximum allowable density in certain land use categories, restrict development in certain parts of the City, and modify the traffic level of service standards in the City. The modification of traffic level of service standards does not impact agricultural resources. The other provisions of Measure V would modify the extent, location, density, and type of development that would be permitted in selected areas of the City. These provisions modify the type of development allowed under the amended General Plan. Therefore, these provisions have been discussed on a programmatic level in each of the following agricultural resources checklist questions.

The intent of the Housing Element update is to ensure adequate housing to meet the demand of all economic segments of the community. This goal is achieved through modifications of the City's development review process to facilitate development at higher densities within selected Land Use designations to accommodate special needs housing. This would not have a direct effect on agricultural resources nor would they result in the conversion of agricultural lands. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element deal with citywide roadway performance standards and roadway connections within the hillside area and would not have an impact on agricultural resources. The amendments to the Public Services and Facilities Element relate to the preservation of existing water supplies and maintenance of residential water rates and do not apply to agricultural resources. Therefore, no impacts associated with agricultural resources would occur with implementation all of the proposed amendments.

The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, conservation of water, and reduction of solid waste would not result in a physical impact that would have an effect on agricultural resources. Furthermore, the movement of certain provisions of the 2006 General Plan from the former Growth Management Element would not result in a physical change and would therefore not have an effect on agricultural resources.

- a) ***Would the Amended General Plan convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the farmland mapping and monitoring program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?***

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. According to the FEIR, implementation of the existing 2006 General Plan would result in the conversion of prime agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses. However, as evidenced by the fact that the City's 1991 General Plan Land Use Element did not include an agricultural land use designation, the City has always considered that agricultural uses would transition to urban uses. The policies identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR state that the City would encourage the conversion of existing agricultural uses to urban uses. Since the conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses was considered as a positive outcome by the City, impacts associated with this issue were considered less than significant in the 2006 General Plan FEIR.

Implementation of the General Plan amendments would not result in any impacts greater than those addressed in the FEIR. The proposed amendments to incorporate Measure V would limit the extent, location, density, and type of development that would occur in selected areas of the City. The proposed amendments would also incorporate agricultural preservation policies into the Open Space and Conservation Element, which would provide for the preservation of existing agricultural groves within hillside preservation areas. Therefore, the proposed amendments would potentially result in the



conversion of less farmland, which in turn would proportionally reduce the impact of agricultural conversion within the City. Because the amendments would result in reduced development within the Planning Area, no greater agricultural land conversion impacts would occur from implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?*

No Impact. Williamson Act contracts consist of a voluntary program that allows property owners to have their property assessed on the basis of its agricultural production rather than at the current market value. The purpose of the Williamson Act contract is to encourage property owners to continue to farm their land and to prevent the premature conversion of farmland to urban uses. As indicated in the FEIR, no Williamson Act contracts are enforced within the General Plan area.

As the amendments primarily deal with restrictions on potential development in identified hillsides within City limits, the proposed amendments would not have any impact on Williamson Act contracts. Since the proposed amendments would not impact any existing Williamson Act contracts and since there are no Williamson Act contracts within the City, no new impacts associated with this issue would occur when compared to the impacts identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR.

c) *Would the Amended General Plan involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Agriculture uses have long existed in the City and surrounding areas. Implementation of the adopted General Plan would result in continued urbanization of the Planning Area. The FEIR concluded that implementation of the adopted General Plan would result in the conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses. However, the FEIR also stated that the General Plan policies provide clear direction that the intent of the City is to encourage the conversion of existing agricultural uses to urban uses. With this stated purpose, the change in character of agricultural areas would be considered a positive effect of the General Plan. Therefore, impacts associated with this issue were considered less than significant in the FEIR.

The proposed amendments to the General Plan would limit development densities within select areas in the City. The proposed amendments would establish principles of managed growth that would preserve, enhance, and maintain the quality of life, including the protection of hillside areas and the preservation of open space so that future development within the City will occur in a way that promotes the social and economic well being of the entire community. The proposed amendments would not change any of the conclusions identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR and would not result on the conversion of agricultural land greater than that previously identified in the FEIR. Therefore, impacts associated with this issue would remain the same as those originally identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR and would remain less than significant.

Mitigation Measures from the FEIR

The 2006 General Plan FEIR did not include mitigation measures related to agricultural resources.



Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed amendments; therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to agricultural resources.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the 2006 General Plan FEIR are required. Because the proposed amendments would not change the analysis conclusions in the 2006 General Plan FEIR, there are no new significant agricultural resource impacts.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

The foregoing analysis and information indicates that the proposed amendments would not result in a substantial change in circumstances related to agricultural resources requiring major FEIR revisions.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in FEIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the 2006 General Plan FEIR was certified that may indicate that a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no substantial new information that would result in greater significant effects related to agricultural resources.

New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the FEIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the area of agricultural resources, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

3. Air Quality

Proposed amendments that would have an effect on air quality include policies regarding the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the reduction of vehicle miles traveled, the reduction in maximum allowable density in certain land use categories, the restriction of development in certain parts of the City.

Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element deal with roadway performance standards and roadway connections within the hillside area. These amendments alter the distribution an impact of traffic through limitations on access in the South Hills Area and implementation of more stringent LOS standards reduce vehicle emissions within the City compared to what was identified in the FEIR. These provisions as well as the reduced volume of traffic resulting



from the implementation of the amendments would reduce the overall volume of air pollutants generated.

The update of the City's Housing Element would comply with recently enacted state housing laws and would streamline the City's development review process for the construction of special needs housing such as low income, shelters, and student housing. The incorporation of these amendments in the General Plan would not create additional impacts to air quality as no increase in dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out would occur.

According to the 2006 General Plan FEIR, impacts from Citywide construction emissions and an increase in long-term mobile source emissions would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of the General Plan and all feasible mitigation measures. Certification of the FEIR required approval of a Statement of Overriding Considerations by the City for the significant unavoidable air quality impacts.

a) *Would the Amended General Plan conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

No Impact. The City of Loma Linda is located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), which includes Orange County and the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. Air quality regulation in the Basin is administered by the Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), a regional agency created for the Basin. To comply with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), a project must be consistent with the local and regional growth forecasts.

As approved in 2006, the implementation of the General Plan would result in an increase in population and vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The 2007 AQMP was based on land use projections provided by participating jurisdictions, including the City's 2006 General Plan. The proposed General Plan amendments include measures and policies intended to reduce development densities and to preserve open space beyond that which was stated in the 2006 General Plan. The updated Housing Element identifies measures for increasing the City's housing supply by removing barriers to the development of special needs housing (e.g. low income, shelters, student housing, second units). This goal is achieved through modifications of the City's development review process to facilitate development at higher densities within selected Land Use designations to accommodate special needs housing. Compared to the adopted General Plan, the updated Housing Element does not increase the number of dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out. The proposed amendments would result in a reduction in the forecast population when compared to the existing General Plan forecasts. Under the existing General Plan population is forecast to reach 37,649 and would be reduced to 31,709 under the General Plan amendment build-out conditions. This is due to the reduction of the developable area as well as a reduction in residential densities resulting from Measure V. This reduction in residential development is anticipated to reduce total vehicle trips in the City.

The 2006 General Plan did not include any policies specifically designed to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT). While VMT was not calculated for the FEIR or for this addendum, it is reasonable to anticipate that new policies identified in the amendments to the General Plan, in conjunction with a decrease in vehicle trips, would indeed reduce the total VMT in the City. As mobile source emissions are the primary contributor to pollutant emissions, the VMT reduction achieved through implementation of the amendments would (compared to the emission levels cited in FEIR), reduce the air pollutant emissions in the City.



Because the 2006 General Plan was used in the formulation of the current AQMP, all projected emissions in the City were accounted for in the AQMP, and no impact would occur. The proposed amendments reduce the amount, location, and density of residential development and VMT, thus emissions would be reduced from that identified in the FEIR. Therefore, levels of air pollutants would be reduced from that identified in the FEIR and would remain consistent with the AQMP. The proposed amendments would not create any new impacts or increase the severity of impacts related to consistency with applicable air quality plans.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The FEIR evaluated the 2006 General Plan's short-term and long-term air quality impacts. The FEIR analysis determined that implementation of the General Plan would result in growth within the City and an increase in the daily VMT. According to the FEIR, the anticipated new vehicle trips associated with the implementation of the General Plan would cause criteria pollutant emissions to exceed the daily emissions thresholds established by the SCAQMD in its *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. Significant and unavoidable air quality impacts related to construction PM₁₀ emissions and mobile source (vehicular) emissions were identified in the FEIR.

The amended Conservation and Open Space Element would include policies to reduce the generation of greenhouse gases. Of these, the policies listed below encourage development that would minimize vehicle trips, facilitate use of public transit, and focus of development near transit features. The policies identified in the amendments, in conjunction with the reduced development permitted within the Planning Area, would reduce total VMT and the volume of pollutants generated. Because the emissions resulting from implementation of the amended General Plan would be reduced, the FEIR has already fully accounted for the air quality impacts of the proposed amendments.

While the overall volume of pollutants would be reduced, like the impact identified in the FEIR, the VMT associated with implementation of the amended General Plan would still result in the emission of air pollutants in excess of established SCQAMD daily thresholds. No change in the impact identified in the FEIR would occur.

- 9.8.1.b Facilitate employment opportunities that offer low-vehicle-use and minimize the need for automobile trips, such as live/work, telecommuting, satellite work centers, and home occupations, in addition to implementation of mixed-use development strategies.
- 9.8.1.c Encourage patterns of commercial development that support use of public transit, including modifying development regulations to facilitate commercial and/or mixed use projects at sites near transit stops.
- 9.8.1.n. Encourage businesses and public agencies to offer telecommuting as a work alternative, and allow corporate satellite work centers near housing concentrations to enable residents who are employees of out-of-city businesses to reduce their commutes.
- 9.8.1.o. Require new development to incorporate features that reduce energy used for transportation, including pedestrian and bicycle pathways, and access to transit (where available).
- 9.8.1.p. Work with Omnitrans to provide turnouts for transit stops.



- 9.8.1.q. Pursue traffic signal timing coordination as a means of improving traffic and reducing vehicle idling times.
- 9.8.1.r. As appropriate, require new development and redevelopment projects to address the following: bicycle and pedestrian access internally and to other areas; safe access to public transportation and construction of paths that connect with other non-motorized routes; safe road crossings at major intersections for school children and seniors; and secure, weatherproof bicycle storage facilities. Ensure that such facilities will have ongoing maintenance.
- 9.8.1.s. Support and participate in the development of intermodal transit hubs that expand alternative transportation use.
- 9.8.1.t. Support and participate in the development of intermodal transit hubs that expand alternative transportation use.
- 9.8.1.u. Encourage the use of public transit and alternative modes of transportation through land use designations and zoning which cluster employment centers with a mix of other uses, and project design that incorporates car pool areas, "park and ride" facilities and similar incentives.
- 9.8.1.v. Ensure that transit systems provide for the storage of bicycles on transit as well as at transit centers.
- 9.8.1.w. Work with Omnitrans to post current schedules and maps at all transit stops and other key locations, to make real-time arrival information available to riders, and to provide shelters that adequately protect riders from inclement weather.

Climate Change. Assembly Bill (AB) 1493 of 2002 required the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop and adopt the nation's first greenhouse gas standards for automobiles. On June 1, 2005, Governor Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-2005, which calls for a reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and for an 80 percent reduction in GHG emissions by 2050. The Governor signed AB 32, the California Climate Solutions Act of 2006 (Health & Safety Code Section 38500 et seq.), in September 2006. AB 32 codified the State's greenhouse gas emissions target by requiring that California's greenhouse gas emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 directs the CARB to make available a list of early action GHG emission reduction measures. Regulations to implement these measures are to be adopted before January 1, 2010, and the finalized emissions reduction measures will become operative and enforceable January 1, 2012.

The proposed amendments would add the following goal to the Conservation and Open Space Element:

9.8.1 Minimize greenhouse gas emissions that are reasonably attributable to the City's discretionary land use decisions and internal government operations, with the goal of reducing Loma Linda's greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.

To achieve this goal, the following policies to reduce the volume of greenhouse gasses emitted within the City have been added in the Conservation and Open Space Element.



- Encourage energy efficient landscaping for resource conservation by developing guidelines that emphasize proper irrigation techniques and sustainable landscaping (organic fertilizers and pesticides).
- Consider light-colored surfacing on pavements and rooftops where feasible to reduce heat absorption.
- As part of the development review process, work with builders to maximize energy conservation benefits in the placement of buildings on a site with regard to sun and natural breezes.
- Actively support provision of infrastructure needed for alternative fuel vehicles, including fueling and charging stations. Review and consider revising applicable codes applying to refueling and recharging infrastructure to facilitate their inclusion in new development where appropriate.
- Prohibit the installation of wood-burning fireplaces and other devices in new or renovated homes.
- Facilitate implementation of renewable technologies through streamlined planning and development rules, codes, processing, and other incentives.
- Incorporate measures to protect solar access from shading by neighboring structures and trees, thereby facilitating the use of passive or active solar systems.
- Provide incentives such as expedited processing for facilities that use renewable energy sources. Work with State and federal agencies to secure tax exemptions, tax rebates, or other financial incentives for such facilities.
- Preserve and encourage planting trees in neighborhoods to provide shade in summer and reduce heat loss in winter. Successful methods include placing trees to the west and northwest of houses to shade from the hot summer sun and grouping trees to protect them from harsh elements and support their longevity. Trees can reduce air temperatures 5-10° F from shading and evapo-transpiration (water in leaves converting into vapor, cooling the air).

The City will implement the previously cited policies in part through the development of a Climate Action Plan, which has been incorporated into Section 11 (General Plan Implementation Programs.) of the General Plan. The Climate Action Plan undertaken by the City to reduce greenhouse gas emissions will consist of the following:

- An inventory of known and reasonable discoverable sources of greenhouse gas emissions that currently exist within the City;
- A baseline inventory of the greenhouse gases currently being emitted in the City;
- An estimate of 1990 greenhouse gas emissions within the City;
- A projected inventory of new greenhouse gases that can reasonably be expected to be emitted in 2020 as the result of the City discretionary land use decisions pursuant to its General Plan, as well as new greenhouse gas emissions that will be emitted from the City's internal operations;
- A target for reduction to 1990 levels of greenhouse gas emissions reasonably attributed to the City's discretionary land use decisions and its internal operation;
- A plan for achieving that target by 2020.



Additionally, to further reduce the City's generation of greenhouse gases, the City will work to implement the SANBAG defined sustainable community strategies that may be developed in conjunction with regional transportation plans.

The development envisioned in the General Plan would generate GHGs. The predominant sources of GHG emissions are transportation use and energy generation. Implementation of the amended General Plan would decrease VMT, reduce the overall amount of residential development in the City and reduce population in the City. These reductions would correspondingly reduce the use of energy compared to that identified in the FEIR. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that compared to the adopted General Plan, the proposed amendments would reduce the volume of GHG emissions within the City. Compared to the conditions resulting from the 2006 General Plan, no greater greenhouse gas impact would occur.

c) *Would the Amended General Plan result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standards (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Please refer to responses 3(a) and 3(b). The City of Loma Linda is located within the South Coast Air Basin, which has been designated as a non-attainment area for ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀). As previously explained, the proposed amendments would result in less development and less VMT, thus resulting in fewer emissions. The proposed amendments would still produce emissions that would contribute to these existing basin-wide air quality impacts, which are considered to be cumulative in nature, and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. However, emissions would be reduced from what was identified in the FEIR, and therefore no additional environmental analysis is needed.

d) *Would the Amended General Plan expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Sensitive receptors include children, the elderly, and acutely ill and chronically ill persons within the Planning Area. These receptors include:

- Long-Term Health Care Facilities;
- Rehabilitation Centers;
- Convalescent Centers;
- Retirement Homes;
- Residences;
- Schools;
- Playgrounds;
- Child Care Centers; and
- Athletic Facilities.



The amendments to the General Plan do not add sensitive receptors to the planning area. Sensitive receptors may be exposed to blowing dust during daily grading and construction activity. With implementation of standard requirements and SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403 which are required of all projects. SCAQMD Rule 402 dictates that air discharged from any source shall not cause injury, nuisance, or annoyance to the health, safety, or comfort of the public. The purpose of SCAQMD Rule 403 is to reduce the amount of particulate matter in the atmosphere resulting from man-made fugitive dust sources. Similar to the impacts analyzed for the 2006 General Plan, impacts to nearby sensitive receptors associated with the proposed amendments would be reduced to less than significant levels with adherence to standard fugitive dust control measures in SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403. While the proposed amendments would restrict/limit development in the selected areas of the City, in other areas, construction activities would still generate pollutants in proximity to sensitive receptors. The impact associated with the proposed amendments would be the same as and no more significant than that identified in the 2006 FEIR.

Based on the microscale (CO hot spot) analysis provided in the FEIR, impacts to the roadway system were determined to be less than significant. The proposed amendments would decrease VMT within the City. Because a less than significant impact was identified in the FEIR, it is reasonable to assume that with a reduction in traffic, the air quality impact would be no more significant than that identified in the FEIR with the implementation of the amendments.

e) *Would the Amended General Plan create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The FEIR contains the following text regarding the creation of objectionable odors:

Implementation of the proposed General Plan will not in and of itself generate odor or toxic air contaminants. Individual development within the City that has the potential to generate odors or toxic air contaminants will be evaluated when project-specific information is available. The SCAQMD Rule 1401 will need to be followed for permit application for any facility that has the potential to emit toxic air contaminants. No additional control measures are required.

The General Plan amendments do not include specific uses that would create objectionable odors not identified in the FEIR. The requirement for project specific analysis regarding the creation of objectionable odors, as stated in the FEIR, would ensure that impacts related to this issue remain less than significant with the implementation of the proposed amendments. Compared to the impacts to persons from objectionable odors forecast in the FEIR, the amended General Plan would have no adverse change or effect.

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR

The FEIR included the following mitigation measures that are applicable to the proposed amendments:

4.3.4.1A. The following are the applicable SCAQMD Rule 403 Measures:



- Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturer's specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more).
- Water active sites at least twice daily. (Locations where grading is to occur will be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving).
- All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).
- Pave construction access roads at least 100 feet onto the site from main road.
- Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.

4.3.4.1B. Implement the following dust suppression measures in the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*.

- Revegetate disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.
- All streets shall be swept once per day if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water).
- Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.
- All on-site roads shall be paved as soon as feasible, watered periodically, or chemically stabilized.
- The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation operations shall be minimized at all times.

4.3.4.1C. Mitigation Measures for Construction Equipment and Vehicles Exhaust Emissions.

- The Construction Contractor shall select the construction equipment used on-site based on low emission factors and high energy efficiency.
- The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.
- The Construction Contractor shall utilize electric- or diesel-powered equipment, in lieu of gasoline-powered engines, where feasible.
- The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period will be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time.
- The Construction Contractor shall time the construction activities so as to not interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flagperson shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.
- The Construction Contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for



the construction crew.

4.3.4.3A. Encourage the use of building materials/methods, which reduce emissions.

4.3.4.3B. Encourage the use of efficient heating equipment and other appliances, such as water heaters, swimming pool heaters, cooking equipment, refrigerators, furnaces, and boiler units.

4.3.4.3C. Encourage centrally heated facilities to utilize automated time clocks or occupant sensors to control heating.

4.3.4.3D. Require residential building construction to comply with energy use guidelines detailed in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code.

4.3.4.3E. Require stationary air pollution sources to comply with applicable air district rules and control measures.

