1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2012071061) for the La Entrada Specific Plan (proposed project) was prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) on behalf of the City of Coachella (City) to: (1) identify the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project; (2) discuss alternatives to the proposed project; and (3) propose mitigation measures that will avoid, offset, or minimize significant environmental impacts of the project. This EIR was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act[1] (CEQA) and Sections 15120 through 15131 and 15161 of the *CEQA Guidelines*,[2] both of which regulate the preparation of EIRs. Based on the potential impacts of the proposed project, including cumulative impacts, the City determined that an EIR should be prepared to analyze potential impacts of the proposed project with respect to the following environmental issues:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population, Housing, and Employment
- Public Services and Utilities
- Recreation Resources

[1] California Environmental Quality Act, as of January 1, 2011, Sections 21000–21178, Public Resources Code (PRC), State of California.

[2] *CEQA Guidelines*, as amended January 1, 2008, Sections 15120 through 15131 and 15161, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Chapter 3, State of California.

- Traffic and Circulation
- Water Supply

These environmental issues are individually addressed in detail later in Chapter 4.0, Existing Environmental Setting, Environmental Analysis Impacts, and Mitigation Measures. It is important to note that, although the proposed project includes a Specific Plan, it does not have a site plan showing actual building locations, so the EIR addresses the potential project effects at a programmatic rather than at a project or construction level.

The project site is located in the City and in unincorporated Riverside County (County) between Interstate 10 (I-10), the Coachella Branch of the All-American Canal (Coachella Canal), and the Little San Bernardino Mountains. Refer to Figure 3.1 for a regional project location map and to Figure 3.2 for a project site location map.

1.2 PROPOSED PROJECT

The project proposes the development of a master-planned residential community that would consist of a mix of the following land uses:

- Approximately 7,800 residential units on approximately 982 acres (ac)
- 135 ac of mixed uses (high-density residential, commercial, public facilities, and other non-residential uses
- Educational uses (three elementary schools and one middle school) on approximately 69.8 ac
- 344.7 ac of parks/recreation uses
- Multipurpose trails
- 112.2 ac of circulation uses
- 556.9 ac of open space

The proposed project also includes extensions of Avenues 50 and 52 into the project site, with Avenue 50 connecting to a future proposed interchange at I-10. CEQA clearance for that future interchange project is not part of the environmental evaluation in this EIR. Separate environmental clearance will be required for that future interchange project. However, the areas on the project site impacted by the extensions of Avenues 50 and 52 from the proposed interchange are analyzed in this EIR.

The proposed project would require an amendment to the City's General Plan to allow for the proposed land uses (e.g., Very Low Density Residential, High Density Residential, Schools, and Mixed Use), to proceed with annexation of the 588 ac part of the project site in unincorporated Riverside County, and to change the land use designations on that part of the site from agricultural to allow for open space, parks/recreation, low-density residential, school, and medium-density residential uses.

A Specific Plan Amendment would be required to adopt the La Entrada Specific Plan, which would replace the previously adopted McNaughton Specific Plan for the project site. The proposed Specific Plan Amendment would expand the boundary for the Specific Plan from the existing 1,612 ac covered by the McNaughton Specific Plan to include the 588 ac parcel on the southeast part of the site as part of the La Entrada Specific Plan. The Specific Plan Amendment would adopt the La Entrada Specific Plan as the guiding land use plan for the entire 2,200 ac project site.

The proposed project would also change the current zoning designations on the site to include mixed uses, neighborhood commercial, and educational uses, with the overall zoning designation being "Specific Plan." In addition, the prezoning for the 588 ac parcel in the unincorporated County would be changed to include educational uses. The existing Specific Plan Zoning District, which includes the previously approved McNaughton Specific Plan, would be revised and expanded to include the entire 2,200 ac La Entrada Specific Plan project site.

Subdivision maps for each phase of the five development phases would be submitted to the City to ensure appropriate provisions have been made to support the land uses within each subdivision.

Approval by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) will be required to incorporate the 588 ac portion of the project site, which is currently in unincorporated Riverside County adjacent to the City of Coachella.

1.3 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The EIR process for the proposed project has involved input from the public and affected agencies at several steps. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued on July 17, 2012, to notify State, regional, and local agencies, interested parties, and members of the general public that an EIR was going to be prepared for the proposed project. The NOP was circulated for 30 days as required by CEQA. The distribution list, Notice of Public Scoping Meeting, and response letters are included in Appendix A, Notice of Completion, Notice of Preparation, and Comment Letters. At of the close of the 30-day NOP public review period, 13 responses to the NOP had been received from public agencies and private organizations.

On August 28, 2012, the City held a public scoping meeting to solicit input on concerns the public had about the project and issues that should be addressed in the EIR. Refer to Chapter 2.0, Introduction, for a summary of environmental issues and concerns raised at the scoping meeting.

This Draft EIR will be circulated for a minimum 45-day public review period, at which time agencies and the public can comment on the technical studies and the analyses of the environmental issues in the EIR. All written comments on the Draft EIR will receive written responses, and the City will carefully evaluate all available information on the project, including comments received on the Draft EIR, prior to taking action.