4.3.4.3F. Adopt incentives and/or regulations to enact energy conservation requirements for private and public developments.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no refined project mitigation measures. However as previously stated the General Plan amendment does include the previously listed policies regarding the reduction of vehicle miles traveled and the reduction of greenhouse gasses that would reduce air quality impacts beyond the policies included in the 2006 General Plan and mitigating in the FEIR.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. The proposed amendments make the General Plan consistent with the provisions of Measure V and reduce development densities, vehicle miles traveled, and preserves large portions of open space. While impacts related to PM₁₀, mobile source (vehicle) emissions and cumulative emissions remain significant and unavoidable, there are no new significant air quality impacts that will be created.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

There are no substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.

This Addendum has analyzed available relevant data to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate that a new significant air quality effect may occur. Based on the information and analysis above, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant air quality impact requiring major revisions to the FEIR. All future projects will be required to comply with the air quality and GHG policies of the General Plan and General Plan amendments. These refined policies are not considered mitigation measures and they have not been added in order to reduce new impacts. Instead the new policies



will ensure that emissions will result in a less than significant impact as intended by the measures contained in the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the area of air quality, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

4. Biological Resources

The amendments to the 2006 General Plan incorporate Measure V into the General Plan; update the City's Housing Element; adds policies to the General Plan to reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduces greenhouse gas emissions in the City, conserve water, reduce solid waste; strengthen selected environmental mitigation policies; and move certain existing 2006 General Plan provisions from the former Growth Management element into the Public Services and Facilities Element.

The movement of certain provisions of the existing General Plan from the former Growth Management Element would not result in a physical change and would therefore not have an effect on biological resources. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element impose more stringent roadway performance standards and restrict and or limit roadway connections within the hillside areas. These amendments would have a beneficial effect on biological resources because, compared to what was identified in the FEIR, the amendments' reduction in roadway connections would reduce the amount of land disturbance and would reduce or eliminate physical barriers within wildlife areas.

The update of the City's Housing Element would comply with recently enacted state housing laws and would streamline the City's development review process for the construction of special needs housing such as low income, shelters, and student housing. The incorporation of these amendments in the General Plan would not create additional impacts to biological resources, as no increase in dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out would occur nor are increased densities proposed in areas that would impact biological resources over what was identified in the FEIR.

- a) *Would the Amended General Plan have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As discussed in the FEIR, 24 plant and animal species are potentially present within the Planning Area that are listed, proposed, or candidates for listing under the California and/or the Federal Endangered Species Act. An additional 35 non-listed sensitive species are considered to be potentially present within the Planning Area, of these 17 species were considered to have a moderate to high potential to occur. Coastal sage scrub is considered to be a sensitive plant community by resource agencies and has the potential to contain numerous sensitive plant and animal species. Within the Planning Area the coastal sage scrub community is located predominately in the Hillside Conservation Area.



The FEIR discussed the potential impacts to biological resources based on a scenario that would allow more intense development within the Hillside Conservation Area and throughout the City. The majority of the proposed amendments would not result in physical changes, rather they would alter the extent, location, density, and type of development that could occur in selected areas of the City. The restrictions on development in the southern portion of the Planning Area and the establishment of a minimum lot size would reduce the amount of residential development predicated to occur at build-out of the currently adopted General Plan. As the majority of the listed or sensitive species that occur within the City occur within the Hillside Conservation Area where development is limited by the proposed amendments, impacts associated with this issue would be reduced from what is described in the FEIR.

The General Plan policies focus primarily on avoidance, preservation, and minimization of impacts to biological resources and habitats. However, the policies do not specify a method of identifying habitats that warrant such measures or the parameters to be used if avoidance or preservation are infeasible. Therefore, the following mitigation measures are proposed in the 2006 FEIR to address the identification and loss of habitats.

4.4.4.1A. Require the preparation of biological reports in compliance with standards established by the City of Loma Linda for development related uses that require discretionary approval to assess the impacts of such development and provide mitigation for impacts to biological resources. The report must be prepared by a qualified biologist; the City Community Development Department must be notified in advance that a report will be prepared for a specific project; the report must include a signed certification attesting to the report contents, specific information as to the type of survey (e.g., General Biological Resources Assessment or Habitat Assessment), site location, property owner. In addition, the report must include the following:

- a. Specified attachments (summary sheet, level of significance checklist, biological resources/project footprint map, and site photos);
- b. Information on literature sources (e.g., California Natural Diversity Data Base, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and environmental documents for nearby projects);
- c. A description of surveys, including timing, personnel, and weather conditions;
- d. A description of site conditions including plant and wildlife habitat, disturbances, and sensitive elements;
- e. An assessment of anticipated project impacts and a discussion of mitigation;
- f. A list of all species observed or detected and a recommendation for any additional focused surveys that may be necessary.

4.4.4.1B. The City establishes baseline ratios for mitigating the impacts of development related uses to rare, threatened, and endangered species and their associated habitats as the following:

- Preserve habitat at minimum of 1:1 replacement ratio in locations that provide long-term conservation value for impacted resources. This could involve acquisition of habitat occupied by the affected species, acquiring a key parcel that fills in a missing link or gap in a reserve that provides conservation for the species, or acquisition of credits in a mitigation bank (endorsed by the USFWS and/or CDFG) that has been established to provide conservation value for the



species. Implementation of the mitigation measure shall include provisions for the preservation of such areas in perpetuity.

- b) *Would the Amended General Plan have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. A preliminary evaluation of potential jurisdictional was conducted within the limits of the Planning Area for the 2006 General Plan FEIR. Twenty-one (21) acres of riparian plant habitat occur along the San Timoteo Wash south of Barton Road. The San Timoteo wash is considered to be a regulated water. Regulated waters include non-wetland waters and wetlands that are regulated by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). In addition, other washes within the Hillside Conservation Area may also be considered to be regulated waters. As stated in the excerpt from the General Plan amendment below, environmentally sensitive areas shall be avoided and all development shall be designed to preserve and protect habitat.

9.2.10.3: Guiding Policy for Avoidance of Environmentally Sensitive Areas. *New development shall be sited so as to maximize the permanent preservation of large blocks of unbroken open space and to minimize the loss of habitat, wildlife, and watershed resources.*

9.2.10.4: Guiding Policy for Development to Respect Wildlife Habitats. *Development projects are to be designed to protect habitat values and to preserve significant habitat areas and habitat connections in their natural condition:*

Implementing Policies

- a. Within habitat areas of rare, threatened or endangered species, disturbance of protected biotic resources is prohibited.*
- b. Development shall avoid "canyon bottoms," which are defined as the land occurring within 200 feet of either side of a line referred to as a "blue line stream" as designated on a U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) map. Within riparian and wetland areas, the vegetative resources that contribute to habitat carrying capacity (vegetative diversity, faunal resting areas, foraging areas, and food sources) shall be preserved in place or replaced so as to not result in a measurable reduction in the reproductive capacity of sensitive biotic resources. Development shall not result in a net loss of wetlands.*
- c. Buffer zones adjacent to areas of preserved biological resources shall be provided. Such buffer zones shall be adequate in width so as to protect biological resources from grading and construction activities, as well as from the long-term use of adjacent lands. The landscape design adjacent to areas of preserved biological resources shall be designed so as to avoid invasive species that could negatively impact the value of the preserved resource.*

To further preserve habitats supporting rare and endangered species of plants and animals including wildlife corridors, the following Implementing Policies have been added to Section 9.4.4:



- f. *Require the landscape design of developments adjacent to areas of preserved biological resources to avoid the use of invasive species which could negatively impact the value of the preserved resource.*
- g. *Cooperate with the State and Federal agencies to encourage preserving streams and creeks in the south hills area in their natural state in order to maintain their value as percolation and recharge areas, natural habitat, scenic resources, and recreation corridors. Where such preservation is not technically and financially feasible, require appropriate mitigation for the loss or modification of a creek or stream.*

To further maximize the benefits of open space, the following Implementing Policy has been added to Section 9.2.10.6:

- e. *Limit allowable on-trail activities to those that are consistent with protection of the environmental and the environmental values of adjacent land.*

As previously stated, the primary areas of the City where sensitive species may be located is the Hillside Conservation Area. With the implementation of the proposed General Plan amendments, the extent, location, density, and type of development within certain portions of the City would be limited. Regulated waters may exist in the Hillside Conservation Area. Other locations within the Planning Area that contain riparian habitat are located outside of the Hillside Conservation Area however and are not included as a part of the Hillside Conservation Area preservation. The 2006 General Plan and the FEIR include policies and mitigation measures to reduce impacts to riparian areas and sensitive species to a level that is less than significant. Riparian protection provisions included in the General Plan amendment would further ensure that impacts to riparian and environmentally sensitive areas are reduced and remain less than significant. The proposed amendments would not have a greater impact than that identified in the FEIR would occur.

- c) ***Would the Amended General Plan have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

No Impact. Wetlands or regulated waters within the Planning Area may be located within the Hillside Conservation Area where development will be limited by the proposed General Plan amendments. Therefore, impacts to the potential federally protected wetlands would be reduced in comparison to the currently adopted 2006 General Plan. The proposed General Plan amendments include policies that limit development within the Hillside Conservation Area thereby reducing or eliminating the potential for impacts to wetlands or waters within the Hillside Conservation Area and the rest of the City. Potential impacts related to the San Timoteo wash would be reduced by measures already in place and included in the 2006 General Plan and FEIR. Compared to the 2006 General Plan, the amended General Plan would have no greater impacts to wetlands.



d) *Would the Amended General Plan interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native or resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impeded the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

No Impact. The mitigation measures and policies included in the FEIR detail measures to ensure avoidance and minimization of impacts to wildlife corridors. Methods to identify specific sites (either locally or regionally) that warrant such measures are also included in the FEIR. These measures specify parameters for compensating for the loss of wildlife movement when avoidance or minimization of impacts is considered to be infeasible. As discussed in the FEIR, the 2006 General Plan Policies and the mitigation measures proposed would ensure that impacts associated with habitat fragmentation and the restriction of wildlife movement would be less than significant

The majority of the proposed General Plan amendments themselves would not result in physical changes, rather the amendments would alter the extent, location, density, and type of development that could occur in certain portions of the City. The proposed amendments will prohibit most types of development in the Hillside Conservation Area of the City and outlines specific instances where limited development may occur. By limiting the areas where development may occur, the potential for impacts is greatly reduced when compared to the currently adopted General Plan. The implementation of the General Plan amendments and the mitigation measures described in the FEIR would reduce impacts below what was analyzed and anticipated in the FEIR.

e) *Would the Amended General Plan conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

No Impact. According to the FEIR and General Plan, there are policies within the City for the preservation of oak trees. Approximately 3 acres of coast live oak woodland occur within the Study Area. The oak woodland consists of approximately 35 coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) trees with an understory of the annual grasses, wild barley (*Hordeum* sp.) and fiddleneck (*Amsinckia* sp.). This stand of oak woodland habitat is isolated from other native habitat and therefore of reduced biological value. However, the trees have intrinsic value to the City as they are the only oak trees remaining within the Planning Area. Therefore, loss of these oak trees was considered a potentially significant impact in the FEIR. As discussed in the FEIR, the impacts to these oak trees would be reduced based on the following policies included in the 2006 General Plan:

9.2.9.1.a. Preserve outstanding natural features, such as the skyline of a prominent hill, rock outcroppings, and native and/or historically significant trees.

9.4.4.c. Preserve, as feasible, the oak woodland areas within the City by requiring development to incorporate the trees into the development design.

The General Plan amendments would not create new impacts to the oak trees within the Planning Area. As discussed in the Chapter 2, amendments to the General Plan would reduce development intensities in comparison to the General Plan and would not create any additional impacts to the oak trees within the Planning Area compared to the 2006 General Plan. Compared to the 2006 General Plan, the amended General Plan would have no greater impact on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.



f) *Would the Amended General Plan conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?*

No Impact. The Planning Area is located outside of the boundaries of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP); however, the City of Loma Linda is located directly north of and adjacent to Riverside County MSHCP and abuts areas covered by the MSHCP. The Hillside Conservation Area connects to a core open space area of Riverside County to the south through Reche Canyon and adjacent hills. The City of Loma Linda is not located within any applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. The policies of both the currently adopted General Plan and the proposed General Plan amendments are directed toward preserving open space and thereby creating areas for habitat conservation. The implementation of the proposed General Plan amendments will have a less than significant impact on conservation plans and will encourage further conservation of areas within the City by limiting development within selected areas of the City. Compared to the 2006 General Plan, the amended General Plan would have no greater impacts regarding consistency with habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

Mitigation Measures from the FEIR

The FEIR included the following mitigation measures that are applicable to the proposed amendments:

4.4.4.1A. Require the preparation of biological reports in compliance with standards established by the City of Loma Linda for development related uses that require discretionary approval to assess the impacts of such development and provide mitigation for impacts to biological resources. The report must be prepared by a qualified biologist; the City Community Development Department must be notified in advance that a report will be prepared for a specific project; the report must include a signed certification attesting to the report contents, specific information as to the type of survey (e.g., General Biological Resources Assessment and Habitat Assessment), site location, property owner. In addition, the report must include the following:

- a. Specified attachments (summary sheet, level of significance checklist, biological resources/project footprint map, and site photos);
- b. Information on literature sources (e.g., California Natural Diversity Data Base, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and environmental documents for nearby projects);
- c. A description of surveys, including timing, personnel, and weather conditions;
- d. A description of site conditions including plant and wildlife habitat, disturbances, and sensitive elements;
- e. An assessment of anticipated project impacts and a discussion of mitigation;
- f. A list of all species observed or detected and a recommendation for any additional focused surveys that may be necessary.

4.4.4.1B. The City establishes baseline ratios for mitigating the impacts of development related uses to rare, threatened, and endangered species and their associated habitats as the following:



- Preserve habitat at minimum of 1:1 replacement ratio in locations that provide long-term conservation value for impacted resources. This could involve acquisition of habitat occupied by the affected species, acquiring a key parcel that fills in a missing link or gap in a reserve that provides conservation for the species, or acquisition of credits in a mitigation bank (endorsed by the USFWS and/or CDFG) that has been established to provide conservation value for the species. Implementation of the mitigation measure shall include provisions for the preservation of such areas in perpetuity.

4.4.4.3A. Require all new development in the hillside areas to prepare a biological report which includes identifying local and regional habitat patterns that provide movement routes for wildlife or where opportunities exist to establish movement routes between isolated habitat patches.

4.4.4.3B. Require avoidance of impacts that would eliminate, substantially constrict, or substantially inhibit wildlife movement, or acquire land that would establish movement routes between isolated habitat patches and create or restore habitat to reestablish the connection.

4.4.4.3C. Where on-site habitat preservation would not provide meaningful mitigation either for affected species or for habitat connectivity, off-site mitigation shall be implemented through the acquisition of lands that provide for regional habitat connectivity. Implementation of the mitigation measure shall include provisions for the preservation of such areas in perpetuity.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new significant impacts associated with the proposed General Plan amendments. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to biological resources.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, no major changes to the FEIR are required. Because the proposed amendments to the General Plan would reduce the potential for development within the City including development within the Hillside Conservation Area, impacts to biological resources overall would be reduced, no new significant biological resource impacts that will be created.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

There are no substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than the Final EIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate a new significant effect on biological resources may occur. The proposed amendments include the alteration and reduction of the areas within the Planning area that may be developed. Mitigation measures that are already in place as a part of the FEIR require completion of biological resource surveys to assess and reduce project specific impacts. Based on the information and analysis above, there is no substantial new information that there will be some new, significant impact on biological resources requiring major revision of the FEIR.



No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the area of biological resources, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

5. Cultural Resources

Implementation of the proposed amendments that relate to cultural resources include the reduction in maximum allowable density in certain land use categories, the restriction of development in certain parts of the City, the provisions for student housing and employee housing to be developed on the university campus and on hospital sites pursuant to the provisions of the updated Housing Element.

The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, conservation of water, and reduction of waste would not result in a physical impact that would have an effect on cultural resources. Furthermore, the movement of certain provisions of the 2006 General Plan from the former Growth Management Element would not result in a physical change and would therefore, not have an effect on cultural resources. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element deal with roadway performance standards and roadway connections within the hillside area. These amendments would result in less than significant impacts to cultural resources as a reduction in roadway connections would reduce ground disturbing activities (e.g., excavation, grading).

a) *Would the Amended General Plan cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As identified in the FEIR, development permitted under the General Plan may disturb or destroy existing historic structures and resources through the construction of new residential, commercial, institutional, industrial, and/or new infrastructure. As evidenced by an architectural/historical inventory of existing structures and the inclusion of a historic preservation chapter in the zoning code (Chapter 17.80), the City of Loma Linda has had a long-term interest in historical preservation. The City is committed to historical preservation as evidenced by the inclusion of General Plan policies directed at preserving historical resources.

The FEIR explained that implementation of the General Plan would require evaluation of new development in relation to existing historical structures as well as the identification and preservation of existing historical structures. Implementation of the proposed amendments would reduce the density and amount of residential development in selected areas of the City. The updated Housing Element identifies measures for increasing the City's supply of special-needs housing (e.g., low income, shelters, student housing, second units) by removing barriers to the development of this housing. This goal is achieved through modifications of the City's development review process to facilitate development at higher densities within selected Land Use designations to accommodate special needs housing. Compared to the adopted General Plan, the updated Housing Element does



not increase the dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out. The 2006 General Plan identified 17,231 dwelling units within the Planning Area at General Plan build-out in 2030. With implementation of the proposed amendments, 13,702 dwelling units could be developed within the Planning Area at build-out. However, under the proposed amendments, an increase in the availability of special needs housing through creation of “very high density” and “senior” General Plan land use districts and provisions for ancillary housing within “Institution” and “Health Care” land use districts would occur. While the potential for special needs housing opportunities will increase, compared to the 2006 General Plan, the overall numbers of residential units will decrease because the amendments alter the extent, location, density, and type of development that could occur in selected areas of the City. Compared to 2006 General Plan, the amended General Plan would have no greater impacts to historical resources. Because all new development in the City is required to adhere to General Plan policies including an evaluation of new development in relation to existing historical structures as well as the identification and preservation of existing historical structures, future development within the City would not result in a greater impact on historical structures or resources than that identified in the FEIR.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State’s CEQA Guidelines?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The City’s General Plan identifies one policy within the Conservation and Open Space Element that provides guidance for the preservation and protection of archaeological resources. This policy requires site-specific cultural resource surveys be conducted prior to development activities. Such a cultural resources survey can identify the existence of above-surface human remains. However, the survey cannot determine with certainty whether buried cultural resources will be uncovered until the surface soil is disturbed, such as during grading activities. Therefore, the FEIR proposed mitigation measures to further reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources. The FEIR stated that, with implementation of the General Plan policy and mitigation measures, potential impacts to archaeological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

As previously explained, implementation of the proposed amendments would reduce the density, location, and amount of residential development from that previously analyzed in the FEIR. The updated Housing Element does not increase the number of dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out. The possibility of disturbing any archaeological resources could still occur in the areas that are still available for development, impacts associated with the discovery of archaeological resources during construction would be the same as or less than those analyzed in the FEIR. Adherence to the adopted General Plan policy and mitigation measures, such as requiring permanent conservation easements in areas containing cultural resources, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Relative to the impact on archaeological resources forecast in the FEIR, no adverse change or effect would occur as soil disturbance would still occur. Because the proposed amendments would reduce the density, location, and amount of residential development from that previously analyzed in the FEIR, no greater archaeological resource impact would occur from implementation of the proposed amendments than of that identified in the FEIR.



c) *Would the Amended General Plan directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As stated in the FEIR, implementation of the General Plan would allow development of structures within areas that have been identified as having a high sensitivity for paleontological resources. With the development of undisturbed land, there remains the possibility that paleontological resources may be disturbed during grading activities. The General Plan includes a policy within the Conservation and Open Space Element that requires, as a standard condition of development, work to be halted in the event paleontological resources are encountered during site grading. Work shall remain halted until a qualified paleontologist evaluates and records the find. The policy, however, does not contain a provision that would require the resource to be collected, cataloged, and curated or for the submittal of a report to the Planning Department documenting findings.

The General Plan recognizes the importance of paleontological resources; however, it lacks a recovery program. Therefore, the impact to paleontological resources were identified as potentially significant. The FEIR identified mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources that may result from grading activities in high sensitivity areas. With implementation of these mitigation measures, the FEIR identified that potential impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Implementation of the proposed amendments would reduce the density, location, and amount of residential development from that previously analyzed in the FEIR. The updated Housing Element does not increase the number of dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out. While development could still occur in paleo-sensitive areas, impacts associated with the discovery of paleontological resources during construction would be the same as or less than those analyzed in the FEIR. Adherence to the adopted General Plan policies and mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Because the proposed amendments would reduce the density, location, and amount of residential development from that previously analyzed in the FEIR, no greater paleontological resource impact would occur from implementation of the proposed amendments than of that identified in the FEIR.

d) *Would the Amended General Plan disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. According to the FEIR, the Guachama Rancheria (SBR-2311/H) is an important historically known Native American property within the General Plan planning area. The potential for disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, may occur during future subsurface activities (e.g., excavation, grading). As identified in the FEIR, in the unlikely event that unknown human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, standard City conditions of approval require work to stop and a qualified archaeologist to be consulted. The FEIR included mitigation measures, such as compliance with State Health and Safety Code 7050.5, which in conjunction with adherence to the adopted General Plan policy would further reduce impacts to a less than significant level. While larger areas may be left undeveloped (or developed with a lower density), with adoption of the proposed amendments, a potential still exists that previously undetected human remains could be uncovered. Impacts associated with the discovery of human remains during construction would be the same as or less than those analyzed in the FEIR because the possibility of disturbing any human remains could still



occur in the areas that are still available for development. Because the proposed amendments would reduce the density, location, and amount of residential development from that previously analyzed in the FEIR, no greater impact associated with the discovery of human remains would occur from implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

Mitigation Measures from the FEIR

The FEIR included the following mitigation measures that are still applicable to the proposed amendments:

4.5.5.1A. When existing information indicates that a site proposed for development may contain paleontological resources, a paleontologist shall monitor site grading activities with the authority to halt grading to collect uncovered paleontological resources, curate any resources collected with an appropriate reposition, and file a report with the City Community Development Department documenting any paleontological resources that are found during site grading.

4.5.5.2A. If human remains are encountered during a public or private construction activity, State Health and Safety Code 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the San Bernardino County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The San Bernardino County Coroner must be notified within 24 hours.

- a. If the coroner determines that the burial is not historic, but prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted to determine the most likely descendent (MLD) for this area. The MLD may become involved with the disposition of the burial following scientific analysis.

4.5.5.2B. Avoidance is the preferred treatment for cultural resources. Where feasible, project plans shall be developed to allow avoidance of cultural resources. Where avoidance of construction impacts is possible, capping of the cultural resource site and avoidance planting (e.g., planting of prickly pear cactus) shall be employed to ensure that indirect impacts from increased public availability to the site are avoided. Where avoidance is selected, cultural resource sites shall be placed within permanent conservation easements or dedicated open space.

4.5.5.2C. If avoidance and/or preservation in place of cultural resources is not possible, the following mitigation measures shall be initiated for each impacted site:

- a. A participant-observer from the appropriate Indian Band or Tribe shall be used during archaeological testing or excavation in the project site.
- b. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the project, the project proponent shall develop a test level research design detailing how the cultural resource investigation shall be executed and providing specific research questions that shall be addressed through the excavation program. In particular, the testing program shall characterize the site constituents, horizontal and vertical extent, and, if possible, period of use. The testing program shall also address the California Register and National Register eligibility of the cultural resource and make recommendations as to the suitability of the resource for listing on either Register. The research design shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review and comment. For sites determined, through the Testing Program, to be ineligible for listing on either the California or National Register, execution of the Testing Program will suffice as mitigation of project impacts to this resource.



- c. After approval of the research design and prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall complete the excavation program as specified in the research design. The results of this excavation program shall be presented in a technical report. The Test Level Report shall be submitted to the City Planning Department for review and comment. If cultural resources that would be affected by the project are found ineligible for listing in the California or National Register, test level investigations will have depleted the scientific value of the sites and the project can proceed.
- d. If the resource is identified as being potentially eligible for either the California or National Register, and project designs cannot be altered to avoid impacting the site, a Treatment Program to mitigate project effects shall be initiated. A Treatment Plan detailing the objectives of the Treatment Program shall be developed. The Treatment Plan shall contain specific, testable hypotheses relative to the sites under study and shall attempt to address the potential of the sites to address these research questions. The Treatment Plan shall be submitted to the City Planning Department for review and comment.
- e. After approval of the Treatment Plan, the Treatment Program for affected, eligible sites shall be initiated. Typically, a Treatment Program involves excavation of a statistically representative sample of the site to preserve those resource values that qualify the site as being eligible for the California or National Register. At the conclusion of the excavation or research program, a Treatment Report, shall be developed. This data recovery report shall be submitted to the City Planning Department for review and comment.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new significant impacts associated with the proposed amendments. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to cultural resources.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. Because the proposed amendments would not change the analysis conclusions in the FEIR, there are no new significant cultural resource impacts.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

There are no substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate a new significant effect on cultural resources may occur. Based on the information and analysis above, there is no substantial new information that there will be some new, significant impact on cultural resources requiring major revision of the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or



showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the area of cultural resources, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

6. Geology and Soils

The implementation of the principles set out in Measure V reduce maximum allowable density in certain land use categories, restrict development in certain parts of the City, and modify the traffic level of service standards in the City. The modification of traffic level of service standards does not impact geologic resources. The other provisions of Measure V would modify the extent, location, density, and type of development that would be permitted in selected areas of the City. These provisions modify the type of development allowed under the amended General Plan. Therefore, these provisions have been discussed on a programmatic level in each of the following geology and soils checklist questions.

The intent of the Housing Element Update is to ensure adequate housing to meet the demand of all economic segments of the community. Other changes to the General Plan include the strengthening of environmental and traffic impact mitigation policies, and the proper incorporation of the 1996 Hillside Initiative. This General Plan amendment would not create additional impacts to geologic resources as the overall number of residential units is decreased. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element do not apply to geologic conditions or hazards. Therefore, these amendments would not create any new impacts or cause any greater impacts than that originally identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR.

- a) ***Would the Amended General Plan expose people or structures to potential adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving:***
- i) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. According to the FEIR, the potential exists for property loss, injury, or death resulting from development in a seismically active region that includes Alquist-Priolo zones. As previously stated, with respect to geology and soils, the proposed amendments—which include the Housing Element Update, the addition of policies regarding water supply and greenhouse gases, and the amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element—would not apply to geologic conditions or hazards. The incorporation of Measure V would limit development densities within select areas of the City. Under the 2006 General Plan, approximately 37,649 people would live within the City and sphere of influence at build-out. With implementation of the amended General Plan, approximately 31,709 people would reside within the City and sphere of influence. Compared to the 2006 General Plan at build-out, the Planning Area would have 5,940 fewer residents. Since the anticipated population in the City under the amended General Plan would be less than what was previously identified in the 2006 General Plan, the potential for people and structures to be impacted by earthquake-related hazards such as liquefaction, ground subsidence, mudslides, and landslides would be less as compared to the 2006 General Plan.



The 2006 General Plan identifies policies related to seismic hazards in the *Public Health and Safety Element* which would reduce or minimize the effects associated with seismic hazards. The FEIR analyzed the policies' effectiveness in reducing the effect of seismic hazards. The various policies of the General Plan related to development stress the importance of building design features and siting of development to reducing impacts of geologic hazards. However, the General Plan policies do not provide specific development standards for areas subject to seismic hazards. To provide adequate mitigation for potential seismic hazards, the FEIR identified mitigation measures that require site-specific ground shaking assessments and compliance with specific design standards.

Compared to the 2006 General Plan, the amended General Plan would reduce the number of residential units within the Planning Area. The greatest reduction in density that would occur under the proposed amendments would be located in the hillside area of the City. Under the amended General Plan, the low density residential (2.1–5 dwelling units per acre) would be replaced with low density (0–4 dwelling units per acre). The amendments would also include new land use designations within the hillside area of the City which would at the lowest density have 0-1 dwelling units per 10 acres and at the highest density have 0–2 dwelling units per acre. The hillside area of the City is bisected by the northern boundary of the San Jacinto Fault Zone. The reduction in density within the hillside area would reduce the number of potential dwelling units and the number of people that would be subject to seismic hazards associated with the San Jacinto Fault Zone. Compared to 2006 General Plan's impact on seismic hazards, impacts related to the amended General Plan would be reduced.

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The General Plan area is located adjacent to the San Jacinto Fault, approximately 5 miles northeast of the San Andreas Fault, approximately 13 miles northwest of the Cucamonga Fault, approximately 22 miles southwest of the Elsinore Fault, and approximately 48 miles southwest of the Newport-Inglewood Fault. The FEIR addressed seismic ground shaking impacts, and provided mitigation for the identified impacts. In addition, all structures in the Planning Area under the 2006 General Plan were required to meet the seismic requirements of the Uniform Building Code. The FEIR determined that adherence to these mitigation measures and the Uniform Building Code standards would reduce potential ground shaking impacts to less than significant levels.

As previously stated, the proposed amendments' greatest reduction in density would occur in the hillside area of the City, which is bisected by the San Jacinto Fault Zone. The reduction in density within the hillside area would reduce the number of potential dwelling units and the number of people in that area that would be subject to seismic ground shaking associated with the San Jacinto Fault Zone. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Liquefaction occurs when loose, unconsolidated, water laden soils are subject to shaking, causing the soils to lose cohesion. As explained in the FEIR, there is a moderate to moderately high susceptibility for liquefaction hazards in the northwest portion



of the General Plan area and the southern reaches of Reche Canyon. The north-central and western portions of the General Plan area are moderately susceptible to liquefaction hazards. However, site-specific geotechnical studies are the only practical and reliable way of determining the liquefaction potential of a particular site. While implementation of the liquefaction policies contained in the *Public Health and Safety Element* of the General Plan would reduce the significance of potential liquefaction impacts, they do not provide specific development standards for development within areas subject to liquefaction, nor do they provide adequate mitigation for potential liquefaction impacts that may be identified through the use of new scientific data, equipment, or procedures. However, the 2006 General Plan FEIR identifies mitigation measures that would reduce liquefaction impacts to a less than significant level.

The 2006 General Plan's forecast to reach 37,649 people at build-out and would be reduced to 31,709 people under the amended General Plan. This is due to a reduction in residential development densities, primarily in the hillside areas. As previously stated, the reduction in residential development would occur in the hillside areas, which are located in the southern portion of the City. The reduction of the development in the hillside areas would not result in more intense development elsewhere in the City as densities identified in the General Plan for these portions of the City would still be applicable. Some dense development would occur from the amendments (e.g., the update to the Housing Element), which would allow more intense development for senior and student housing in the City. Because the amendments have only identified the densities of these land use designations and not the exact location of such uses, these types of housing would occur in areas that may be susceptible to liquefaction hazards. However, the existing 2006 General Plan included policies and mitigation measures that would be applicable to all development. Implementation of the policies and mitigation measures would mitigate liquefaction impacts.

As there would be less overall residential development and therefore less people within the Planning Area under the amended General Plan, the magnitude of liquefaction impacts would be reduced. While the level of significance associated with this issue would remain the same as that identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR, the number of people exposed to this hazard would be reduced. Site-specific geotechnical studies would be required for development within the City under both the existing adopted General Plan and the proposed amended General Plan. Therefore, the significance of the impacts associated with liquefaction impacts would be the same as the impacts originally identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR.

iv) *Landslides?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The FEIR noted that the southern portion of the City has steep natural slopes, which are susceptible to instability. The type of instability anticipated in this area includes landslides, surficial soil slips, wet debris flows, and surficial creep. The FEIR states that implementation of the slope failure policies contained in the *Public Health and Safety Element* of the General Plan would reduce the significance of potential landsliding impacts to a less than significant level.

It is projected that at General Plan build-out, a population of 37,649 would reside within the City. With the incorporation of the proposed amendments to the General Plan, population within the City would be reduced to 31,709 people due to the prohibition of most types of development in the Hillside Conservation Area. By limiting the areas where development may occur under the amended General Plan, the potential for landslide impacts under the amended General Plan is reduced when compared to the 2006 General Plan. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed amendments would reduce



the potential for people and structures to be affected by landslide events. The potential exposure to landslide impact is reduced in magnitude under the amended General Plan. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Grading and site preparation within the Planning Area would expose surface soil to erosion. An increase in population anticipated by the City's General Plan would cause an increase in residential and non-residential structures, resulting with alterations and loss to existing topsoil. In addition, exposure of underlying soils during landform modifications substantially increases the potential for soil erosion. The FEIR stated that the General Plan policies would reduce potential impacts associated with soil erosion and the loss of topsoil to a less than significant level. Any development within the Planning Area that would require the excavation, stockpiling, and movement of on-site soils resulting in the disturbance of 1.0 acre or more, including development that would occur with the proposed amendments to the General Plan, are required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). As part of NPDES requirements, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that identifies best management practices (BMPs) to limit the soil erosion during project construction would be required. Adherence during construction to provisions of the policies contained in the FEIR, the NPDES permit and applicable BMPs contained in the SWPPP would ensure that potential impacts related to soil erosion are less than significant.

The General Plan amendment (new Section 9.2.8.3) identifies landform grading standards that seek to minimize grading, avoid tall manufactured slopes and steep embankments the could lead to soil erosion and silting of lower slopes; and create artificial slopes that stimulate the appearance of surrounding natural terrain. By reducing the areas where residential development and the density of development (e.g. large lot residential development in the hillside areas) may occur in the City, and through implementation of landform grading standards, the proposed amendments would minimize the potential for soil erosion and loss of topsoil as less land would be disturbed. Soil erosion impacts under the amended General Plan would be reduced in magnitude when compared to the 2006 General Plan.

c) *Would the Amended General Plan be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As stated in the FEIR, development within the General Plan area may result in the construction and occupation of structures in areas underlain by expansive soils. If not properly mitigated by site preparation and/or foundation design, expansive soil conditions can cause substantial damage to structures and other improvements over time. Build-out of the General Plan area increases the number of persons, residential units, and non-residential uses developed on collapsible and expansive soils. The *Public Health and Safety Element* of the General Plan identified policies that would be implemented when development occurs on expansive or unstable soils.



While updates to the Housing Element include methods of increasing special needs housing within the City, a reduction of overall residential development is forecast based on the implementation of all of the General Plan amendments. The proposed amendments to incorporate the provision of Measure V would limit development densities within areas of the City and reduce the potential for development to occur on a geologic unit or soil type that is unstable. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

d) *Would the Amended General Plan be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-b of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Please refer to Response 4(c).

e) *Would the Amended General Plan have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

No Impact. There are several small areas in the City that are not connected to the City's sanitary sewer system. These areas include the southwestern portion of the City and the eastern sphere of influence both north and south of Barton Road. The *Public Services and Utilities Element* of the General Plan contains policies that would be implemented as future development occurs in the City. The identified General Plan policies set standards for future sewer service in addition to recognizing needed improvements. Implementation of these policies would ensure that in the event that a septic sewer or alternative wastewater disposal system is required, soils would be able to support such a sewer system. Adherence to the identified General Plan policies would reduce impacts associated with this issue to a less than significant level.

Updates to the Housing Element include methods of increasing special needs housing within the City, while incorporation of other amendments would result in a reduction of overall residential development within the hillside areas of the City. Impacts associated with this issue under the amended General Plan would be reduced in magnitude when compared to the 2006 General Plan as overall less land would be developed within the Planning Area.

Mitigation Measures from the FEIR

The FEIR includes the following mitigation measures, which reduced potentially significant impacts resulting from seismic events and geotechnical conditions to a less than significant level.

Impact 4.6.4.1 Fault Rupture

4.6.4.1A. Before a project is approved or otherwise permitted within an A-P Zone or within 150 feet of any other active or potentially active fault mapped in a published United States Geological Survey (USGS) or CGS reports, or within other potential earthquake hazard area (as determined by the City), a site-specific geologic investigation shall be prepared to assess potential seismic hazards resulting from development of the project site. Where and when required, the geotechnical investigation shall address the issue(s), hazard(s), and geographic area(s) determined by the City of Loma Linda Public Works Department and Building Division to be relevant to each development. The site-specific



geotechnical investigation shall incorporate up-to-date data from government and non-government sources.

Based on the site-specific geotechnical investigation, no structures intended for human occupancy shall be constructed across active faults. This site-specific evaluation and written report shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to City of Loma Linda Public Works Department and Building Division for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits. If an active fault is discovered, any structure intended for human occupancy shall be set back at least 50 feet from the fault. A larger or smaller setback may be established if such a setback is supported by adequate evidence as presented to and accepted by the City.

Impact 4.6.4.2 Ground Shaking

4.6.4.2A. As determined by the City, a site-specific assessment shall be prepared to ascertain potential ground shaking impacts resulting from development. The site-specific ground shaking assessment shall incorporate up-to-date data from government and non-government sources and may be included as part of any site-specific geotechnical investigation. The site-specific ground shaking assessment shall include specific measures to reduce the significance of potential ground shaking hazards. This site-specific ground shaking assessment shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to the City of Loma Linda Public Works Department and Building Division for review and approval prior to the issuance of construction and/or building permits.

Impact 4.6.4.3 Liquefaction

4.6.4.3A. As determined by the City, a site-specific assessment shall be prepared to ascertain potential liquefaction impacts resulting from development. The site-specific liquefaction assessment shall incorporate up-to-date data from government and non-government sources and may be included as part of any site-specific geotechnical investigation required in Mitigation Measure 4.6.4.1A. This site-specific ground shaking assessment shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to the City of Loma Linda Public Works Department and Building Division for review and approval prior to the issuance of construction and/or building permits.

4.6.4.3B. Where development is proposed within an identified or potential liquefaction hazard area (as determined by the City), adequate and appropriate measures such as (but not limited to) design foundations in a manner that limits the effects of liquefaction, the placement of an engineered fill with low liquefaction potential, and the alternative siting of structures in areas with a lower liquefaction risk, shall be implemented to reduce potential liquefaction hazards. Any such measures shall be submitted to the City of Loma Linda Public Works Department and Building Division for review prior to the approval of the building permits.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required.



CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, no major changes to the FEIR are required. There are no new significant impacts on geology and soils that would be created with implementation of the proposed amendments in the General Plan because it is consistent with the project as described in the FEIR.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

There are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in Final EIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate that a new significant effect from geology or soils may occur. Based on the information and analysis above, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact from geology or soils requiring major revisions to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects Described in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the areas of geology and soils, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Implementation of the proposed amendments related to hazards and hazardous materials include the reduction in the maximum allowable residential density in certain land use categories, the restriction of limited development in certain parts of the City, the provisions for student housing and employee housing to be developed on the university campus and on hospital sites pursuant to the updated Housing Element, and the restricted use and/or construction/extension of roads in the hillside areas.