1.4 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Sections 4.1 through 4.17 in the EIR identify the following significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project:

- **Aesthetics:** Change in visual character of the site
- **Agriculture:** Conversion of Prime and Unique Farmland to non-agricultural uses
- **Air Quality:**
    - The proposed project would exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) emissions thresholds during both construction and operation;
    - During construction, the proposed project would exceed the SCAQMD emissions thresholds for reactive organic gases (ROGs), nitrogen oxides (NO_X), and carbon monoxide (CO) for Phases 1 through 5
    - During operation, the proposed project would exceed the SCAQMD emissions thresholds for ROGs, NO_X, CO, and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$)
    - Significant contribution to cumulative impacts during project construction and operation
- **Geology:** Impacts from strong seismic ground shaking from on-site faults
- **Global Climate Change:** The proposed project would result in significant unavoidable greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and global climate change (GCC) impacts, both project level and cumulative contributions
- **Public Services and Utilities:** Interim impacts to police and fire services as well as adverse impacts to library services, solid waste, and wastewater treatment
- **Traffic:**
    - Impacts resulting from construction of the off-site intersection improvements
    - Impacts associated with the existing plus project intersection impacts
    - Impacts associated with the existing plus project freeway segments and ramp merge/diverge locations
    - Project direct impacts with Phases 1 through 4 (without the Avenue 50 Interchange) to one State Route 86 (SR-86)/southbound Dillon Road on-ramp
    - Project direct impacts (with the Avenue 50 interchange) to three I-10 mainline lanes and four I-10 ramp merge/diverge locations
    - For Cumulative Year 2035 impacts to 44 intersections
    - For Cumulative Year 2035 impacts to 21 I-10 freeway mainline lanes, 1 SR-86 mainline lane, 20 I-10 freeway ramp merge/diverge locations, and 2 SR-86 freeway ramp merge/diverge locations

1.5 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

In compliance with Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, an EIR must describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the project objectives, and would avoid or substantially lessen significant effects of the project. The EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative; rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives. This EIR evaluates two No Project Alternatives

to allow decision-makers and the public to compare the effect of approving the project to the effect of not approving the project. In addition, this EIR evaluates a Retirement Community Alternative and a No Annexation Alternative. A more detailed description of these alternatives to the proposed project and analyses of the potential environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of those alternatives are provided in Chapter 5.0, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.

1.5.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Consistent with Section 15126.6(e) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the No Project Alternative is the existing condition of the project site at the time the NOP was published, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project were not approved. The setting of the site at the time of the NOP is described throughout Chapter 4.0 in this EIR with respect to individual environmental issues and the baseline of the impact assessment for the proposed project. This alternative will evaluate circumstances under which the proposed project does not proceed. It assumes the adopted General Plan land uses and the approved McNaughton Specific Plan would continue to be the regulating land use documents for the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative assumes the project site could be developed with up to 8,000 low-, medium-, and high-density residential units, two 18-hole golf courses, and a mix of commercial, hotel/hospitality, recreation, and open space uses.

1.5.2 Alternative 2: No Project/No Development

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the project site would remain vacant and undeveloped and would not include the development of the site with the land uses in either the proposed La Entrada Specific Plan or the adopted McNaughton Specific Plan. This alternative allows for a comparison of the effects of the proposed La Entrada Specific Plan with the effects of doing nothing on the project site.

1.5.3 Alternative 2: Reduced Project – Retirement Community Alternative

Alternative 2 would implement the proposed La Entrada Specific Plan with the same land uses but with Senior Housing replacing the single-family residential units in that Specific Plan. Alternative 2 would include approximately the same land uses and layout as the proposed project, but with Senior Housing replacing the single-family housing units included in the proposed La Entrada Specific Plan. However, the population on the site under Alternative 2 would be less, and the need for schools would be reduced.

1.5.4 Alternative 3: Reduced Project – No Annexation Alternative

Alternative 3 is a Reduced Project Alternative that would implement the proposed La Entrada Specific Plan, excluding the 588 ac area that would be annexed from unincorporated Riverside County into the City. This Alternative would reduce the number of residential units on the site from the 7,800 units in the proposed Specific Plan to 6,504 units, and would eliminate approximately 26 ac of parks, 207 ac of open space, and one 16 ac school site. Alternative 3 assumes that some drainage channel improvements would still be required in the unincorporated County area to facilitate storm

water runoff originating from a large area north of I-10 through the project area and southwest toward the Coachella Canal. Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would also include the extensions of Avenues 50 and 52 onto the project site.

1.5.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative

The No Project/No Development Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project because the physical impacts that would occur with the proposed project would not occur with this Alternative. If there were no changes to the existing conditions on site, none of the short- and long-term impacts under the proposed project would occur. Therefore, the potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed project would be avoided with the No Project/No Development Alternative.

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Although Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative, this alternative would not satisfy the majority of identified project objectives because it would not provide for an orderly development of residential and commercial uses that would retain revenue-generating uses, and it would not provide new employment opportunities to residents, commercial services for residents, or additional housing for residents in an area that is easily accessible to public transportation, retail, and service uses.

Alternative 4 (No Annexation) would include the proposed La Entrada Specific Plan Development land uses on the project site, excluding the 588 ac area that would be annexed from Riverside County into the City of Coachella. Alternative 4 would reduce the number of residential units to 6,504 and would eliminate approximately 26 ac of park uses, 207 ac of open space, and one 16 ac school site on the 1,612 ac site in the City. Alternative 4 would also include extensions of Avenues 50 and 52 onto the project site, and would still allow the development of employment and revenue-generating uses as well as provide additional diverse housing opportunities in the City while reducing the significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative 4 (No Annexation) is the environmentally superior alternative. However, as noted in the analysis of Alternative 4, the magnitude of the impacts under Alternative 4 is proportionally reduced but the significance of the impacts remains the same. Therefore, although Alternative 4 would lessen the magnitude of significant impacts, it would not result in the avoidance of significant impacts identified for the proposed project. As a result, a comparison of the proposed project and Alternative 4 does not result in a conclusion that Alternative 4 performs substantially better in avoiding significant adverse impacts that would occur under the proposed project.

1.6 IMPACTS, MITIGATION, AND LEVEL OF IMPACTS

Table 1.A summarizes the potential impacts of the proposed project, prescribed mitigation measures to address those impacts, and the level of significance under CEQA of each impact based on implementation of the identified mitigation measures. In addition to the mitigation measures provided in Table 1.A, there are a number of Project Design Features included in the project that help avoid or minimize potential environmental impacts of the project; they are described in detail in Section 3.9, Project Design Features.