The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, conservation of water, and reduction of waste would not result in a physical impact that would have an effect on hazards and hazardous materials.

a) *Would the Amended General Plan create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The FEIR determined that the acreage of new commercial, business park, and/or industrial developments would more than double over the existing developed acres at build-out of the 2006 General Plan. These anticipated new uses would require or generate hazardous materials, potentially increasing exposure of residents and employees to hazardous materials and waste. As stated in the FEIR, hazardous materials are commonly used by



all segments of our society. If improperly handled, stored, or disposed of, these materials could have substantial health and environmental consequences. Proper identification of potential problems associated with the handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials would play an increasingly important role in the anticipated commercial and industrial economic growth of Loma Linda and its sphere of influence in the coming years. The *Loma Linda General Plan* establishes policies pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials in the Public Health and Safety Element. As explained in the FEIR, the policies provide specific guidance for the location of new development within the hillsides, while identifying and regulating local routes related to the transportation of hazardous material and hazardous waste.

The adoption of the proposed amendments incorporating Measure V would amend the existing General Plan with regard to residential land use densities, planned residential developments and communities, hillside conservation, and open space both within the Planning Area. The update of the Housing Element would provide for student housing and employee housing to be developed on the university campus and on hospital sites and would ensure adequate housing opportunities for all segments of the community.

Future development that may occur under the proposed amendments, including the special-needs housing associated with the Housing Element update, would still be required to comply with the General Plan policies that protect the public from potential hazards that may result from the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Because all development implemented under the proposed amendments would still be required to adhere to these same policies, in comparison to the analysis within the FEIR, no greater hazards and hazardous material impacts would occur.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan create a significant harm to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As stated in response 7(a), the FEIR determined that new commercial, business park, and/or industrial developments would more than double over the existing developed acres at build-out of the 2006 General Plan. According to the FEIR, illegal dumping of hazardous waste is a region-wide problem that is by no means unique to the City of Loma Linda. It is anticipated that as the City continues to develop, the amount of unimproved land will decrease and therefore areas where dumping can occur would be reduced. While the proposed amendments establish principles of managed growth that would preserve open space, development would still occur within the Planning Area, limiting the amount of potential areas for dumping. However, the overall number of hazardous waste sites requiring cleanup as a result of illegal dumping is expected to increase due to the increasing costs of legal disposal and the phased closure of many existing hazardous waste landfills.

Numerous properties in the Planning Area were developed prior to the existing hazardous materials standards. As these properties are redeveloped, there is the likelihood that hazardous materials (e.g., asbestos) could be encountered. There are many vacant parcels which could be the site of earlier development or unknown dumping of potentially hazardous materials. Future development that may occur under the proposed amendments, including the special-needs housing associated with the Housing Element update, would still be required to adhere to applicable local, State, and Federal safety standards. While the proposed amendments would result in increased development densities (e.g., student, senior, or hospital associated residential uses), these uses would still be required to adhere to City policies related to the use, transport, and storage of hazardous materials. Because all



development implemented under the proposed amendments would still be required to adhere to these same local, State, and Federal safety standards, and guidelines, and/or regulations in the General Plan, in comparison to the analysis within the FEIR, no greater hazards and hazardous material impacts would occur.

c) *Would the Amended General Plan emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The transport, storage, handling, and retail sale of hazardous materials would be required to adhere to applicable local, State, and Federal safety standards, guidelines and/or regulations. The proposed amendments would reduce the overall location, density, and amount of residential development from that previously analyzed in the FEIR. The proposed amendments would reduce the amount of residential development, and future development that would occur under the proposed amendments would still be required to adhere to applicable local, State, and Federal safety standards, guidelines and/or regulations, assuring a less than significant impact related to the emission of hazardous materials or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. No greater impact than of that identified in the FEIR would occur with adoption of the proposed amendments.

d) *Would the Amended General Plan be on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code 675962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As identified in the FEIR, common hazardous materials and hazardous waste concerns within the Planning Area are related to medical waste, transportation accidents, illegal dumping, underground storage tank (UST) leaks, leaking natural gas pipelines, commercial/industrial wastes, agricultural pesticides, and illegal drug laboratories. Several properties within the City are listed in the California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List) pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5(E).

The proposed amendments would reduce the overall location, density, and amount of residential development within the Planning Area. Relative to the analysis from the FEIR, development would still occur on sites within the Planning Area that are on the list of hazardous materials sites; however, because of the increased preservation of open space areas, less potential area would be available for development. Nonetheless, the potential for development on a hazardous materials site may still occur. As identified in the FEIR, adherence to applicable local, State, and Federal safety standards, guidelines, and/or regulations would result in a less than significant impact related to the this issue. As future development that may occur under the proposed amendments would still be required to adhere to applicable local, State, and Federal safety standards, guidelines, and/or regulations, no greater impact related to hazardous materials sites would occur with adoption of the proposed amendments.



- e) ***For a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has been adopted within 2 miles of a public airport, would the Amended General Plan result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The San Bernardino International Airport is located approximately 1.5 miles from the northern boundary of the City. Portions of the City fall within the 2-mile radius considered within the airport influence area. According to Government Code, Section 65302.3, general plans must be consistent with the Airport Land Use Commission's plan for the area included within their jurisdiction. According to the FEIR, the Airport Land Use Plan for the San Bernardino International Airport has not been adopted; therefore, compliance with airport land use compatibility policies cannot be determined at this time.

The proposed amendments would result in a reduction in the location, density, and amount of development previously analyzed. However, development would still occur within the Planning Area and within the San Bernardino International Airport influence area. While the development that would occur within the airport influence area would be subject to the same airport hazard, the proposed amendments would reduce the amount of development.. Because no incompatible uses (e.g., residential uses) are proposed within the 2-mile radius of the airport influence area under the proposed amendments, compared to the FEIR, no greater airport safety hazard impact would occur with implementation of the proposed amendments.

- f) ***For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Amended General Plan result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

No Impact. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project limits. No safety hazard impact would occur with implementation of the proposed amendments as no people residing or working in the project area would be in close proximity to a private airstrip.

- g) ***Would the Amended General Plan impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As stated in the FEIR, the Loma Linda Emergency Operations Plan implements the City's emergency planning, organization, and response policies and procedures. More specifically, the Plan identifies how the City would respond to extraordinary events or disasters, from preparation through recovery. The City has recognized that the planning process must address a wide range of hazards that could potentially threaten the City. The identified hazards have been placed into three broad categories: natural, technological or man-made, and national security. The plan addresses the integration and coordination with other agencies and governmental levels when required. In addition, the plan provides assistance in the development of department Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). Each department's SOP defines their responsibilities pertaining to specific emergency situations. Once an emergency occurs, the Loma Linda Emergency Operations Plan offers recovery operations organization, responsibilities, and damage/safety assessment. The plan also discusses after-action reporting procedures and possible disaster assistance programs depending on the type of emergency.

The various policies of the Public Health and Safety Element of the General Plan related to the City's adopted emergency plan provide specific guidance to the location of new development within the hillsides and establish design standards that ensure compatibility with existing development. As



identified in the FEIR, compliance with the General Plan policies reduces the impact to the City's adopted emergency plan to a less than significant level. Projects will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for adherence to these design standards. Because development that would occur subject to the proposed amendments would still be subject to the City's adopted emergency plan and design standards, and changes in land use, residential densities, housing policies, and/or traffic level of service standards would not alter the implementation of the City's Emergency Operations Plan, impacts related to the City's adopted emergency plan would not be greater than those identified in the FEIR.

h) Would the Amended General Plan expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized area or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The development of residential uses in the lower foothills to the south and southwest creates additional problems in controlling a wildland fire due to limited firefighting facilities, and lack of direct access to the areas, thereby lengthening response times. The higher density senior/student housing associated with the update of the Housing Element would not occur in areas that are considered wildfire-prone. As such, the proposed senior/student housing would not be exposed to wildland fires and impacts are less than significant.

Compared to the level of development resulting under the approved General Plan, provisions of the proposed amendments would reduce the location, density, and amount of development in the hillside areas. This reduction, especially within the wildfire prone areas of the hillside areas would result in less potential of injury or death involving wildland fires. This would include where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. In comparison to the analysis in the FEIR, no greater impact related to wildfire hazards would occur from implementation of the proposed amendments as development locations and densities are reduced.

Mitigation Measures from the FEIR

The FEIR did not include mitigation measures related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed amendments; therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to hazards and hazardous materials.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. Because the proposed amendments would not change the analysis conclusions in the FEIR, there are no new significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts.



No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

The foregoing analysis and information indicates that the proposed amendments would not result in a substantial change in circumstances related to hazards and hazardous materials requiring major EIR revisions.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in FEIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate that a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no substantial new information that would result in greater significant effects related to hazards and hazardous materials.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects Described in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the areas of hazards and hazardous materials, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

8. Hydrology and Water Quality

Implementation of the proposed amendments that relate to hydrology and water quality include the reduction in maximum allowable density in certain land use categories, the restriction of development in certain parts of the City, modifications to policies ensuring flood protection and adequate water supply, and the implementation of policies to increase water efficiency and reduce water quality impacts as discussed in the sections below.

The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and reduction of solid waste would not result in a physical impact that would have an effect on hydrology and water quality. Furthermore, the movement of certain provisions of the existing General Plan from the former Growth Management Element would not result in a physical change and would therefore not have an effect on hydrology and water quality. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element deal with roadway performance standards and roadway connections within the hillside area. These amendments do not impact hydrology and water quality as a reduction in roadway connections would not impact drainage areas, runoff, flooding, or water quality.

The update of the City's Housing Element would comply with recently enacted state housing laws and would streamline the City's development review process for the construction of special needs housing such as low income, shelters, and student housing. The incorporation amendments in the General Plan would not create additional impacts to hydrology and water quality as no increase in dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out would occur nor are increased densities proposed in areas that would impact hydrology or water quality.



a) *Would the Amended General Plan violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As identified in the FEIR, construction, grading, and excavation activities within the Planning Area would result in temporary soil erosion during storm events, which would contribute to short-term increases in the sediment load in the City's storm drain system. Additionally, substances such as oils, fuels, paints, and solvents may be transported to nearby drainage systems, watersheds, and groundwater recharge areas from the conversion of permeable areas to impermeable areas and increased runoff. The significance of these water quality impacts would vary depending upon the level of construction activity, location, weather conditions, and soil conditions.

The proposed General Plan amendments would reduce the density and amount of residential development in selected areas of the City such as hillsides and would require a minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet throughout the City for single-family residences. The proposed amendments establish two new higher-density residential land use categories, allow student and employee housing ancillary to institutional and healthcare uses and identify policies to ensure an adequate supply of housing for special needs residents.

The General Plan establishes policies to maintain water quality and regulate waste discharge requirements within both the Public Services and Facilities Element and Conservation and Open Space Element. As explained in the FEIR, these policies guide development within the hillsides and establish development standards for new development that ensure compatibility with water quality standards. Compliance with the General Plan policies reduces the impact to the City's water quality to a less than significant level. Projects will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, implementation of BMPs to reduce drainage system discharge would be required, along with the implementation of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), for municipal and private projects to protect groundwater recharge areas from construction runoff and other potential sources of pollutant runoff. The amendments reduce the overall number of residential units; furthermore, with a reduction in density within hillside areas, less area will be disturbed. A decrease in development in the hillside areas would result in decreased impervious areas, which would correspondingly decrease the amount of runoff. The reduction of development, construction, and soil disturbance within the hillside areas would reduce the potential for sediment and other pollutants to be released during a storm event. The amendments to the General Plan include the following guiding policy and implementing policy:

9.6.2 Guiding Policy

Water quality and availability are critical to the current and future residents of the City of Loma Linda, its planning area and its sphere of influence. No new development shall be approved that endangers the quality or quantity of water delivered to households within the City.

Implementing Policies

- a. No development project shall be approved which would cause the quality of water delivered to Loma Linda households to fail to meet State and/or Federal water quality standards, or which would cause an increase in residential rates, or which would result in a restriction of water usage, except for those projects exempt under State and/or Federal law.



The implementation of the above policies would ensure that impacts related to water quality would be reduced when compared to the General Plan as analyzed in the FEIR. The amendments would not cause a water quality impact greater than that analyzed in the FEIR.

- b) *Would the Amended General Plan substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Increased development in the City would reduce the amount of permeable surfaces suitable for recharge, increases the rate and volume of runoff and the subsequent flow of water in streams, and increases the amount of oil and grease and other non-point source pollutants that enter streambeds and recharge areas.

Though the Housing Element would allow an increase in special needs housing opportunities, when compared to the 2006 General Plan, the proposed amendments as a whole would reduce the overall density, population, and the amount of development within the City. Because a reduction in development within the Planning Area would occur, water demand would also decrease, resulting in less withdrawal of groundwater. Furthermore, Implementing Policy 9.6.2e has been revised to disallow the approval of projects for which assured water supply is not available. Combined with the reduction in residential uses envisioned by the proposed amendments, this requirement will ensure that groundwater supplies would be sufficiently maintained to support existing and planned uses. No adverse change or effect greater than that identified in the FEIR would occur.

- c–d) *Would the Amended General Plan substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which result in flooding on-or-off-site?***

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As stated in the FEIR, future development under the 2006 General Plan would increase the amount of impervious surfaces throughout the Planning Area. While existing drainage facilities are not adequate to accommodate the existing stormwater runoff during 100-year floods in the northern section of the City, new development throughout the Planning Area would increase the volume and rate of stormwater entering the current drainage system; however, as discussed in the 2006 General Plan FEIR, the policies of the General Plan would reduce impacts associated with this issue to a less than significant level. These policies are still in effect for all development that may occur within the City under the amended General Plan. The impacts of the amendments to the General Plan would have a similar impact to that identified in the Final EIR.

As stated in the FEIR, natural materials in the Planning Area are relatively susceptible to erosion. Development within the Planning Area, especially in the hillside area, would increase the potential for soil erosion. Development would increase and concentrate runoff, which if not controlled, may accelerate the rates of erosion of unprotected surfaces. Increased rates of erosion would likely accelerate sedimentation of drainage channels and flood control features, which would impact the



effectiveness of these features. The General Plan amendment (new Section 9.2.8.3) identifies landform grading standards that seek to minimize grading, avoid tall manufactured slopes and steep embankments that could lead to soil erosion and silting of lower slopes; and create artificial slopes that stimulate the appearance of surrounding natural terrain. By reducing the areas where residential development and the density of development (e.g. large lot residential development in the hillside areas) may occur in the City, and through implementation of landform grading standards, the proposed amendments would minimize the potential for soil erosion and loss of topsoil as less land would be disturbed.

As discussed in Response 8a, the updated Housing Element includes provisions to ensure housing for all segments of the community; however, the proposed amendments as a whole would result in a reduction in the overall residential density and amount of development within the City compared to what was previously analyzed in the General Plan FEIR. Adherence to the required NPDES requirements will ensure that development does not create or contribute to a significant off-site drainage impact. Compared to the 2006 General Plan, the amended General Plan would have no greater impact on existing drainage patterns, or increases to the rate or amount of surface runoff.

e) *Would the Amended General Plan create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Please refer to response 8(c). As discussed in Response 8a, the updated Housing Element includes provisions to ensure housing for all segments of the community. The proposed amendments as a whole would result in a reduction in the overall residential density and amount of development within the City compared to the 2006 General Plan. As such, a decrease in the need of paved surfaces would occur, and fewer modifications to natural features would be necessary. No increase in runoff impacts is anticipated to occur with implementation of the proposed amendments.

f) *Would the Amended General Plan otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Please refer to Response 8(a). The FEIR has stated that with the continued development in the Planning Area, water resources would continue to decline. Because the proposed amendments would reduce the overall population and amount of residential development within the city compared to that identified in the 2006 General Plan, impacts to water resources would be reduced. Policies have been included in the amendments to the General Plan that would reduce impacts to water resources beyond what was analyzed in the General Plan FEIR. Policies to protect water quality are included in Response 8a. Additional policies included in the amendments regarding water efficiency and conservation are described below.

9.6.1.2 Guiding Policy for Water Efficiency

Maximize water efficiency, water reuse, and the beneficial use of stormwater, including groundwater recharge and water quality improvement

Implementing Policy

- a. Reduce the waste of potable water through efficient technologies, conservation efforts, and design and management practices, and by better matching the source and quality of water to the user's needs.



- b. Support efforts to reduce waste and increase reuse through integrated planning of programs and complementary land use and building regulations. Assess and remove barriers to integrated water resource planning
- c. Initiate a Water Conservation Program. Develop model water demand management programs using best practices, including the following:
 - Requiring water conservation in new construction
 - Requiring water conservation fixtures
 - Encouraging business rebates
 - Encouraging plumbing maintenance programs
- d. Require site-appropriate, drought-tolerant low water use landscaping and efficient irrigation systems where appropriate for new development. For parcels adjacent to publicly managed open space, appropriate landscaping will also be non-invasive and have low flammability. Limit the amount of water intensive landscaping, particularly lawn area allowed, in order to reduce the amount of water needed for irrigation.
- e. Encourage use of irrigation technologies such as evapo-transpiration systems — where real-time weather data is transmitted to installed controllers to automate water needs — that save water, promote greater plant health, and reduce runoff. Encourage water agencies to conduct irrigation training workshops for homeowners and professionals.
- f. Encourage use of on-site rainwater capture, storage, and infiltration for irrigation and other non-potable uses, and work with appropriate authorities to establish standards for rainwater quality and use. Ensure that catchments do not adversely affect habitat dependent on in-stream flow.

The implementation of the policies listed above would ensure that efficient water usage within the City and reduce the demand for water within the City. These policies in combination with the policies identified under Response 8a would ensure that no greater impact than that identified in the FEIR would occur with implementation of the amended General Plan.

g) *Would the Amended General Plan place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As identified in the FEIR, flooding represents a potential hazard to citizens and property within the Planning Area. While a majority of the area potentially subject to flood hazards is located in the northern portion of the Planning Area, existing topography and the presence of water storage tanks increase the potential for flooding. In addition, failure of the Seven Oaks Dam at a time when the reservoir is full, while not likely, would represent a substantial flood hazard for downstream areas, including the northern portions of the City of Loma Linda. The FEIR identified mitigation to reduce flood hazard impacts to a less than significant level.

Compared to the 2006 General Plan, the proposed amendments would reduce the density and amount of residential development that would occur in the City. As such, less development than that anticipated in the 2006 General Plan would occur in the hillside areas. The proposed amendment includes a flood control facility performance standard (Section 10.2.4.2), "...Provide sufficient facilities



development to protect structures designed for human occupancy and roadways identified as evacuation routes from inundation during the 100-year flood event. Do not approve projects where adequate flood protection to meet this standard is not available.” The placement of housing within a 100-year flood would remain the same as in the 2006 General Plan because the potential for development within the 100-year flood plain remains the same with the proposed amendments. Impacts of the proposed amendments, like those of the existing General Plan will remain less than significant with adherence to mitigation and no impact greater than that analyzed in the FEIR would occur.

h) *Would the Amended General Plan place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Please refer to Response 8(f). As previously explained, the proposed amendments would reduce the amount of development from that identified and analyzed in the FEIR. A performance standard for flood control facilities is identified in the amendment which will ensure structures approved for human occupation and evacuation routes are appropriately protected from inundation during 100-year flood events. The potential for residential development within the 100-year floodplain remains the same; therefore, relative to 100-year flood hazard identified in the FEIR, the amount of development potentially subject to flood hazard would remain the same. Compared to the General Plan, no adverse change or effect is anticipated to occur. Impacts remain less than significant with adherence to mitigation.

i) *Would the Amended General Plan expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As explained in the FEIR, the majority of the area potentially subject to flood hazards is located in the northern portion of the Planning Area. Existing topography and water storage tanks increase the potential for flood events in other portions of the Planning Area. In addition, failure of the Seven Oaks Dam at a time when the reservoir is full, while not likely, would represent a substantial flood hazard for downstream areas, including the northern portions of the City of Loma Linda.