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
4.1 AESTHETICS		
Less than Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.1.1: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista		
Visual resources in and around the City of Coachella (City) include the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains to the southwest, the Mecca Hills and Orocopia Mountains to the east, the Little San Bernardino Mountains to the northeast, open space, and agricultural areas. There are no City-designated scenic vistas identified in the City of Coachella General Plan and no designated scenic corridors in the vicinity of the project site. The Santa Rosa Mountains and Mecca Hills are visible from all areas of the project site as well as from areas around the project site and looking across the project site. Views of the project land uses from areas west of the Coachella Branch of the All American Canal (Coachella Canal) would be along the middleground slopes leading up to the Mecca Hills/Orocopia Mountains and Little San Bernardino Mountains. The Specific Plan establishes building height limits for each land use designation. The maximum height of the buildings would be three stories for mixed-use non-residential development. Residences on the hillsides in the east part of the project site would have views of the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains and the Coachella Valley. Views from the Coachella Valley floor toward the hillside on the project site would consist of the views of the project land uses, project development, and the Mecca Hills to the east. The Specific Plan would not result in a skyline development silhouette from public vantage points. The proposed project includes approximately 900 acres (ac) of open space and park/recreation uses that would preserve scenic views from the project site. An analysis of views from several vantage points indicates that development on the project site would partially encroach or not encroach into or obstruct existing views to resources off the project site and would not have a significant effect on any designated scenic vistas from those viewpoints. No substantial adverse effects to scenic vistas within the existing viewshed would occur. While scenic vistas would not be substantially affected by development of the project site as proposed under the Specific Plan, that development would transform views of the site from natural desert habitat and terrain visible above the dike to a developed condition with structures, green parks, and landscaping. Construction of the proposed project would result in temporary visual changes due to grading, other construction activities, and the presence of construction equipment and materials. As each project phase is completed, there would no longer be views of construction activities, materials, or equipment in those areas. The activities associated with short-term construction would not obstruct or significantly affect a scenic vista.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
As a result, the potential effects of the construction and operation of the proposed Specific Plan land uses on scenic vistas would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.		
Threshold 4.1.2: Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway		
The project site is not designated as a scenic resource in the City's General Plan and is not located along a designated State Scenic Highway. There are no City-designated scenic corridors in the project area, and the General Plan does not identify scenic rock formations on the project site. The project site is vacant, and there are no historic buildings or other aesthetic structures on site. The City's General Plan identifies only mature date palms as scenic plant resources, but there are no mature date palms on the project site. Therefore, the project impacts on this type of scenic resource are considered to be less than significant. While significant visual resources are visible from the project site and surrounding areas, none are visible from a designated State Scenic Highway, and none would be obstructed by the proposed project. As a result, impacts related to significant visual resources are considered less than significant. The General Plan and the adopted McNaughton Specific Plan currently designate the project site for a mix of land uses, clearly acknowledging that the site could be developed in the future and is therefore not considered an aesthetic resource to be preserved in its current undeveloped state. Future development would be required to comply with General Plan and Specific Plan policies regulating the design of new buildings and protecting the visual quality of the City. For these reasons, although the proposed project would convert vacant land to urban uses, scenic resources in the area would not be degraded, resulting in a less than significant impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated		
Threshold 4.1.4: Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area		
During construction on the Specific Plan site, travelers in the area will have views of the site that include construction fencing, equipment, grading areas, building pads, partially constructed structures, and other related facilities and activities. These views would be temporary and therefore would not represent a permanent change in views of construction equipment and activities from outside the project site. There will be no evening or night construction. As a result, there would be no night lighting on the site for construction equipment or activities. However, there would be limited security lighting provided at the Site Manager's trailer and at other locations in the construction areas. That level of lighting would comply with the applicable requirements in the City Municipal Code. The construction activities and equipment would not represent substantial potential sources of glare on the project site. As a result, the construction activities and equipment on the	**4.1.1 Photometric Study.** Prior to the issuance of grading permits for any phase of development, the applicant shall submit to the City of Coachella (City) a photometric (lighting) study (to include parking areas and access way lights, external security lights, lighted signage, and ball field lighting) providing evidence that the project light sources do not spill over to adjacent off-site properties in accordance with the City's Municipal Code. All project-related outdoor lighting, including but not limited to, street	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
project site would result in less than significant temporary impacts related to aesthetics and light and glare. The project land uses would include light sources such as street and parking lot lighting, landscape lighting, illuminated signs, security lighting, exterior lighting on buildings, and vehicle lights (i.e., headlights). Although the proposed project would introduce new sources of light that would contribute to the light visible in the night sky and the surrounding area, the project site is in an undeveloped desert area, and there are no nearby sensitive receptors that would be adversely impacted by that lighting. Because agricultural uses in the vicinity of the project site operate during the day, the project light and glare effects on those uses would be less than significant because those types of uses are not typically sensitive to light and glare. While the proposed project would add new lighting sources to the project area, the numbers and types of lighting sources are not anticipated to substantially differ from that commonly utilized at existing developments within the City. However, because the project site and the immediate surrounding area are relatively undeveloped with few or no existing light sources, the proposed project would introduce a substantial amount of light and glare sources where none previously existed, resulting in a potentially significant impact. All building and landscape lighting would be consistent with the design guidelines in the Specific Plan and in all City regulations and ordinances that pertain to specific plan developments. On-site landscaping would reduce glare and would screen light sources to reduce the visual impact of lighting from buildings and parking lots. All development in the City is required to adhere to lighting requirements contained in the City's Zoning Code. Adherence to the City's Zoning Code would ensure that any building or parking lighting would not significantly impact adjacent uses. Mitigation Measure 4.1.1 would further reduce potential light-related impacts of the project beyond the requirements of the City's Municipal Code. Therefore, these light and glare impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level. Homeowner and association lighting other than street lighting would be shielded to minimize illumination of adjacent properties and to reduce glare. Ball field lighting is anticipated to be in the form of tall fixtures strategically placed to illuminate the ball field completely and would incorporate low-glare shielded lighting to minimize glare impacts to surrounding areas. Mitigation Measure 4.1.1 would also further reduce potential ball field light-related impacts of the project beyond the requirements of the City's Municipal Code. New traffic signals would be added at the intersections of internal roads on the project site. Traffic signals are fitted with shielding to direct light toward a specific lane while	lighting, building security lighting, parking lot lighting, and landscaping lighting shall be shielded to prevent spillover of light to adjacent properties. All ball field lighting shall be fully shielded. Shielding requirements and time limits shall be identified on construction plans for each phase of development.	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
blocking the views of the vehicles in lanes moving in other directions. Due to the lower intensity of the lights used in traffic signals and the use of shielding, the potential light impacts of traffic signals would be less than significant. Exterior surfaces of project structures would be finished with a combination of architectural coatings, trim, and/or other building materials such as stucco, wood, concrete, and brushed metal. The proposed project is not expected to substantially increase the amount of daytime glare in the project area.		
Significant Adverse Impact		
Threshold 4.1.3: Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings		
The proposed project would substantially modify the existing visual character and quality of the site. Existing undeveloped desert terrain would be developed into a master-planned community with residential, mixed-use, school, park/recreation, and open space uses that would permanently change the visual character of the project site. The proposed project includes extensions of Avenues 50 and 52 east from their present termini over the Coachella Canal, providing access into the project site. The visual character of the Canal would be moderately changed because there are currently no crossings of the Canal immediately adjacent to the project site. Although the proposed land use plan incorporates open space areas and retention of the natural drainage courses on site, development of the 2,200 ac site and the extension of arterial roads into and through the project site would permanently alter the visual conditions of the project site. Those changes may potentially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, or the views of surrounding areas. This is a potentially significant impact. The changes in the visual character of the site will be partially mitigated based on compliance with: Standard Condition 4.1.1, which would require the applicant to provide detailed project plans for architectural review by the City with Tentative Tract Map submittal; the design requirements in the Specific Plan; the Project Design Features, including retention of the northern steeper slopes in natural open space; and the hillside development guidelines in the Specific Plan. There are no other feasible mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce potential impacts to changes in visual character to a less than significant level. Therefore, project-related visual character impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with compliance with Standard Condition 4.1.1 and the requirements of the Specific Plan.	**4.1.1 Standard Condition – Architectural Review.** Prior to the issuance of grading permits and/or Site Plan for any phase of development, the applicant shall submit to the City of Coachella (City) a photometric study (to include parking areas and access way lights, external security lights, lighted signage, and ball field lighting) providing evidence that the project light sources do not spill over to adjacent off-site properties in accordance with the City's Municipal Code. All project-related outdoor lighting, including but not limited to, street lighting, building security lighting, parking lot lighting, and landscaping lighting shall be shielded to prevent spillover of light to adjacent properties. All ball field lighting shall be fully shielded. Shielding requirements and time limits shall be identified on construction plans for each phase of development.	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact after Standard Condition

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
4.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES		
No Impacts		
Threshold 4.2.2: Conflict with an existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract		
The project site is not covered under a Williamson Act Contract; therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any Williamson Act contract. The areas for the proposed extensions of Avenues 50 and 52 are currently zoned A-T (Agricultural Transitional) and O-S (Open Space). The A-T zone designation permits the continued agricultural use of land suited to eventual development in other uses, pending proper provisions of utilities, major streets, and other facilities so that compact, orderly development will occur. The extensions of Avenues 50 and 52 would be considered to be the provision of new major streets so that orderly development (e.g., La Entrada Specific Plan) would occur. Therefore, the extensions of Avenues 50 and 52 would be consistent with the A-T zoning designation. The proposed project would not conflict with or result in impacts associated with the existing zoning for agricultural uses.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Threshold 4.2.3: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104 (g))		
No part of the project site is zoned for timberland or timberland development. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or result in impacts associated with existing zoning for forest land or timberland.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Threshold 4.2.4: Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to nonforest use		
There is no forest land on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to the loss or conversion of forest land.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Less than Significant Impact		
Threshold 4.2.5: Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to nonforest use		
The Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) score for the proposed project (30.2 points) does not exceed the threshold that would indicate a significant impact on agricultural resources. As a result of the analysis based on the LESA model, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to agricultural resources due to the conversion of the site to nonagricultural uses.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Significant Adverse Impact		
Threshold 4.2.1: 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 nonagricultural use		
Approximately 0.025 ac of the project site is designated as Prime Farmland, and 9.535 ac are designated as Unique Farmland. Those designated farmlands would be converted to nonagricultural uses by the proposed project. The conversion of the 0.025 ac of Prime Farmland would be 0.00075 percent of the total loss of Prime Farmland in the County during the 2008–2010 period and the conversion of the 9.535 ac of Unique Farmland	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
would be 0.54 percent of the total loss of Unique Farmland in the County during the same period. Because Prime and Unique Farmlands are finite and irreplaceable resources, the conversion of these lands on the project site to nonagricultural uses is a significant adverse impact of the project. There is no feasible mitigation for this project impact.		
4.3 AIR QUALITY		
Less than Significant Impact		
Threshold 4.3.4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations		
Naturally Occurring Asbestos. The project site is in Riverside County, which is not among the counties that are found to have serpentine and ultramafic rock in their soils. Therefore, the potential risk for naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) during project construction is small and less than significant. No mitigation is required. **Long-Term Microscale (Carbon Monoxide Hot Spot) Analysis.** Vehicle trips associated with the Specific Plan land uses would contribute to congestion at intersections and along road segments in the project vicinity. Localized air quality effects would occur as a result of vehicle emissions for project-related traffic. The proposed project would contribute to increased carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations at intersections in the project vicinity. All the intersections analyzed for potential CO impacts would experience 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations below the federal and State standards both without and with the project. As a result, the proposed project would not have a significant impact on local air quality for CO, and no mitigation is required. **Locally Significant Pollutant Concentrations.** There are three existing residences near the project site that could be exposed to construction-related emissions. In addition, during construction of the later project phases, residents of earlier phases could also be exposed to construction-related emissions. However, due to the size of the construction areas, the majority of construction activities would be located far from these sensitive receptors. Thus, measurable pollutant concentration increases are very unlikely, and the project impacts on sensitive receptors would be below a level of significance. **Screening Health Risk Assessment of Interstate 10 Emissions.** The Health Risk Assessment (HRA) evaluated the health risks of air toxics associated with diesel trucks traveling on Interstate 10 (I-10) near the project site. The HRA indicated that the cancer risk threshold of 10 in 1 million and the chronic risk threshold of 1 would not be exceeded at the proposed residences on the project site. Therefore, there would not be any significant health risks to persons living on the project site near I-10, and no mitigation is required.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated		
Threshold 4.3.5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people		
Construction. The operation of heavy-duty equipment on the project site during construction would emit odors. While these odors could be objectionable near the equipment, the project-related construction activities in the early phases would be a sufficient distance from existing sensitive receptors and, during later phases of development, future sensitive receptors, and the natural dissipation in the air over the distance between the equipment and the sensitive receptors would substantially reduce the potential for objectionable odors at the sensitive receptors. No other sources of objectionable odors are expected during project construction. No mitigation is required. **Operation.** The residential, commercial, and mixed uses on the project site do not include recognized sources of long-term objectionable odors. The proposed drainage system for the Specific Plan includes up to five retention basins and earthen drainage channels through the project site. These water features have the potential to cause odors from bacteria generated by still or slow moving water and/or decaying plant materials. Mitigation Measure 4.9.2 would require preparation and implementation of a maintenance plan for these water features that would minimize odors caused by standing or retained water. Therefore, the project operations would not result in objectionable odors at on- and/or off-site uses. No mitigation is required.	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.9.2, provided later in this table.	Less than Significant Impact
Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.3.1: Would the project result in a significant adverse impact if it conflicts with or obstructs implementation of the applicable air quality plan		