As previously identified, the proposed amendments would result in a reduction in the density and amount of development from that identified in the FEIR. However, the amount of development within the 100-year flood hazard area will remain the same as that contemplated in the adopted General Plan. Compared to the impact identified in the FEIR, no increase in impacts would occur from implementation of the proposed amendments.

j) *Would the Amended General Plan expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Please refer to response 8(h). As explained in the FEIR, the northern portion of Planning Area is within the inundation area of the Seven Oaks Dam, the failure of which would impact the City and its sphere of influence. Additionally, canals, levees, and



flood control channels may vulnerable to the earthquake-induced effects of liquefaction, lateral spreading, and primary fault rapture.

Compared to the 2006 General Plan, the proposed amendments would result in a reduction in the density and the amount of residential development within the City. No increase in effects is anticipated to occur with implementation of the proposed amendments related to the exposure of people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow forecast in the FEIR. Though the amendments to the General Plan would reduce residential development and the overall population, the amendments would have the same impacts related to this issue as the 2006 General Plan. No change in the impact identified in the FEIR would occur as a result of the amendments.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures

The FEIR included the following mitigation measures that area applicable to the proposed amendments:

4.8.4.2A. New development shall incorporate features to facilitate the on-site infiltration of precipitation and/or runoff into groundwater basins. Features such as (but not be limited to) detention basins incorporated into project landscaping; and the installation of porous areas within parking areas. Groundwater recharge features shall be included on development plans and shall be reviewed by the Loma Linda Department of Public Works, Water Division and the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of grading permits.

4.8.1. Development in Zone 4 will be required to provide appropriate water storage capacity and hydraulic pumps as necessary to meet required water and fire flow during emergencies.

4.9.5.1A. Development within the 100-year floodplain shall be prohibited unless mitigation measures consistent with the National Flood Insurance Program are provided.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there are no major changes to the FEIR are required. Because the proposed amendments would not change the analysis conclusions in the FEIR, there are no new significant hydrology and water quality impacts.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

The foregoing analysis and information indicates that the proposed amendments would not result in a substantial change in circumstances related to hydrology and water quality requiring major EIR revisions.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in FEIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General



Plan's impacts in the areas of hydrology and water quality, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

9. Land Use and Planning

Implementation of the proposed amendments that relate to land use and planning include the reduction in maximum allowable density in certain land use categories and the restriction of development in certain parts of the City.

The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, conservation of water, and reduction of waste would not result in an impact that would have an effect on land use and planning. Furthermore, the movement of certain provisions of the existing General Plan from the former Growth Management Element would not result in a physical change and would therefore not have an effect on land use and planning. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element deal with roadway performance standards and roadway connections within the Hillside Area. These amendments do not impact land use and planning. Similarly, amendments to the Open Space and Conservation Element would not have an effect on land use and planning as the provisions associated with these amendments deal with preservation of open space and resource conservation and would not alter the projected population.

The update of the City's Housing Element would comply with recently enacted state housing laws and would streamline the City's development review process for the construction of special needs housing such as low income, shelters, and student housing. The incorporation of this General Plan amendment would not create additional impacts to land use and planning as no increase in dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out would occur.

a) *Would the Amended General Plan physically divide an established community?*

No Impact. The proposed amendments augment the General Plan with regard to the housing element, residential land use densities, planned residential developments and communities, hillside conservation, and open space both within the City and within its sphere of influence. The proposed General Plan amendments incorporating Measure V will reduce the extent, location, density and type of development within certain parts of the city, require a 7,200-square foot lot size minimum; restrict development in the Hillside Conservation Area, and require new developments to mitigate traffic impacts to a Level of Service C or better (unless there is already a current level of service failure in the City).

It is anticipated that the implementation of the proposed General Plan amendments would restrict the area available for development within the south hills and reduce residential densities that would be allowed within the Planning Area. As with the implementing projects that would take place under the 2006 General Plan, projects that would take place based on the amended General Plan would require review by the City staff to ensure that a division of an established community within the City would not occur. The General Plan Amendment does not propose specific development that would divide an established community. Compared to the 2006 General Plan's impact from physically dividing an established community, the amended General Plan would have no greater impact.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to*



the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The majority of the proposed amendments are intended to ensure that the currently approved General Plan is consistent with the provisions of Measure V provisions. The amendments also include: an update of the Housing Element, policies to reduce VMT; revisions to strengthen environmental and traffic mitigation policies; the incorporation of the 1996 Hillside Initiative; changes providing for a broader range of uses in Planning Area "B"; and policies to reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions and prevent impacts development that would prevent development that would impact water supply or quality. The proposed amendments to the Land Use Element would alter the extent, location, density, and type of development that could occur in selected areas of the City. While the goals and policies of both plans are similar, the proposed General Plan amendments provide restrictions on development within various areas of the City to ensure that the goals of the General Plan are achieved. While the proposed General Plan amendments include changes from the currently approved General Plan, the amended polices function to achieve the original goals of the General Plan as well as provide new goals. These goals are not contradictory to the approved General Plan. Therefore, the proposed General Plan amendments implement and are considered consistent with the policies contained in the approved General Plan. Compared to the 2006 General Plan's impact from consistency with applicable land use plans, the amended General Plan would have no greater impacts.

c) Would the Amended General Plan conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. Please refer to response 4(f). No habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan has been adopted within the Planning Area. The proposed General Plan amendments will not conflict with the provisions of any adopted habitat conservation plans as the City of Loma Linda is not located within the boundaries of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. The proposed amendments will limit development in areas adjacent to the MSHCP. Or other Habitat Conservation Plan. Compared to the 2006 General Plan's impact regarding consistency with applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans, the proposed amendments would not result in any greater impacts.

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR

The FEIR did not include mitigation measures related to land use and planning. In the absence of any mineral resource, the proposed amendments would have no mineral resource impact. Compared to the impacts identified in the FEIR and no change would occur.

New/Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new significant impacts associated with the General Plan Amendment. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to land use or planning.



CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. There are no new significant impacts on land use and planning that will be created with implementation of the General Plan Amendment because it is consistent with the 2006 General Plan as described in the FEIR.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicated that there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate that a new significant effect related to land use or planning may occur. Based on the information and analysis above, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact related to land use or planning requiring major revisions to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects Described in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the areas of land use and planning, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

10. Mineral Resources

The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, conservation of water, and reduction of waste would not result in a physical impact that would have an effect on mineral resources. Furthermore, the movement of certain provisions of the existing General Plan from the former Growth Management Element would not result in a physical change and would therefore not have an effect on mineral resources. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element deal with roadway performance standards and roadway connections within the Hillside Area. These amendments do not impact mineral resources as an increase in land disturbance would not occur. Similarly, amendments to the Open Space and Conservation Element would not affect mineral resources as the provisions associated with these amendments deal with preservation of open space and resource conservation and would not create additional land disturbance or place development in areas that may contain mineral resources.

The update of the City's Housing Element would comply with recently enacted state housing laws and would streamline the City's development review process for the construction of special needs housing such as low income, shelters, and student housing. The incorporation of this General Plan amendment would not create additional impacts to mineral resources and as no increase in land disturbance or placement of residences in areas that may contain mineral resources in the City at build-out would occur.



a) *Would the Amended General Plan result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?*

No Impact. As stated in the FEIR, no significant mineral resources are known to exist within the City of Loma Linda. No significant mineral resources are located within the planning area. No impact upon the availability of mineral resources would occur as a result of the General Plan Amendment. Due to the absence of any significant mineral resources in the City and the policies implemented under the amended General Plan, the General Plan amendment would not have a significant effect on mineral resources when compared to the impacts identified in the 2006 General Plan.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

No Impact. Please refer to response 10(a). No mineral resources within the City have been identified and therefore no impacts associated with the General Plan were identified.

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR

The FEIR did not include mitigation measures related to mineral resources. In the absence of any mineral resource, the proposed amendments would have no mineral resource impact. Compared to the impacts identified in the FEIR and no change would occur.

New/Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new significant impacts associated with the General Plan Amendment. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to mineral resources.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. There are no new impacts on mineral resources that will be created with implementation of the General Plan Amendment because there are no mineral resources within the City of Loma Linda.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates that there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate that a new significant effect on mineral resources may occur. Based on the information and analysis above,



there is no substantial new evidence that there will be a new, significant impact on mineral resources requiring major revisions to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects Described in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the area of mineral resources, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

11. Noise

Implementation of the proposed amendments that would have an effect on noise include the reduction in maximum allowable density in certain land use categories, restriction of development in certain parts of the City, and the modification of the traffic level of service standards in the City. The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, conservation of water, and reduction of solid waste would not result in a physical impact that would have an effect on noise.

a) *Would the Amended General Plan result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The FEIR identifies three major sources of noise in the City: transportation noise, daily life/community activities noise, and railroad noise. Major transportation noise sources in the City occur on Interstate 10, Redlands Boulevard, Barton Road, Anderson Street, Mountain View Avenue, and Mission Road, and from trains traveling along the Union Pacific Rail Road.

While the General Plan contains policies directed at minimizing the effect of construction noise, potentially significant impacts would still occur as development occurred under the General Plan. Implementation of the proposed amendments would reduce the amount of construction that would occur in the Hillside Preservation Area, the Hillside Conservation Area, and the Expanded Hillside Area due to the reduced densities and reduced sewer, water, street, and utility construction. The FEIR includes mitigation measures to ensure noise impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. Implementation of the General Plan policies directed at minimizing the effect of construction noise and the identified mitigation measures would reduce potential construction-related noise impacts and those impacts remain at a less than significant level with the implementation of the proposed amendments.

An increase in long-term traffic within the General Plan Area would result in the exposure of persons to excessive noise levels resulting from increased traffic volumes. A doubling of traffic volume is required for a three-decibel increase in traffic noise. Although the proposed amendments would restrict residential development densities within the South Hills area, the level of traffic within the City would increase over existing conditions as a result of the continued, although reduced, growth the City would experience when compared to the 2006 General Plan. While this increase in traffic over



the existing condition would occur, it would be less of an increase than that which could occur as a result of the 2006 General Plan build-out because residential development would be reduced. The FEIR states that General Plan-related traffic noise would increase up to 7.0 dBA. While the General Plan contains policies directed at minimizing the effect of traffic noise, potentially significant impacts would still result from development. The FEIR includes mitigation measures to further ensure traffic noise impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

The proposed amendments would limit development densities and would restrict use and/or construction/extension of roads in hillside areas. However, while less dense development would occur under the proposed amendments, the number of properties that would contain residential land uses would be reduced; therefore, the impact is reduced in extent or magnitude, yet remains the same as that identified in the FEIR. The proposed amendments would not result in development or generation of traffic in excess of that identified in the FEIR. Impacts associated with the exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of established standards are the same as or less than those analyzed in the FEIR.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan expose persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Implementation of the General Plan does not include any noise sources that would generate long-term vibrations that would be perceptible to humans at nearby sensitive receptors (e.g., new railroads). Short-term construction period pile driving and the resulting impacts associated with construction at individual project sites are addressed in the construction impacts discussion. Groundborne vibrations from passing trains are usually localized to areas within about 100 feet of the track. Implementation of the proposed amendments would result in a reduction in densities in hillside areas, thus less development would occur in these area than what was previously analyzed in the FEIR. Vibration/noise impacts resulting from project construction will be short-term. The operation of equipment on the site will require compliance with applicable City standards regarding the generation of ground vibration or groundborne noise. Adherence to these measures will reduce impacts associated with this issue to a less than significant level. The amended General Plan's impacts associated with the exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels would be the same as or less than those analyzed in the FEIR.

c) *Would the Amended General Plan result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The General Plan contains policies directed at minimizing the effect of traffic noise. Potentially significant impacts would still occur with implementation of the General Plan. The FEIR includes mitigation measures to ensure traffic noise impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. Under the proposed amendments, the construction of through roads in hillside areas would be restricted. Relative to the traffic noise impacts forecast in the FEIR, no adverse change or effect would occur as the construction of roadways would be reduced. Implementation of the General Plan policies and the mitigation measures cited in the FEIR would reduce potential traffic-related noise impacts to a less than significant level. No greater traffic noise impact would occur from implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.



The update of the City's Housing Element would comply with recently enacted state housing laws and would streamline the City's development review process for the construction of special needs housing such as low income, shelters, and student housing. The General Plan amendment would not create additional noise impacts as all development in the City would still be required to comply with the City's noise standards. Policies identified in the 2006 General Plan reduce the impacts of noise sources on sensitive land uses, and include mechanisms to ensure appropriate review and implementation of noise reduction requirements are implemented on new development. Therefore, the update of the City's Housing Element would not create new impacts associated with noise than that previously identified in the General Plan FEIR. Impacts remain at a less than significant level.

Implementation of the General Plan could generate operational noise from truck delivery, truck loading and unloading, and parking lot activities. New projects developed under the General Plan would be subject to the City's noise ordinance and the provisions of the General Plan including those implemented under the proposed amendments. Policies identified in the General Plan would reduce the impacts of stationary noise sources on sensitive land uses, and include mechanisms to ensure appropriate review and placement of noise reduction requirements on new development. Impacts from stationary noise sources are reduced to less than significant levels with adherence to the General Plan policies. No greater noise impact would occur from implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

d) *Would the Amended General Plan result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As previously identified, while the General Plan contains policies directed at minimizing the effect of construction noise, potentially significant impacts would still occur with implementation of the General Plan. The FEIR includes mitigation measures to further ensure construction noise impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. Implementation of the proposed amendments would reduce the amount of residential development that would occur in the hillside areas. While the amount of development permitted in the area would be reduced, significant increases in noise levels would still occur citywide. The amendments modify 7.8.1.1 (Implementing Policy (k)) to specifically identify the installation of temporary noise barriers (as needed) in noise mitigation plans prepared to reduce construction-related noise. Similar to the impact identified in the FEIR, adopted General Plan policies and mitigation measures would ensure this impact is reduced to a less than significant level. Compared to the FEIR, no greater noise impact would occur from implementation of the proposed amendments.

e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Amended General Plan expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact. The FEIR identified that the City is located approximately 1.5 miles south of the San Bernardino International Airport and approximately 8 miles west of Redlands Municipal Airport. Due to the Planning Area's distances from these airports, no significant airport noise impacts would occur in the City. Because the proposed amendments would not alter the City's boundaries and would not expose people residing or working in the project area beyond that analyzed in the FEIR, no impact would occur with respect to airport noise.



f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Amended General Plan expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. Please refer to responses 11(e) above. The Planning Area is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts associated with this issue will occur as no people residing or working in the project area would be in close proximity to a private airstrip.

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR

The FEIR included the following mitigation measures that are applicable to the proposed amendments:

4.11.5.1A. Standard construction activities shall be limited to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. No construction activities shall be allowed on weekends and holidays until after the buildings are enclosed without prior authorization of the City.

4.11.5.1B. To reduce daytime noise impacts due to construction, to the maximum feasible extent, the City shall ask all project applicants to develop a site-specific noise reduction program, subject to the City's approval, which includes the following measures:

- Signs shall be posted at the construction site that include permitted construction days and hours, a day and evening contact number for the job site, and a day and evening contact number for the City in the event of problems.
- An on-site complaint and enforcement manager shall be posted to respond to and track complaints.
- A pre-construction meeting shall be held with the job inspectors and the general contractor/on-site project manager to confirm that noise mitigation and practices are completed prior to the issuance of a building permit (including construction hours, neighborhood notification, posted signs, etc.).
- Equipment and trucks used for project construction shall utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).
- Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed-air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed-air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the where feasible, which could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures shall be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible.
- Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, or insulation barriers or other measures shall be incorporated to the extent feasible.

4.11.5.1C. If pile-driving occurs as part of the project, it shall be limited to between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, with no pile driving permitted between 12:30 and 1:30 p.m. No pile driving shall be allowed on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays.



4.11.5.1D. To further mitigate potential pile-driving and/or other extreme noise generating construction impacts, a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures shall be completed under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. This plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the City to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation is achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible and shall be implemented prior to any required pile-driving activities:

- Implement “quiet” pile-driving technology, where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions;
- Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around the entire construction site;
- Utilize noise control blankets on the building structure as it is erected to reduce noise emission from the site;
- Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings; and
- Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements.

4.11.5.1E. A process with the following components shall be established for responding to and tracking complaints pertaining to pile-driving construction noise:

- A procedure for notifying City staff and Police Department;
- A list of telephone numbers (during regular construction hours and off-hours);
- A plan for posting signs on-site pertaining to complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem;
- Designation of a construction complaint manager for the project; and
- Notification of neighbors within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of pile-driving activities.

4.11.5.2A. Buildings associated with noise sensitive uses and are directly exposed to traffic noise levels exceeding 57 dBA CNEL should be equipped with air conditioning or mechanical ventilation to allow the windows and doors to remain closed for prolonged periods of time, thus reducing noise levels below the level of significance (45 dBA CNEL).

4.11.5.2B. Buildings associated with noise-sensitive uses and are directly exposed to traffic noise levels exceeding 69 dBA CNEL should incorporate mitigation measures such as building façade upgrades.

4.11.5.2C. Outdoor active use areas, such as backyards and school playgrounds, would need to be protected by freestanding sound walls along the property boundaries where exposed to noise levels above 70 dBA.



New/Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new significant impacts associated with the proposed amendments because the proposed amendments would not result in the addition of any new noise sources to the City that were not previously analyzed in the FEIR. No new or refined mitigation measures are required.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. A comparison of the FEIR with the proposed amendments has determined that there are no significant environmental impacts related to noise resulting from implementation of the proposed amendments.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates that there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate that a new significant noise impact may occur. Based on the information and analysis above, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant noise impact requiring major revisions to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects Described in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the area of noise, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

12. Population and Housing

Implementation of the proposed amendments that relate to population and housing include the reduction in maximum allowable density in certain land use categories, the restriction of development in certain parts of the City, the provisions for student housing and employee housing to be developed on the university campus and on hospital sites consistent with the provisions of the updated Housing Element.

The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, conservation of water, and reduction of solid waste would not result in an impact that would have an effect on population and housing. Furthermore, the movement of certain provisions of the existing General Plan from the former Growth Management Element would not result in a physical change and would therefore not have an effect on population and housing. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element deal with roadway performance standards and roadway connections within the hillside area. These



amendments do not impact population and housing as a reduction in roadway connections would not cause population growth, divide a community, or displace residents within the City more than what was identified in the FEIR.

a) *Would the Amended General Plan induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The proposed amendments to the General Plan include changes to the Housing Element, residential land use densities, housing availability, hillside conservation, traffic mitigation, and open space conservation within the City. The Housing Element provides for increasing special needs housing stock to ensure adequate housing opportunities for all segments of the community. This goal is achieved through modifications of the City's development review process to facilitate development at higher densities within selected Land Use designations to accommodate special needs housing. While the housing amendment would create higher density development in selected areas, the overall result of all of the amendments would be a reduction in population compared to that predicted under the adopted General Plan. The 2006 General Plan anticipates a build-out population of 37,649. Build-out under the proposed amendments would result in a population of 31,709 persons, a decrease of 5,940 persons. The proposed amendments would not induce population growth beyond that already anticipated in the FEIR. As such the proposed amendments would not create any greater impacts than those identified in the FEIR.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact. The FEIR identified that approximately 17,261 residential units and 27,567 jobs would result from development within the City through the build-out of the General Plan.