General Plan Air Quality Element Policy Analysis. The proposed project is consistent with most of the applicable General Plan policies. The proposed project would exceed several South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) emissions thresholds during construction and operation. Therefore, the proposed project would be partially inconsistent with two General Plan policies related to air quality. Because there is no feasible mitigation to reduce all the construction and operation air quality emissions to a less than significant level, there is no way to mitigate the partial inconsistency with the General Plan policies. Impacts related to these two policies are considered to be significant unavoidable adverse impacts.	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact
Threshold 4.3.2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation		
Construction Equipment Emissions. Construction activities produce combustion emissions from various sources such as site grading, utility engines, on-site heavy-duty construction vehicles, asphalt paving, and vehicles transporting materials and construction crews. The Specific Plan would be constructed in five phases. Construction equipment/vehicle emissions of reactive organic gases (ROGs), nitrogen oxides (NO_X), and CO would exceed the SCAQMD emissions thresholds for each phase of the proposed	**4.3.1 Application of Architectural Coatings.** Prior to issuance of any grading permits, the Director of the City of Coachella Public Works Department, or designee, shall verify that construction contracts include a statement specifying that the Construction Contractor shall comply with South	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
project. Measures to reduce NO_X and CO emissions consist principally of the use of Tier 4 or greater diesel equipment (refer to Mitigation Measure 4.3.2). However, even if all the construction equipment conformed to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 3 specification, it is not feasible to reduce the significant levels of NO_X and CO emissions to less than the SCAQMD daily thresholds. Therefore, project construction would result in significant adverse air quality impacts related to NO_X and CO emissions. **Fugitive Dust.** Fugitive dust emissions would be generated as a result of land clearing, grading, and other exposure of soils to air/wind during construction. The proposed project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 to control fugitive dust that would reduce the fugitive dust emissions during construction of each phase to below the SCAQMD thresholds. **Architectural Coatings.** The application of architectural coatings would result in a large amount of ROG emissions as the coatings are sprayed on and curing. Even with the application of architectural coatings using standard application techniques with a 25 percent transfer efficiency, emissions would be substantially more than the SCAQMD ROG threshold of 75 pounds per day (lbs/day). Measures to reduce ROG emissions include methods to increase the efficiency of applying architectural coatings. Even with compliance with Measure 4.3.1 and the use of high-volume, low-pressure (HVLP) application techniques, it is not feasible to reduce the ROG emissions to below the 75 lbs/day SCAQMD threshold. There is no feasible mitigation that would reduce this exceedance to below the thresholds. **Operations.** Long-term operational air emissions would be generated by stationary and mobile sources. Area sources include architectural coatings, consumer products, and landscaping. Energy sources include natural gas consumption for heating and electricity for lighting in buildings and outdoor areas. Mobile sources are traffic on area roads. The residential and commercial uses on the project site would generate emissions from all these types of sources during operation with peak daily emissions exceeding the SCAQMD daily thresholds for ROGs, NO_X, CO, particulate matter (PM) less than 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}) and PM less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$). Mitigation Measure 4.3.3 requires the project to comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) regarding energy conservation and green buildings standards. Although this would help reduce operational emissions, the majority of the emissions causing the exceedances would be from privately owned vehicles operating as a result of the project. There are no feasible mitigation measures available to the project that would have any effect on emissions from private vehicles. As a result, there are no feasible	Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1113 and any other SCAQMD rules and regulations on the use of architectural coatings or high-volume, low-pressure (HVLP) spray methods. Emissions associated with architectural coatings would be reduced by complying with these rules and regulations, which include using precoated/natural colored building materials, using water-based or low-volatile organic compounds (VOC) coating, and using coating transfer or spray equipment with high transfer efficiency. **4.3.2** **EPA Tier 4-Final Emissions Standards.** The applicant shall make available to the City of Coachella Public Works Director or designee a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment equal to or greater than 50 horsepower that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of construction activities for the project. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine production year, and certification of the specified Tier standard. A copy of each such unit's certified Tier specification, best available control technology (BACT) documentation, and California Air Resources Board (ARB) or SCAQMD operating permit shall be provided on site at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment. Off-road diesel-powered equipment that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the construction activities for the project shall meet the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 4–Final emissions standards, and off-road equipment greater than 300 horsepower shall be equipped with diesel particulate filters. **4.3.3** **Construction Equipment Maintenance.** Throughout the construction process, general	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
mitigation measures to reduce the operational air quality impacts to a less than significant level.	contractors shall maintain a log of all construction equipment maintenance that shows that all construction equipment has been properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. **4.3.4** **Construction Equipment Operating Optimization.** General contractors shall ensure that during construction operations, trucks and vehicles in loading and unloading queues turn their engines off when not in use. General contractors shall phase and schedule construction operations to avoid emissions peaks and discontinue operations during second-stage smog alerts. **4.3.5** **Construction Generator Use Minimization.** General contractors shall ensure that electricity from power poles is used rather than temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators to the extent feasible. **4.3.6** **Construction Equipment Idling Minimization.** General contractors shall ensure that all construction vehicles are prohibited from idling in excess of 5 minutes, both on site and off site. **4.3.7** **Project Operations.** Prior to issuance of any construction permits, the project applicant shall submit for review and approval by the City of Coachella Public Works Director, building plans that incorporate measures such as, but not limited to, the following: **Operational Mitigation Measures (Transportation).