The General Plan amendments would reduce the density and amount of development in the City in selected areas such as hillsides and would require a minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet with the exception of areas proposed specifically for higher density uses. The amendments also identify new land uses such as "Senior Housing" and add provisions to existing designations which allow ancillary residential uses within "Health Care" and "Institution" designations. Compared to the 2006 General Plan' impacts in this category, impacts from the proposed amendments would be the same. Whether housing is displaced during development is dependent on where new development occurs. Whether displacement occurs will be determined at the time that specific development applications are accepted at the City. Compared to the impact identified in the FEIR, impacts related to this issue would be the same. No greater impact related the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing, which would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere would occur from implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

c) *Would the Amended General Plan displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact. Please refer to response 12(b) above.



Mitigation Measures from the FEIR

The FEIR did not include mitigation measures related to population and housing.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed amendments; therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to population and housing.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. Because the proposed amendments would not change the analysis conclusions in the FEIR, there are no new significant population and housing impacts.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed amendments; therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to population and housing.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

The foregoing analysis and information indicates that the proposed amendments would not result in a substantial change in circumstances related to population and housing requiring major EIR revisions.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in FEIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate that a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no substantial new information that would result in greater significant effects related to population and housing.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects Described in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the areas of population and housing, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.



13. Public Services

The amendments to the General Plan incorporate Measure V into the General Plan; update the City's Housing Element; adds policies to the General Plan to reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduces greenhouse gas emissions in the City, conserve water, reduce solid waste; and move certain existing 2006 General Plan provisions from the former Growth Management element into the Public Services and Facilities Element.

Implementation of the proposed amendments that would have an effect on public services include the reduction in maximum allowable density in certain land use categories, the restriction of development in certain parts of the City, the provisions for student housing and employee housing to be developed on the university campus and on hospital sites consistent with the provisions of the updated Housing Element. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element deal with roadway performance standards and roadway connections within the hillside area. These amendments impact public services such as police and fire services as a reduction in roadway connections would reduce the potential for service calls within the City in comparison to that identified in the FEIR.

The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, conservation of water, and reduction of solid waste would not result in a physical impact that would have an effect on public services. Furthermore, the movement of certain provisions of the existing General Plan from the former Growth Management Element would not result in a physical change and would therefore not have an effect on public services.

The update of the City's Housing Element would comply with recently enacted state housing laws and would streamline the City's development review process for the construction of special needs housing such as low income, shelters, and student housing. The incorporation amendments in the General Plan would not create additional impacts to public services as no increase in dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out would occur nor are increased densities proposed in areas that would impact public services.

a) *Would the Amended General Plan result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

i) *Fire?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The Loma Linda Fire and Rescue Division of the Department of Public Safety provides fire protection services for the City. Currently the City has only one fire station. The FEIR includes a discussion stating that the City will require a new fire station in the future and that the additional development of the Hillside Conservation Area would create a greater fire hazard due the increase in human activity in this area. For reference this text is included below.

...The Hillside Conservation Area portion of the City is identified as needing a second station for several reasons: first, it lies within the City's identified Hazardous Fire Area; second, the extended drive times into the area from the headquarters station; and third, future development in the area, which may include over 2,000 dwelling units. The need to expand



services in the near future is also shown by the rapidly increasing rate of calls for service. In 2002, the Fire and Rescue Division experienced an approximate 14 percent increase in call volume over 2001 volumes. Additionally, approximately 25% of the calls received by the Department are simultaneous calls...

...The Hillside Conservation Area has a greater chance of being exposed to wildland fires. This area also has a greater density of vegetation, which has a very high oil content that creates fire danger. Providing fire service to the Hillside Conservation Area is currently difficult. The presence of structures and residents in the area will continue to be a hazard in the future...

The General Plan Amendment would reduce development in the Hillside Conservation Area. The reduction in population and developable area of the City based on the development restrictions of the General Plan Amendment and the preservation of the Hillside Conservation Area would reduce the number of service calls but the impact would remain similar related to fire services in comparison to what was analyzed in the FEIR. The level of demand for would be reduced; however, the level of impact would likely be similar to that identified in the FEIR.

The General Plan Amendment includes mandatory reductions in residential density and greater mitigation of traffic impacts. While updates to the Housing Element include methods of increasing special needs housing stock within the City a reduction of overall population is forecast because fewer residential units would be permitted, fewer residents would reside in the City at build-out. The reduction in residential densities would reduce the overall General Plan build-out population which in turn would incrementally reduce the potential for fire emergencies. The General Plan Amendment policies require that any impacted intersections operate at a level of Service C or better and no change in volume to capacity ratio is allowed. The requirement for the implementation of greater mitigation of traffic impacts will ensure that vehicular traffic congestion would be reduced. This in turn would limit the potential for vehicle accidents and road hazards and thus the need for emergency fire response. Policies from the FEIR that will ensure the reduction of any potential impacts associated with the provision of fire protection services to a less than significant level. Any impacts would be further reduced by the General Plan Amendment. Compliance with the General Plan policies and compliance with all relevant City requirements will reduce all impacts associated with the provision of fire protection services to the City to a less than significant level. Compared to the 2006 General Plan's impact on fire services, the General Plan amendments have fewer impacts.

ii) *Police?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Police services are provided to the City under contract with the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. According to the FEIR, increases in population and employment resulting from implementation of the General Plan would increase the need for police personnel, facilities, and/or support services. The FEIR identifies several policies that will reduce impacts associated with the provision of police services to a less than significant level. The proposed General Plan Amendment would reduce the projected impacts on police services by reducing the number of residences and residents and decreasing residential density throughout the City. This in turn would proportionally reduce the projected future population and the likely number of calls for service which would reduce the demand for law enforcement services. These Amendments to the General Plan would incrementally reduce the demand for police services and therefore, like the 2006 General Plan will not require any additional mitigation beyond the policies stated in the General



Plan and FEIR. Compared to the 2006 General Plan's impact on police services, the General Plan amendments have fewer impacts.

iii) *Schools?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The City is located within the boundaries of two school districts: Redlands Unified School District and the Colton Joint Unified School District. The implementation of the 2006 General Plan as approved would increase the number of dwelling units in the City and, therefore, the number of students attending local schools. The proposed General Plan Amendment would reduce the extent of the density of future residential development within selected areas of the City. Compared to the 2006 General Plan the General Plan Amendment would reduce the total projected population of the City by 5,940. Therefore a proportional reduction in the local student population would follow. No increase in local student population over what was analyzed in the FEIR would occur. Additionally, FEIR includes policies to reduce potential impacts to schools associated with implementation of the General Plan to a less than significant level. As previously stated the provisions of the General Plan Amendment would reduce the projected population of the City at General Plan build-out, and therefore will not require additional school services over and above that analyzed in the FEIR. Compared to the 2006 General Plan's impact on school services, the General Plan amendments have fewer impacts.

iv) *Parks?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Please refer to response 14(a). Implementation of the proposed project will not result in any increase in population over what is projected in the 2006 General Plan and therefore would not result in significant impacts to parks. Compared to the 2006 General Plan's impact on parks, the General Plan amendments have fewer impacts.

v) *Other Public Facilities?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The FEIR identified the provision of library services as a potentially significant impact associated with the build-out of the General Plan. Policies were identified in the General Plan to reduce these impacts to a level that is less than significant. As the General Plan Amendment would reduce the population of the City at build-out compared to the 2006 General Plan, impacts on other public facilities would be reduced compared to what is forecast in the FEIR.

Applicable Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR

There are no mitigation measures included in the FEIR regarding public services.

New/Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new significant impacts associated with the proposed General Plan Amendment. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for impacts associated with public services.



CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. Because the General Plan Amendment is consistent with and reduces impacts in comparison to the 2006 General Plan as described in the FEIR, there are no new significant impacts to public services that will be created.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicated that there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was approved that may indicate that a new significant impact to public services may occur. Based on the information and analysis above, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact related to land use or planning requiring major revisions to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects Described in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the area of public services, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

14. Recreation

Implementation of the proposed amendments that relate to recreation include the reduction in maximum allowable density in certain land use categories and the restriction of development in certain parts of the City.

The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, conservation of water, and reduction of solid waste would not result in a physical impact that would have an effect on recreation. Furthermore, the movement of certain provisions of the 2006 General Plan from the former Growth Management Element would not result in a physical change and would therefore not have an effect on recreation. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element deal with roadway performance standards citywide and roadway connections within the Hillside Area. These amendments do not impact recreation as a change in projected population (and therefore demand on recreational facilities) would not occur. Similarly, amendments to the Open Space and Conservation Element would not change as the provisions associated with these amendments deal with preservation of open space and resource conservation and would not alter the projected population.



The update of the City's Housing Element would comply with recently enacted State housing laws and would streamline the City's development review process for the construction of special needs housing such as low income, shelters, and student housing. The implementation of this General Plan amendment would not create additional impacts to recreation as no increase in the number of dwelling units or households anticipated in the City at build-out would occur.

a) *Would the Amended General Plan increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The City currently provides park maintenance services. No recreational programs are offered. As the City's population grows as projected, increases in the need and use of existing parkland and recreational facilities would occur. The City's General Plan identifies several policies addressing recreational services and maintenance of facilities within the *Public Services and Facilities Element*.

The General Plan policies anticipate and address the future needs for recreational programs. Methods of funding for these programs are also identified. Performance standards for maintenance of the parkland and facilities are established in the General Plan policies. As policies identify and cover recreational programs and maintenance of parklands and facilities, the impact to these recreational resources will be reduced to a less than significant level. Implementation of the proposed amendments would reduce the density, location, and amount of residential development previously analyzed in the FEIR, thereby reducing the City's anticipated build-out population. Relative to the impact on parks and recreational facilities previously forecast in the FEIR, no adverse change or effect would occur. Because the amendments would result in fewer residents, no greater recreational impact would occur from implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan provide recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The FEIR included an analysis of parkland and recreational facilities within the City based on the existing parkland acreage and population of 2002 (19,636 persons).

The FEIR identified that implementation of the 2006 General Plan is forecast to generate a population of 37,649 persons at General Plan build-out, an increase of 18,013 persons over year 2002. As identified in the FEIR, the various policies of the General Plan recognize the requirement to meet the City standard of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 population. The policies address the funding for new parkland in addition to the design and location. The policies also cover standards for facilities and provide that facilities appropriate to all ages and interests shall be developed within the City. As identified in the FEIR, implementation of the performance standards contained within the General Plan policies related to parks and recreational facilities would minimize the impact of growth and development on parkland.



The proposed amendments would not increase demand on local or regional park/recreation facilities beyond what was identified in the FEIR as the amendments would result in a reduction in density and amount of development previously analyzed. With a reduction in density and amount of development occurring through implementation of the proposed amendments, there is a corresponding reduction in total population growth and housing growth that was forecast to occur under implementation of the 2006 General Plan. Under the proposed amendments, the population of the City would result in a decrease of 5,940 persons in population forecast at build-out. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

Applicable Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR

The FEIR did not include mitigation measures related to recreation.

New/Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed amendments related to recreation; therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to recreation.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. A comparison of the FEIR with the proposed amendments has determined that there are no significant environmental impacts related to recreation resulting from implementation of the proposed amendments.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates that there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate that a new significant recreational impact may occur. Based on the information and analysis above, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant noise impact requiring major revisions to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects Described in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the area of recreation, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.



15. Transportation/Traffic

The principles set out in Measure V reduce maximum allowable density in certain land use categories, restrict residential development in certain parts of the City, and modify the traffic level of service standards in the City. Additionally, the General Plan Amendments add and/or modify policies that: place responsibility for mitigating the impacts of future growth on individual development projects; ensure development projects pay applicable traffic mitigation fees and appropriately participate in improvements for routes of regional significance; and develop roads in hillside areas to standards appropriate to the character and topography of the area. The modification of traffic level of service standards in addition to the other provisions of Measure V would modify the extent, location, density, and type of development that would be permitted in selected areas of the City. These provisions modify the type of development allowed under the amended General Plan and would change the volume and extent of traffic generated within the Planning Area.

The intent of the Housing Element update is to ensure adequate housing to meet the demand of all economic segments of the community. Although updates to the Housing Element include methods of increasing housing stock within the City for special needs housing, a reduction of overall population and therefore an overall reduction in population would result from the implementation of the General Plan amendments. Therefore, these amendments would not create any new impacts or cause any greater impacts than that originally identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR.

- a) ***Would the Amended General Plan cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As identified in the FEIR, the adopted General Plan would result in new traffic within the Planning Area. Although implementation of the identified General Plan policies and mitigation measures in the FEIR would reduce impacts, there are no guarantees that improvements would be made to freeway mainlines. For the 2006 General Plan, the FEIR stated that impacts associated with traffic along freeway mainline segments would remain significant and unavoidable.

An updated traffic impact analysis (Appendix A of this Addendum) which analyzes traffic conditions resulting from the proposed General Plan amendments identified a number of measures that, when implemented, would maintain acceptable service level standards along all affected roadway segments, which include freeway mainline segments. However, even if future development permitted under the amended General Plan provides required fair share contributions, the City cannot ensure that the improvements needed to maintain level of service standards in surrounding communities or at freeway interchanges would actually be completed. While there is no mechanism in place that would provide for developer contributions to improvements along freeway mainline segments and there is no guarantees that improvements would be made to freeway mainlines, the General Plan identify efforts the City will undertake with other Cities, SANBAG, and Caltrans to coordinate transportation facilities and facilities funding. The proposed amendment states the City will work with these agencies to mutually require developments that are not subject to a local Nexus Study to provide mitigation for impacts created to another jurisdiction's local roadway system, and to work to establish a feasible sub-regional system for the payment of fees to Caltrans to mitigate development-related impacts on freeways. Therefore, like the impact identified in the 2006 General Plan, impacts



associated with traffic along freeway mainline segments in the amended General Plan would remain significant and unavoidable.

The proposed amendments would limit the extent, location, density, and type of development that could occur within selected areas of the City. The proposed amendments that would be made to the General Plan would be to make the General Plan consistent with Measure V provisions. Measure V requires that, except where the current level of service is lower than level of service (LOS) C, all new development projects within the Planning Area must maintain LOS C throughout the City. In any location where the level of service is below LOS C at the time an application for a development project is submitted, mitigation measures shall be imposed on that development project to assure, at a minimum, that traffic is maintained at levels no worse than that existing at the time an application for development is filed. In any location where LOS F occurs at the time a development application is submitted, mitigation measures shall be imposed on that development project to assure, at a minimum, that the volume to capacity ratio is maintained at a volume to capacity ratio that is no worse than that existing at the time the application for development is submitted. Projects for which mitigation necessary to achieve the above stated objectives is infeasible shall not be approved unless and until feasible mitigation measures are identified and implemented.

While updates to the Housing Element would include methods of increasing special needs housing within the City, a reduction of overall number of dwelling units and population is forecast to occur. With the 2006 General Plan, it is projected that a population of 37,649 people would reside in the City at General Plan build-out conditions. It is anticipated that the proposed amendments to the General Plan would reduce the projected population to 31,709 people at General Plan build-out conditions. Since there would be less residential development and fewer residents within the City, it is reasonable to conclude that there would be less traffic generated. With less traffic generated, traffic volumes on the existing roadway network would be correspondingly reduced. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the proposed amendments would not cause an increase in traffic that would be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the existing street system.

The proposed amendments would limit traffic to emergency vehicles only on roads branching from San Timoteo and Reche Canyon Roads to north of the Hillside Preservation Area, Hillside Conservation Area, and Expanded Hillside Area. Additionally, within the Hillside Areas, roadway connections between existing roadways and San Timoteo and Reche Canyon Roads would be prohibited. Since there is no existing urban development within these hillside areas, the existing roadway network within this area is limited to utility access uses. Since the limitation of these roadways to emergency vehicles only would not significantly change the capacity at which the roadways are currently utilized for, the proposed amendments would not cause any new significant impacts. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The 2006 General Plan FEIR provides a discussion on the San Bernardino County Management Plan (CMP) as part of the analysis for traffic impacts. The CMP establishes a level of service (LOS) of E as the regional performance standard for roadways and highways (as analyzed at intersections, freeway interchanges, and along freeway mainlines), unless operations are at LOS F in the existing condition, in which case LOS F is the



performance standard. However, the CMP permits cities and the County to establish more stringent standards for roadway performance. The City of Loma Linda currently uses LOS D as the performance standard for the intersections it controls, as well as at freeway interchanges. Since the performance standard of LOS D for roads or highways within the City is higher than the performance standard of LOS E established by the CMP, analysis is based on the performance standard set by the City as it is the more stringent standard in effect.

As identified in the FEIR, under General Plan build-out conditions, 45 intersections would not meet the minimum level of service standard of D. However, the FEIR does identify policies that address the impacts of prospective development on traffic and transportation within the Planning Area. The transportation policies identified in the FEIR focus on needed traffic improvements within the City but do not specifically require individual development projects within the City to undertake such construction.

To ensure that individual development projects pay the fair-share cost associated with the construction of these traffic infrastructure features, mitigation measures were identified to reduce traffic impacts associated with development projects. The amendment includes Implementing Policy c (Section 6.10.1) which states, "...developments impacting the California/Redlands, Benton/Barton, and Anderson/Redlands intersections or requiring the realignment of Orange Street shall be conditioned to require the provision of needed physical improvements rather than the payment of fair share fees." Also, the amendment requires developments along Redlands Boulevard, Barton Road, Anderson Street or Mountain View Avenue to provide fair share contributions for traffic signal synchronization. Adherence to these identified policies and mitigation measures would reduce but not fully mitigate associated impacts to a less than significant level.

As previously stated, part of the proposed amendments is the implementation of Measure V provisions. As a requirement of Measure V, except where the current level of service is lower than level of service (LOS) C, all new development projects within the Planning Area would be required to maintain LOS C throughout the City. As identified in the General Plan FEIR, under existing General Plan build-out conditions, 45 intersections would not meet the City's minimum LOS standard of D.

The revised traffic impact analysis (Appendix A of the Addendum), which analyzed the General Plan build-out conditions with the incorporation of the proposed amendments, identified 38 intersections that would not meet the minimum LOS of D.¹ However, Measure V would require LOS to be maintained at LOS C instead of LOS D. With the implementation of the proposed amendments to the existing 2006 General Plan, 42 intersections will not meet the minimum LOS of C.² Because fewer intersections would operate at unsatisfactory LOS during General Plan build-out conditions with implementation of the proposed amendments (42 intersections under the LOS C standard) than under the existing 2006 General Plan (45 intersections under the LOS D standard), it can be reasonably inferred that there is less traffic generated and utilizing these intersections. However, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable until such time that the improvements can be made.

¹ Table Q – General Plan Build-Out Conditions Intersection Levels of Services with Recommended Network for LOS D Thresholds, *Traffic Impact Analysis City of Loma Linda General Plan*, LSA Associates, Inc., July 17, 2008 (Appendix A of this Addendum).

² Table R – General Plan Build-Out Conditions Intersection Levels of Service with Recommended Network for LOS C Thresholds, *Traffic Impact Analysis City of Loma Linda General Plan*, LSA Associates, Inc., July 17, 2008 (Appendix A of this Addendum).