** • Provide one electric car charging station for every 10 high-density residences and	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	provisions for electric car charging stations in the garages of all medium-, low-, and ultra-low-density housing. Provide at least two designated parking spots for parking of zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) for car-sharing programs in all employee/worker parking areas. • Provide incentives for employees and the public to use public transportation such as discounted transit passes, reduced ticket prices at local events, and/or other incentives. • Implement a rideshare program for employees at retail/commercial sites. • Create local "light vehicle" networks, such as neighborhood electric vehicle (NEV) systems. • Require the use of 2010 model year emissions-compliant diesel trucks, or alternatively fueled, delivery trucks (e.g., food, retail and vendor supply delivery trucks) at commercial/retail sites upon project build-out. If this isn't feasible, consider other measures such as incentives, phase-in schedules for clean trucks, etc. **Operational Mitigation Measures (Energy Efficiency).** • Design all structures to use passive heating, natural cooling, and reduced pavement to the extent feasible. All residences shall use either high-efficiency or solar hot water systems. • Limit the hours of operation of outdoor lighting in publicly accessible areas. • Install light-colored "cool" roofs on all structures and cool pavements throughout the project site.	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	• Require the use of electric/energy-efficient appliances (e.g., stoves) in all residences. **Operational Mitigation Measures (Other).** • Require that all Homeowner Association Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) mandate the use of water-based or low volatile organic compound (VOC) cleaning products by all residents. • Provide outlets for electric and propane barbecues in every residence with an outside patio. • Require that all Homeowner Association CC&Rs mandate the use of electric lawn mowers and leaf blowers by all residents. • Require that all Homeowner Association CC&Rs mandate the use of electric or alternatively fueled sweepers with high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters by all residents. • Require the use of electric or alternative fueled maintenance vehicles by all grounds maintenance contractors.	
Threshold 4.3.3: 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 which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)		
Construction. During construction, the proposed project would temporarily contribute criteria pollutants above the SCAQMD thresholds. Other projects in the area may be under construction at the same time as the proposed project. The concurrent construction of two or more projects would generate fugitive dust and equipment emissions that could result in substantial short-term increases in air pollutants in the local area. Each project would be required to comply with SCAQMD standard Rule 403 construction measures. Because the proposed project itself would result in a significant adverse air quality impact during construction related to ROGs, NO_X, and CO that cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, it would also potentially contribute to a significant short-term cumulative adverse air quality impact for those same pollutants in the project area. Because there is no feasible mitigation available to reduce the construction-related ROGs, NO_X, and CO	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
impacts of the project to below a level of significance, there is no mitigation that would reduce the project contribution to cumulative short-term adverse air quality impacts to below a level of significance. Therefore, construction air quality impacts are considered cumulatively significant. **Operation.** Operation of the proposed project would result in emissions of ROGs, NO_X, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ that exceed the SCAQMD daily thresholds. Because there is no feasible mitigation available to reduce those project impacts to below a level of significance, there is no mitigation that would reduce the project contribution to cumulative long-term adverse air quality impacts to below a level of significance. Therefore, operational air quality impacts are considered cumulatively significant.		
4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
Less than Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.4.4: 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 site		
The project site is near three Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (CVMSHCP) Conservation Areas (i.e., Desert Tortoise & Linkage Conservation Area, Mecca Hills/Orocopia Mountains Conservation Area, and the East Indio Hills Conservation Area) but would not interfere with or disturb these conservation areas. As a result, the project effects related to habitat fragmentation and wildlife movement are not considered significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.4.5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance		
The City does not have a tree preservation policy or ordinance preventing or restricting the removal of trees in the City. The City's General Plan Conservation Element contains policies protecting biological resources. The proposed project would comply with the policies protecting biological resources outlined in the City's General Plan Conservation Element. Therefore, impacts related to potential conflicts with local policies or ordinances and the General Plan Conservation Element regarding protection of biological resources would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.4.6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan		
The project site is within the planning boundary of the CVMSHCP but is not within a designated Conservation Area. The project site is in proximity to three CVMSHCP Conservation Areas. The project would not result in either direct or indirect impacts on those Conservation Areas because no development is proposed near the Desert Tortoise and Linkage Conservation Area. Therefore, impacts related to potential conflicts with an adopted HCP would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.4.1: ***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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service***		