Under the 2006 General Plan, it is projected that 37,649 people would reside in the City under build-out conditions. The proposed amendments to the General Plan would reduce the population from 37,649 people to 31,709 people. As stated previously, the number of intersections exceeding LOS C under the amended General Plan (42 intersections) would be less than the number of intersections exceeding the LOS standard under the 2006 General Plan (45 intersections) at build-out. This is the result of an overall reduction of residential development within the Planning Area. This reduction in population under the amended General Plan would result in reduced traffic volumes on the existing roadway network, as evidenced by reduced number of intersections exceeding the LOS standard.

As identified in the revised traffic study,¹ the number of through lanes required at some roadway segments is less than those recommended under the 2006 General Plan. This is because the amended General Plan proposes lower densities and less intense residential development in select areas of the City, especially in the hillside area. These changes result in lower trip generation forecast and volumes for build-out conditions, and would therefore require lesser capacity on the City's major thoroughfares. Since volumes on the roadway system would be reduced with the General Plan amendments due to a reduction of development that could occur within selected areas of the City, it is reasonable to conclude that the total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would also be reduced.

The proposed amendments would result in lower volumes on the City's circulation system and would require the funding and/or construction of the roadway improvements within the City before a development project is approved. However, for intersections and roadway segments outside the City's jurisdiction, there are no guarantees that improvements would be made prior when certain development projects are constructed. Therefore, impacts associated with traffic along freeway mainlines would remain significant and unavoidable under the amended General Plan, which is the same as what was identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR. Therefore, the inclusion of these proposed amendments to the General Plan would not result in any new impacts greater than those that have been identified and analyzed in the FEIR.

c) *Would the Amended General Plan result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location than results in substantial safety risks?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The City is located approximately 1.5 miles south of the San Bernardino International Airport and approximately 8 miles west of the Redlands Municipal Airport. The northern portion of the City is currently identified as being within the Airport Influence Area for the San Bernardino International Airport. Implementation of the 2006 General Plan would not result in a change in air traffic patterns and no significant impact is forecast to occur.

While updates to the Housing Element include methods of increasing special needs housing within the City, a reduction of overall population and density is forecast based on the implementation of all of the General Plan amendments. The greatest reduction in overall population would occur within the hillside area of the City as the proposed amendments would reduce and prohibit certain types and densities of development within the hillside area. Since there would no increases in traffic levels under the amended General Plan and because the proposed amendments change the density and

¹ Figure 17 – Existing General Plan Build-out Conditions Roadway Circulation Network and Figure 16 – Recommended General Plan Build-out Conditions Roadway Circulation Network For Level of Service C Thresholds, *Traffic Impact Analysis City of Loma Linda General Plan*, LSA Associates, Inc., July 17, 2008 (Appendix A of this Addendum).



not the location of future development within the City, the proposed amendments to the General Plan would not change the conclusions identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR associated with air traffic patterns. Therefore impacts associated with air traffic patterns under the amended General Plan would remain less than significant and no greater impact than that identified with the 2006 General Plan would occur.

d) *Would the Amended General Plan substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The existing road system serving the City is transitioning to a more urban character. All development within the Planning Area would be required to comply with appropriate design features required by the City. Part of the proposed amendments would be that the hillside areas in the City would be developed with the minimum number of roads possible, with clustering of development strongly encouraged to minimize the need for access roads. Roads in hillside area are to be designed and constructed to standards appropriate to the character and topography of the area, and provide for the dispersion of traffic so as to prohibit direct alignment of new roadways with Whittier Avenue, Bryn Mawr Avenue, or Wellesley Avenue. As part of the proposed amendments, existing roads through the Hillside Conservation Area, the Hillside Preservation Area, and the Expanded Hillside Area (Hillside Area) from Reche Canyon Road or San Timoteo Canyon Road to roads north of the Hillside Area would be restricted to use by emergency vehicles only. No existing or future roads would be connected to Reche Canyon Road or San Timoteo Canyon Road, or to each other by roads through the Hillside Area. The purpose of limitations on through roads is to minimize the adverse impacts of through traffic and environmental damage that is caused by or follows road construction. All roads in the hillside area should be designed to fit the hilly terrain by: following contour lines, using minimum pavement widths, relaxing curve and other standards, and lowering speed limits. Because fewer roads would be constructed in the hillside areas where there are typically more design hazards, there is less of a potential for an increase in hazards associated with roadway design features. Impacts associated with this issue would remain less than significant. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

e) *Would the Amended General Plan result in inadequate emergency access?*

No Impact. The existing paved roadways within the Planning Area currently provide adequate emergency access per the 2006 General Plan FEIR. Future development that would occur within the Planning Area would be designed and constructed to provide adequate emergency access to the property and on-site structures. Since all future development would have to provide adequate emergency access to and from the development, no impact associated with this issue would occur.

As all future development within the General Plan Area would still be required to provide adequate emergency access based on existing City standards, the proposed amendments would not result in any new impacts to inadequate emergency access. The proposed amendments would not change the conclusions identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR associated with emergency access adequacy. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.



f) *Would the Amended General Plan result in inadequate parking capacity?*

No Impact. Future development that would result from implementation of the proposed GPA would be required to provide parking in accordance with the City of Loma Linda parking standards as identified in Chapter 17.24 (Parking Regulations) of the City's Municipal Code. Adherence to these standards would ensure that sufficient parking will be provided at all times for all uses. The proposed amendments would not result in any new impacts to inadequate parking capacity as all development would still be required to adhere to Chapter 17.24 of the City's Municipal Code. The proposed amendments would not change the conclusions identified in the FEIR associated with parking capacity and impacts associated with this issue would remain less than significant. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

g) *Would the Amended General Plan conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

No Impact. The 2006 General Plan states that bicycling and walking are key elements of the City's planned circulation system and identified an extensive network of sidewalks to reduce reliance on private automobile use. The future development that would occur would be required to comply with adopted policies that support alternative transportation. Under the proposed General Plan amendments, all future development in the City would be required to adhere to alternative transportation policies contained within the General Plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

The proposed GPA generally details limitation on the extent, location, density, and type of development that could occur in selected areas of the City. Therefore, the proposed amendments do not result in any new impacts or conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs that support alternative transportation. All development within the Planning Area would still be required to adhere to policies identified in the City's Transportation and Circulation Element of the General Plan. In regards to the provisions, dedication, and/or maintenance of alternative transportation program, the proposed GPA would not change the conclusions identified in the FEIR associated with alternative transportation. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR

Impact 4.14.4.1 Increase Traffic Volumes.

4.14.4.1A. Individual development projects undertaken pursuant to the General Plan shall be required to provide roadway/intersection improvements or provide a fair share contribution toward such improvements as are needed to maintain applicable Level of Service standards on roadway links, intersections, and at freeway interchanges. For impacts on roadways and intersections outside of the City of Loma Linda, as well as for freeway interchanges, implementation of the requirement to provide improvements or fair share contributions shall be predicated on the commitment of the agency controlling the roadway, intersection, or interchange to commit to completing the improvement.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures

The revised traffic impact analysis (Appendix A of the Addendum) has identified refined improvement measures for intersections within the study area. These measures reflect improvements needed to



maintain satisfactory LOS at the identified intersections. The intersection improvement measures have been incorporated to highlight the differences between the old intersection improvements and the new intersection improvements. The following measures use strikethrough and double-underline to delineate changes between the old and new measures. The ~~strikethrough~~ notation indicates text that has been deleted while double-underline indicates text that has been added. Some measures have been removed as they no longer are needed or have been constructed since the approval of the General Plan.

- ~~Waterman Avenue/Hospitality Lane: Addition of a second southbound left turn lane.~~
- Waterman Avenue/Interstate 215 On-Ramp: Installation of a traffic signal and add a northbound left turn lane.
- Waterman Avenue/Redlands Boulevard: ~~Addition of two westbound right turn lanes, one eastbound through lane, one southbound left turn lane, and one northbound through lane. Modification of signal phasing to provide westbound right turn overlap phasing.~~ Add a northbound through lane, a southbound through lane, a southbound left-turn lane, an eastbound through lane, a westbound left-turn lane, and two westbound right-turn lanes.
- ~~Waterman Avenue/Washington Street: Addition of an eastbound left turn lane and a westbound through lane. Modification of signal phasing to provide southbound right turn overlap phasing.~~
- ~~University Avenue/Barton Road: Modification of signal phasing to provide southbound right turn overlap phasing.~~
- I-10 Westbound Ramps/Carnegie Drive/Hospitality Lane: Add a westbound right-turn lane. Provide overlap phasing for the southbound right-turn lane. Restripe the westbound shared through/right-turn lane to a through lane.
- University Avenue/Oakwood Drive/Barton Road: Add an eastbound left-turn lane and convert the southbound right-turn lane to a free right-turn lane.
- Evans Street/Van Leuven Street: Install a traffic signal. Add a northbound through lane, a northbound right-turn lane, two southbound left-turn lanes, a southbound through lane, and a westbound left-turn lane. Restripe the northbound shared through/right-turn lane to a through lane. Restripe the southbound shared through/left-turn lane to a through lane. Restripe the westbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a right-turn lane.
- Evans Street/Stewart Street: Convert from a two-way stop control to an all-way stop control. Add a northbound shared through/left-turn lane, a southbound shared through/left-turn lane, a westbound left-turn lane, and a westbound right-turn lane. Restripe the northbound and southbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lanes to shared through/right-turn lanes. Restripe the westbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a through lane.
- Evans Street/University Avenue: Convert from a two-way stop control to an all-way stop control. Add a southbound shared through/left-turn lane, an eastbound left-turn lane, and a westbound right-turn lane. Restripe the southbound and eastbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lanes to shared through/right-turn lanes. Restripe the westbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a shared through/left-turn lane.
- Evans Street/Barton Road: Install a traffic signal.
- ~~Campus Street/Stewart Street: Restriping of westbound approach as one dedicated left turn lane and one shared through/right turn lane.~~ Restripe the westbound shared through/left-turn lane to a left-turn lane.



- ~~Tippecanoe Avenue/Interstate 10 Westbound Ramps: Addition of a northbound left turn lane and conversion of southbound right turn lane to free right turn. These improvements cannot be accommodated without reconstruction of the interchange.~~
- ~~Anderson Street/Interstate 10 Eastbound Ramps: Addition of a dedicated eastbound right turn lane and a dedicated northbound right turn lane.~~
- Anderson Street/Academy Street: Change the signal phasing from permitted to protected for the north-south direction. This is proposed for safety and not for the improvement in levels of service.
- Anderson Street/Van Leuven Street: Install a traffic signal. Add a northbound left-turn lane, a northbound through lane, a southbound through lane, and an eastbound right-turn lane. Restripe the northbound shared through/left-turn lane to a through lane. Restripe the eastbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a left-turn lane.
- Hill Drive-Anderson Street/Anderson Street-Mound Street: Install a traffic signal.
- Anderson Street/Lawton Avenue: Install a traffic signal.
- Poplar Street/Redland Boulevard: Install a traffic signal. Add an eastbound right-turn lane. Restripe the eastbound shared through/right-turn lane to through lane.
- ~~Anderson Street/Redlands Boulevard: Addition of a southbound left turn lane. Add a dedicated eastbound right-turn lane.~~
- ~~Anderson Street/Barton Road: Addition of a northbound left turn lane and a southbound left turn lane. Add a northbound right-turn lane. Provide overlap phasing for the southbound right-turn lane. Restripe the northbound shared through/right-turn lane to a through lane.~~
- Poplar Street/Redlands Boulevard: Installation of a traffic signal. Add an eastbound right-turn lane. Restripe the eastbound shared through/right-turn lane to through lane.
- ~~Richardson Street/Redlands Boulevard: Installation of a traffic signal.~~
- ~~Benton Street/Prospect Avenue: Addition of one northbound left turn lane and one northbound right turn lane. Add a northbound left-turn lane and an eastbound right-turn lane. Restripe the northbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a shared through/right turn lane. Restripe the eastbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a shared through/left turn lane.~~
- Benton Street/Barton Road: Add a southbound left-turn lane.
- Benton Street/Lawton Avenue: Add an eastbound and westbound through lane.
- ~~Loma Linda Drive/Barton Road: Modification of signal phasing to provide northbound right turn overlap phasing. Provide overlap phasing for the northbound right-turn lane.~~
- ~~Mountain View Avenue/Interstate 10 Westbound Ramps: Addition of two northbound left turn lanes, a westbound left turn lane, and a southbound through lane. These improvements cannot be accommodated without reconstruction of the interchange. Add a northbound left-turn lane, a northbound through lane, a southbound through lane, and a westbound left-turn lane. Restripe the northbound shared through/left-turn lane to through lane. Restripe the westbound shared through/left-turn lane to a shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane.~~
- Mountain View Avenue/Interstate 10 Eastbound Ramps: Addition of a northbound through lane, a dedicated northbound free right-turn lane, a southbound left turn lane, and a dedicated eastbound right turn lane, and a dedicated eastbound right-turn lane. These improvements cannot be accommodated without reconstruction of the interchange.



- Mountain View Avenue/Business Center Drive: Add a southbound through lane and change north-south signal phasing from split phase to protected.
- Mountain View Avenue/Redlands Boulevard: Add a northbound through lane, Addition of a dedicated northbound right turn lane, and one eastbound left turn lane. a southbound through lane, an eastbound right-turn lane, a westbound left-turn lane, and a westbound right-turn lane. Restripe the northbound, eastbound, and westbound shared through/right-turn lanes to through lanes.
- Mountain View Avenue/Mission Road: Installation of a traffic signal, add a northbound left-turn lane, a southbound left-turn lane, a southbound through lane, and an eastbound left-turn lane.
- Mountain View Avenue/Lawton Avenue: Addition of a westbound right turn lane. Restripe the westbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a shared through/left-turn lane.
- Bryn Mawr Avenue/Redlands Avenue: Install a traffic signal. Add a westbound left-turn lane. Restripe the westbound shared through/left-turn lane to a through lane.
- California Street/Interstate 10 Westbound Ramps: Addition of a westbound left turn lane, a northbound left turn lane, and a dedicated southbound right turn lane. These improvements cannot be accommodated without reconstruction of the interchange. Add a northbound left-turn lane.
- California Street/Interstate 10 Eastbound Ramps: Addition of an eastbound left turn lane, an eastbound right turn lane, and a northbound right turn lane. Add a dedicated eastbound right-turn lane. Restripe the eastbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a shared left-turn/through lane.
- California Street/Redlands Boulevard: Addition of two northbound through lanes, one southbound through lane, a southbound left turn lane, an eastbound left turn lane, a westbound left turn lane, and a dedicated westbound right turn lane. Modification of signal phasing to provide westbound right turn overlap phasing. Add a northbound left-turn lane, a northbound through lane, a northbound right-turn lane, a southbound left-turn lane, a southbound through lane, a southbound right-turn lane with overlap phasing, an eastbound left-turn lane, and a westbound right-turn lane with overlap phasing. Restripe the northbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a through lane. Restripe the southbound and westbound shared through/right-turn lanes to through lanes.
- California Street/Orange Avenue: Install a traffic signal. Add a southbound through lane, a northbound left-turn lane, and a southbound left-turn lane. Restripe the northbound right-turn lane to a dedicated through/right-turn lane. Restripe the northbound through/left-turn lane to a through lane. Restripe the southbound left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a through/right-turn lane.
- ~~California Street/Mission Road: Installation of a traffic signal. Addition of a northbound through lane.~~
- ~~California Street/Barton Road: Addition of an eastbound left turn lane and a dedicated southbound right turn lane.~~
- ~~Pepper Avenue/Valley Boulevard: Addition of one southbound left turn lane. Restriping of northbound shared through/left turn lane as a through lane only. Modification of signal phasing to provide northbound and southbound protected left turns.~~
- ~~Pepper Avenue/Interstate 10 Westbound Ramps: Addition of one northbound through lane. Conversion of dedicated southbound right turn lane to a shared through/right turn lane. Provide overlap phasing to the southbound right-turn lane.~~



- Pepper Avenue/I-10 Eastbound Ramps: Add a southbound left-turn lane.
- Rancho Avenue/I-10 Westbound Ramps: Add a northbound left-turn lane, a southbound right turn lane, and restripe the southbound shared through/right-turn lane to a through lane.
- Rancho Avenue/I-10 Eastbound Ramps: Add a northbound right-turn lane, a southbound left turn lane, and restripe the northbound shared through/right-turn lane to a through lane.
- Mount Vernon Avenue/Valley Boulevard/Interstate 10 Westbound On-Ramp: Addition of one northbound left turn lane and one westbound left turn lane. Add a northbound bearleft- turn lane, a northbound hard left-turn lane, a southbound shared bear-right/hard-right turn lane, an eastbound left-turn lane, a westbound bear left-turn lane, and a shared westbound bearleft/ hard-left turn lane.
- I-10 Eastbound Ramps/Mission Road/Mount Vernon Avenue: Add an eastbound through lane, and a southbound left-turn lane. Provide overlap phasing for the southbound right-turn lane.
- ~~Sperry Drive/Interstate 10 Westbound Off Ramp: Addition of one northbound through lane, one southbound through lane, and one westbound left turn lane.~~
- ~~Mount Vernon Avenue/Interstate 215 Southbound Ramps: Restriping of one southbound through lane as a shared through/left lane.~~
- Washington Street/Interstate 215 Northbound On-Ramp: Prohibit eastbound left turn.
- Mount Vernon Avenue/ I-215 Southbound Ramps/Washington Street: Provide overlap phasing for the westbound right-turn lane.
- I-215 Northbound On-Ramp/Washington Street: Install a traffic signal. Add an eastbound left turn lane and a westbound right-turn lane. Restripe the westbound shared through/right-turn lane to a through lane.
- ~~Barton Road/Washington Street: Addition of a northbound free right turn lane.~~
- ~~Hunts Lane/Washington Street: Addition of an eastbound through lane and a southbound free right turn lane. Conversion of dedicated westbound right turn lane to shared through/right turn lane.~~
- ~~Waterman Avenue/5th Street: Addition of a westbound left turn lane and a northbound through lane.~~
- ~~Waterman Avenue/3rd Street: Addition of a dedicated northbound right turn lane.~~
- ~~Tippecanoe Avenue/Mill Street: Addition of a dedicated northbound right turn lane, a southbound left turn lane, an eastbound left turn lane, two dedicated eastbound right turn lanes, a westbound left turn lane, and a dedicated westbound right turn lane. Modification of signal phasing to provide eastbound right turn overlap phasing.~~
- ~~Tippecanoe Avenue/San Bernardino Avenue: Addition of a northbound left turn lane, a southbound left turn lane, an eastbound left turn lane, a westbound left turn lane, and a dedicated westbound right turn lane.~~
- ~~Alabama Street/San Bernardino Avenue: Addition of an eastbound left turn lane.~~
- ~~Alabama Street/Interstate 10 Westbound On-Ramp: Addition of one northbound left turn lane and one southbound through lane.~~
- Alabama Street/I-10 Eastbound Ramps: Add a northbound right-turn lane.



- Orange Avenue/Lugonia Avenue (SR-38): Add an eastbound right-turn lane.
- ~~Alabama Street/Redlands Boulevard: Addition of a westbound left turn lane, a dedicated westbound right turn lane, a southbound left turn lane, a dedicated southbound right turn lane, a northbound left turn lane, and a dedicated northbound right turn lane.~~
- ~~Boulder Avenue/5th Street: Addition of one eastbound through lane and one westbound through lane.~~
- ~~Orange Street/Redlands Boulevard: Addition of one eastbound left turn lane and one southbound left turn lane.~~
- University Street/Interstate 10 Westbound On-Ramp: Installation of a traffic signal. Restriping of southbound approach as one shared left turn/through/right turn lane and one dedicated right turn lane. Add a northbound left-turn lane and a southbound right-turn lane. Restripe the northbound shared through/left-turn lane to a through lane.
- University Street/Interstate 10 Eastbound Off-Ramp: Installation of a traffic signal.
- ~~Wabash Avenue/Lugonia Avenue: Installation of a traffic signal. Conversion of eastbound right turn lane to a shared through/right turn lane.~~
- Wabash Avenue/Citrus Avenue: Installation of a traffic signal.
- University Avenue/Oakwood Drive/Barton Road: Add an eastbound left-turn lane and convert the southbound right-turn lane to a free right-turn lane.
- Evans Street/Redlands Boulevard: Install a traffic signal. Add two northbound left-turn lanes, two eastbound through lanes, two westbound left-turn lanes, and a westbound through lane. Restripe the northbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a right-turn lane. Restripe the eastbound shared through/right-turn lane to a right-turn lane with overlap phasing. Restripe the westbound shared through/left-turn lane to a through lane.
- Evans Street/Van Leuven Street: Install a traffic signal. Add a northbound through lane, a northbound right-turn lane, two southbound left-turn lanes, a southbound through lane, and a westbound left-turn lane. Restripe the northbound shared through/right-turn lane to a through lane. Restripe the southbound shared through/left-turn lane to a through lane. Restripe the westbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a right-turn lane.
- Evans Street/Stewart Street: Install a traffic signal.
- Evans Street/University Avenue: Convert from a two-way stop control to an all-way stop control. Add a southbound shared through/left-turn lane, two eastbound left-turn lanes, and a westbound right-turn lane. Restripe the southbound and eastbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lanes to shared through/right-turn lanes. Restripe the westbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a shared through/left-turn lane.
- Evans Street/Barton Road: Install a traffic signal.
- Campus Street/Stewart Street: Restripe the westbound shared through/left-turn lane to a left-turn lane.
- Anderson Street/Academy Street: Change the signal phasing from permitted to protected for the north-south direction. This is proposed for safety and not for the improvement in levels of service.
- Anderson Street/Van Leuven Street: Install a traffic signal. Add a northbound left-turn lane, a northbound through lane, a southbound through lane, a southbound right-turn lane, and an eastbound right-turn lane. Restripe the northbound shared through/left-turn lane to a through



lane. Restripe the eastbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a left-turn lane. Restripe the southbound shared through/right-turn lane to a through lane.

- Hill Drive-Anderson Street/Anderson Street-Mound Street: Install a traffic signal.
- Anderson Street/Lawton Avenue: Install a traffic signal.
- Benton Street/Barton Road: Add a southbound left-turn lane.
- Benton Street/Lawton Avenue: Add an eastbound and westbound through lane.
- Mountain View Avenue/Business Center Drive: Add a southbound through lane and change north-south signal phasing from split phase to protected.
- Mountain View Avenue/Redlands Boulevard: Add a northbound through lane, a northbound right-turn lane, a southbound through lane, a southbound right-turn lane, an eastbound left-turn lane, an eastbound through lane, an eastbound right-turn lane, a westbound left-turn lane, a westbound through lane, and a westbound right-turn lane with overlap phasing. Restripe the northbound, eastbound, and westbound shared through/right-turn lanes to through lanes.
- Mountain View Avenue/Mission Road: Install a traffic signal, add a northbound left-turn lane, a southbound left-turn lane, a southbound through lane, and an eastbound left-turn lane.
- Mountain View Avenue/Prospect Avenue: Add an eastbound left-turn lane.
- Mountain View Avenue/Lawton Avenue: Add a westbound right-turn lane and restripe the westbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a shared through/left-turn lane.
- Bryn Mawr Avenue/Redlands Avenue: Install a traffic signal. Add a westbound left-turn lane. Restripe the westbound shared through/left-turn lane to a through lane.
- Bryn Mawr Avenue/Beaumont Avenue: Add an eastbound and westbound through lane.
- California Street/Redlands Boulevard: Add a northbound left-turn lane, a northbound through lane, a northbound right-turn lane, a southbound left-turn lane, a southbound through lane, a southbound right-turn lane with overlap phasing, an eastbound left-turn lane, and a westbound right-turn lane with overlap phasing. Restripe the northbound shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a through lane. Restripe the southbound and westbound shared through/right-turn lanes to through lanes.
- California Street/Orange Avenue: Install a traffic signal. Add a southbound through lane, a northbound left-turn lane, and a southbound left-turn lane. Restripe the northbound right-turn lane to a dedicated through/right-turn lane. Restripe the northbound through/left-turn lane to a through lane. Restripe the southbound left-turn/through/right-turn lane to a through/right-turn lane.

Mitigation Measure 4.14.4.1A still requires all development projects within the City to provide roadway/intersection improvements or a fair-share contribution toward those improvements. Since **Mitigation Measure 4.14.4.1A** would accomplish the same goal as the mitigation measure identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR, there are no new significant impacts associated with the proposed project.



CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. Because the GPA is consistent with the project as described in the FEIR, there are no new significant impacts on transportation.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicated that there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.

The GPA would improve LOS within the Planning Area as less development would be allowed. This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was approved that may indicate that a new significant impact on transportation may occur. Based on the information and analysis above, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact on transportation requiring major revisions to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects Described in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the area of transportation/traffic, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.

16. Utilities and Service Systems

The principles set out in Measure V reduce maximum allowable density in certain land use categories, restrict development in certain parts of the City, and modify the traffic level of service standards in the City. The modification of traffic level of service standards does not impact wastewater treatment requirements, the construction of new water or wastewater facilities, new stormwater drainage facilities, water supplies, generation of wastewater, or the generation of solid waste. The other provisions of Measure V would modify the extent, location, density, and type of development that would be permitted in selected areas of the City. These provisions modify the type of development allowed under the amended General Plan. Therefore, these provisions have been discussed on a programmatic level in each of the following utility and service systems checklist questions.

The intent of the Housing Element Update is to ensure adequate housing to meet the demand of all economic segments of the community. Although updates to the Housing Element include methods of increasing housing stock within the City for special needs housing, a reduction of overall population and therefore an overall reduction in development is anticipated based on the implementation of all of the General Plan amendments. Therefore, the incorporation of this General Plan amendment would not create additional impacts to wastewater treatment requirements, the construction of new water or wastewater facilities, new stormwater drainage facilities, water supplies, generation of wastewater, or



the generation of solid waste. Amendments associated with the Transportation and Circulation Element do not apply to the provision of utility infrastructure or services. Therefore, these amendments would not create any new impacts or cause any greater impacts than that originally identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR. Amendments associated with water supply and solid waste are discussed on a programmatic level in each of the following checklist questions, as these apply to utilities and service systems impacts.

a) *Would the Amended General Plan exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As identified in the FEIR, wastewater facilities within the City are operated and maintained by the City's Department of Public Works, Utility Division. By law, local governments and water districts are responsible for complying with Federal regulations, both for wastewater plant operation and the collection systems (e.g., sanitary sewers) that convey wastewater to the wastewater treatment facility. Proper operation and maintenance is critical for sewage collection and treatment as impacts from these processes can degrade water resources and effect human health. For these reasons, publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) receive Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) to ensure that such wastewater facilities operate in compliance with water quality regulations set forth by the State. WDRs establish effluent limits on the kinds and quantities of pollutants that POTWs can discharge. These permits also contain pollutant monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements.

Each POTW that intends to discharge into the nation's waters must obtain a WDR prior to initiating its discharge. Prior to the issuance of building permits, future development projects would be required to meet the City's requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provision of adequate wastewater facilities. The 2006 General Plan FEIR identifies that future development within the Planning Area would comply with regulations that implement waste discharge prohibitions and meet water quality objectives administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the City, and the County of San Bernardino. Therefore, impacts related to this issue were identified as being less than significant.

The amendments would modify the extent, location, density, and type of development that would be permitted in selected areas of the City. All new development within the City would be subject to the same wastewater treatment requirements and standards as development under the adopted 2006 General Plan. Additionally, all development within the Planning Area under the amended General Plan would still be required to adhere to policies identified in the Public Services and Utilities Element of the 2006 General Plan. Impacts would remain less than significant as identified in the FEIR. The proposed amendments would not change the conclusions identified in the FEIR associated with wastewater treatment requirements. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

b) *Would the Amended General Plan require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR, the City's sewer service area consists of approximately 10.6 square miles, which included the City and



sphere of influence areas. Undeveloped areas accounted for nearly 48 percent of the Planning Area. The FEIR identified policies establishing standards for future wastewater service and recognized existing needed improvements. Implementation of these policies and the continual updating of the Master Plan of Sewer Facilities would ensure that adequate wastewater facilities are in place to accommodate existing and future development. Therefore, the effects associated with the future development forecast in the 2006 General Plan were determined to be less than significant.

The proposed amendments would not change the conclusions identified in the 2006 General Plan associated with the construction or expansion of new or existing water and wastewater treatment facilities. While updates to the Housing Element would include methods of increasing housing stock available for different income levels within the City, a reduction of overall population is forecast based on the implementation of all of the General Plan amendments. Under the 2006 General Plan, it is projected that a population of 37,649 would reside in the City at General Plan build-out. The proposed amendments to the General Plan would reduce anticipated population to 31,709 people in the City at General Plan build-out (2030). Because there would be dwelling units and 5,904 fewer residents within the Planning Area under the amended General Plan, there would be less of a demand on water resources and a reduction in the amount of wastewater generated. Compared to the 2006 General Plan, a reduction in the amount of water and wastewater needing treatment would occur under the amended General Plan. The level of significance associated with this issue would remain less than significant. Because policies would still apply to any new development that would occur under the amended General Plan, no new impacts would be associated with the proposed amendments. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR.

c) *Would the Amended General Plan require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Implementation of the 2006 General Plan would result in an increase in development within the Planning Area. An increase in development would result in an increase in the amount of impermeable surfaces and, therefore, an increase in surface runoff. Future development that would occur in the Planning Area would be required to adhere to standards pertaining to the construction or expansion of stormwater facilities and infrastructure. Adherence to these standards and requirements would reduce impacts associated with this issue to a less than significant level.

Since all development within the Planning Area would still be required to adhere to City policies pertaining to the provision of adequate stormwater facilities, the proposed amendments would not result in any new impacts or conflict with the construction or expansion of new and existing stormwater drainage facilities. While updates to the Housing Element include methods of increasing special needs housing within the City a reduction of overall population (5,940 fewer residents) is forecast based on a reduction in overall residential development permitted under the amendments. Therefore, with implementation of the proposed amendments, the amount of development that could occur within the Planning Area would be reduced from what was originally envisioned in the 2006 General Plan. This would result in less impervious surfaces and would ultimately reduce the demand on the existing and proposed stormwater drainage facilities within the Planning Area. The proposed amendments would not change the conclusions identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR associated with stormwater facilities. No greater impact associated with stormwater facilities would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.



d) *Would the Amended General Plan have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. The City produces enough water to meet the projected average daily demand at 2006 General Plan build-out, but not enough to supply peak daily demand. To meet the future demand for water, new wells would need to be constructed. Although the FEIR recognizes the water supply issues and encourages the use of water conservation measures, the policies do not ensure the provision of water supplies adequate to support peak demand development that may occur as a result of 2006 General Plan implementation. Despite adherence to General Policies, and the modification of Implementing Policy 9.6.2(e), which states the City will not, "...approve projects for which assured water supply is not available," , the implementation of the General Plan will have a significant and unavoidable effect on water supply.

While updates to the Housing Element include methods of increasing special need housing within the City a reduction of overall population is forecast based on the implementation of all of the General Plan amendments. Under the 2006 General Plan, it is projected that at build-out, a population of 37,649 people would reside within the City. With the incorporation of the proposed amendments to the General Plan, total anticipated build-out population would be reduced to 31,709 residents. As there would be less people to demand water services through a reduction of people within the City would ultimately result in a reduction of the amount of water that would be demanded. A component of the proposed amendments also includes provisions that prohibit any development that would fail to meet State or Federal water quality standards; would result in an increase in residential water rates; or that would result in restriction of water usage; or for which assured water supply is not available. Despite the implementation of these water conservation provisions, there would be no mechanism in place that would ensure that water would be available after future development is built despite the provision for no increase in residential water rates or a restriction of water usage. Although less residential development would occur with implementation of the proposed amendments which would lessen the amount of water that would be required, as there is no guarantee of water being available to meet future water demand a significant and unavoidable impact would still remain. Therefore, the proposed amendments would not result in any new impacts that were not already disclosed and analyzed in the 2006 General Plan FEIR.

e) *Would the Amended General Plan result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider who serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Please refer to response 16(b).

f) *Would the Amended General Plan be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. Solid waste in the City is collected and transported to various solid waste facilities for processing. "Green waste" is transported to Inland



Empire Composting, where the green waste is grinded and chipped and eventually used as ground cover, mulch, or soil additives. Recyclable materials such as aluminum, paper, cardboard, glass, and plastics are collected in the City and transported to a transfer station in Moreno Valley. Solid waste not diverted to recycling or composting facilities is transported to San Timoteo Solid Waste Disposal Site in Redlands.

The County of San Bernardino Solid Waste Division has stated that, based on current permitted disposal rates and capacity, this landfill will reach capacity by May 2016. However, adequate room at the San Timoteo landfill is available for further expansion. Development of land uses identified in the adopted General Plan has been planned and the solid waste disposal needs of such development have been incorporated into local and regional waste management planning. Thus, the 2006 General Plan FEIR identified that long-term planning and adherence to existing local, State, and Federal solid waste requirements would reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a less than significant level.

While updates to the Housing Element include methods of increasing special needs housing within the City, a decrease in overall population would result from implementation of the proposed amendments. This reduction in development would reduce the amount of solid waste generated. Additionally, policies included in the Public Services and Facilities Element identify measures to further decrease the total amount of solid waste delivered to landfills. In addition, the amendments would add "zero waste" policies to the Public Services and Facilities Element, which would further reduce the amount of solid waste generated within the Planning Area. Since all development under the amended General Plan would still be required to adhere to existing local, State, and Federal solid waste requirements, the proposed amendments would not change the impacts identified in the 2006 General Plan associated with the landfill capacity. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.

g) *Would the Amended General Plan comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

No Impact. Future development associated with 2006 General Plan build-out conditions is required to comply with applicable elements of AB 1327, Chapter 18 (California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991) and other applicable local, State, and Federal solid waste disposal standards, compliance with these requirements ensures that no impacts associated with this issue would occur.

The amendments to General Plan would not result in any new solid waste impacts or conflict with compliance of Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. All future development within the Planning Area would still be required to adhere to policies identified in the City's Public Services and Utilities Element of the adopted General Plan including additional measures to further reduce the amount of solid waste delivered to landfills. Because the additional policies would further reduce the volume of solid waste, and because a reduced population would generate a reduced amount of solid waste, the level of impact associated with this issue is reduced, but would remain the same as the impacts identified in the 2006 General Plan FEIR associated with solid waste reduction and disposal. Therefore, no greater impact would occur from the implementation of the proposed amendments than that identified in the FEIR.



Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR

The 2006 General Plan FEIR did not include mitigation measures related to utilities and service systems.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to utilities and service systems would be required by implementation of the proposed amendments.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. Because the proposed amendments are consistent with the General Plan as described in the FEIR, there are no new significant impacts to utilities and service systems that will be created.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicated that there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate that a new significant impact on utilities or service systems may occur. Based on the information and analysis above, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact on utilities and service systems requiring major revisions to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects Described in the Final EIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the areas of utilities and service systems, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.



17. Mandatory Findings of Significance

- a) ***Does the Amended General Plan have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As previously stated, the Planning Area provides potential habitat for endangered and threatened species. With the implementation of **Mitigation Measure 4.4.4.1A** through **Mitigation Measure 4.4.4.3C**, impacts to any biological resources within the Planning Area would still remain significant and unavoidable. While previous earthmoving activities within the City have not revealed any cultural resources, a potential for the discovery of such resources would exist during future grading activities that would take place as a part of the implementation of the General Plan Amendments. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 4.5.5.2A** through **Mitigation Measure 4.5.5.2C** related to the discovery, recovery, and/or recordation of cultural resources and/or human remains during construction activities would ensure a less than significant impact to cultural resources. Because the proposed amendments to the General Plan would reduce the potential for development within the City including development within the Hillside Conservation Area, impacts to biological resources overall would be reduced, no new significant biological resource impacts will be created.

- b) ***Does the Amended General Plan have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when reviewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future project.)***

New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR. Because the proposed amendments would reduce the density and amount of development previously analyzed, such impacts would be proportionally reduced. The FEIR identified significant cumulative impacts related to air quality, biological resources, water resources, land use, public services and utilities, and transportation and traffic. However, like the significant impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, water resources, and transportation and circulation identified in the FEIR, the cumulative effect of development per the provisions of the proposed amendments, would remain significant and unavoidable. This is not a change over what was identified in the General Plan FEIR.

- c) ***Does the Amended General Plan have environmental effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

No Changes in the Project or in the Circumstances and No New Information that would Require the Preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. As detailed in the preceding responses, implementation of the proposed amendments would not result, either directly or indirectly, in substantially adverse effects to human beings. Less than significant impacts related to this issue would occur.



Mitigation Measures from the FEIR

The FEIR includes mitigation measures to reduce impacts related to the implementation of the General Plan. These mitigation measures have been included within the appropriate section of this EIR addendum.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures

There are no new potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed amendments; therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to biological resources, cultural resources, aesthetics, air quality, and hydrology and water quality.

CEQA Determinations

Major EIR Revisions Not Required.

Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no evidence that major changes to the FEIR are required. Because the proposed amendments would not change the analysis conclusions in the FEIR, there are no new significant impacts.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.

The foregoing analysis and information indicates that the proposed amendments would not result in a substantial change in circumstances requiring major EIR revisions.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in FEIR.

This Addendum has analyzed all available relevant information to determine whether there is new information that was not available at the time the FEIR was certified that may indicate that a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the foregoing analysis and information, there is no substantial new information that would result in greater significant effects related to biological resources, cultural resources, aesthetics, air quality, traffic and circulation, hydrology and water quality.

New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the FEIR.

Since the certification of the FEIR for the 2006 General Plan, there has been no new information showing that mitigation measures or alternatives once considered infeasible are now feasible, or showing that there are feasible new mitigation measures or alternatives substantially different from those analyzed in the FEIR that the City declines to adopt. There are therefore no new or substantially different mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the amended General Plan's impacts in the area of mandatory findings of significance, and a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not necessary.



4.0 REFERENCES AND PREPARERS

4.1 REFERENCES

City of Loma Linda General Plan, City of Loma Linda, adopted June 2006.

City of Loma Linda General Plan Update Draft Program Environmental Impact Report, City of Loma Linda, March 22, 2004.

City of Loma Linda General Plan Update Final Program Environmental Impact Report, City of Loma Linda, June 21, 2004.

Traffic Impact Analysis City of Loma Linda General Plan, LSA Associates, Inc., July 17, 2008.

4.2 PREPARERS

- LSA Associates, Inc., Environmental Planning Consultants
 - Lynn Calvert-Hayes, Principal in Charge
 - Ray Hussey, Associate
 - Carl Winter, Associate
 - Kelly Czechowski, Environmental Planner
 - Sean Reilly, Planner
 - David Atwater, Assistant Environmental Planner
 - Steven Dong, Technical Editor
 - Nancy Hasegawa, Word Processor
 - Sheryl Woodard, Document Production



APPENDIX A: TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

(Available from the City in electronic format)