Special Interest Plant Communities/California Desert Native Plants Act. The proposed project would impact approximately 16.6 ac of desert dry wash woodland that would be considered a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) vegetated streambed and includes 6.6 ac of desert dry wash woodland that adjoins a streambed. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4.5 would reduce the project impacts related to desert dry wash woodland and CDFW jurisdictional waters to a less than significant level. **Nonlisted Special-Interest Species.** Nineteen special-interest species identified in the project *Biological Resources Assessment* have a probability of occurring on the project site. Although they have no official State or federal protection status, some of these special-interest species are covered by the CVMSHCP and are conserved through the CVMSHCP Conservation Areas and mitigation measures. The nonlisted species that are not covered by the CVMSHCP occupy the same habitats as the covered species although their population distribution is not as limited as the covered species. Therefore, the potential project impacts to nonlisted species would be less than significant, **Threatened and Endangered Species.** The proposed project would result in the loss of habitat for threatened and endangered species. The impacts to the Coachella Valley milkvetch would be mitigated to less than significant levels through compliance with the CVMSHCP. Impacts to the desert tortoise and its associated habitat would be mitigated based on compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.4.1. **Burrowing Owl and Migratory Birds.** The project site contains potential habitat for the burrowing owl, a species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), California Fish and Game Code, and the CVMSHCP. Although participation in the CVMSHCP (through payment of the mitigation fee) would reduce impacts to the burrowing owl, mitigation is required to ensure compliance with the MBTA and the California Fish and Game Code. The project could also impact other nesting bird species during construction. Mitigation Measures 4.4.2, 4.4.3, and 4.4.4 would reduce potentially significant impacts to burrowing owls and other migratory birds to a less than significant level.	**4.4.1** **Desert Tortoise Salvage or Surveys.** The project applicant will retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys for the desert tortoise. If desert tortoise are found, the project applicant shall notify the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) 45 days prior to the issuance of any grading permit to allow the USFWS to salvage adult tortoises. If the USFWS is not able to salvage desert tortoise, the project applicant will salvage desert tortoise per current USFWS desert tortoise clearance survey protocol. Construction on the project site would not occur until the tortoises are salvaged. **4.4.2** **Burrowing Owl Preconstruction Surveys.** The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys for burrowing owls no less than 14 days prior to any ground-disturbing activities. The preconstruction surveys shall be approved by the City of Coachella Director of Development Services and conducted in accordance with current survey protocols provided in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (March 7, 2012). **4.4.3** **Burrowing Owl Avoidance Measures.** In the event a burrowing owl is found to be present on site during the preconstruction survey, the project applicant shall ensure the following applicable avoidance measures, derived from the guidelines of the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (March 7, 2012): • Avoid disturbing occupied burrows during the breeding nesting period, from February 1 through August 31. If burrows are occupied	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	by breeding pairs, an avoidance buffer should be established by a qualified biologist. The size of such buffers is generally a minimum of 300 feet, but may increase or decrease depending on surrounding topography, nature of disturbance, and location and type of construction. The size of the buffer area will be determined by a qualified biologist. Continued monitoring will be required to confirm that the specified buffer is adequate to permit continued breeding activity. • Avoid impacting burrows occupied during the nonbreeding season by migratory or nonmigratory resident burrowing owls • Avoid direct destruction of occupied burrows through chaining (dragging a heavy chain over an area to remove shrubs) or disking • Develop and implement a worker awareness program to increase the on-site worker's recognition of and commitment to burrowing owl protection • Place visible markers near burrows to ensure that equipment and other machinery does not collapse occupied burrows • Do not fumigate, use treated bait, or other means of poisoning nuisance animals in areas where burrowing owls are known or suspected to occur If an occupied burrow is present within the approved development area, the project applicant shall ensure that a clearance mitigation plan is prepared in accordance with the Staff Report and is approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) prior to implementation. This plan will specify the procedures for confirmation and exclusion of nonbreeding owls	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	from occupied burrows, followed by subsequent burrow destruction. There shall also be provisions for maintenance and monitoring to ensure that owls do not return prior to construction. Breeding owls shall be avoided until the breeding cycle is complete. **4.4.4** **Preconstruction Nesting Bird Survey.** The project site should be cleared of vegetation outside the general bird nesting season (February 1 through August 31) to minimize potential conflicts with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). In the event that vegetation is not removed outside the bird nesting season, a preconstruction nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist 3 days prior to vegetation removal. If nesting birds protected by the MBTA are found, the biologist shall prescribe avoidance measures to be approved by the City of Coachella Director of Development Services, such as a construction buffer, until the nesting activity is concluded. The specific details of these measures depend on such factors as the species, nesting stage, topography, and type of adjacent work. Any specified buffer less than 300 feet will require continued monitoring until nesting is complete to verify its adequacy for preventing nest failure due to construction disturbance. **4.4.5** **CDFW Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Authorization.** Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the City of Coachella Director of Development Services shall verify that the project applicant has obtained authorization from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code for the alteration of a streambed. In order to obtain these authorizations, the project applicant shall:	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	• Notify CDFW of the intent to alter the streambed. Issuance of a Streambed Alteration Agreement may require compensatory mitigation, as described below; • Develop and implement a mitigation plan subject to review and approval by the CDFW, RWQCB, and USACE if jurisdiction is determined to compensate for the loss of the riparian habitat. Mitigation will require one or more of the following options: (1) on-site creation or enhancement of riparian habitat; (2) off-site creation or enhancement of riparian habitat; and/or (3) participation in an established off-site mitigation bank program or in-lieu fee program. If the mitigation plan includes habitat replacement, it shall identify a success criterion of percent cover of wetland or riparian vegetation equal to or greater than the vegetative cover currently associated with the existing streambeds (16.6 acres [ac]). The following specifies the required components of a jurisdictional habitat restoration and monitoring plan. • Prior to the initiation of any construction-related activities, the applicant shall submit a detailed restoration program and restoration site plans for RWQCB and CDFW approval. Mitigation would occur at no less than 1:1 or greater as negotiated with the regulatory agencies. Mitigation opportunities may include restoration, enhancement, or creation of jurisdictional areas. It is currently anticipated that some of the existing dry washes in the project area will be realigned and/or consolidated such that there will be no net loss of total soft-bottom streambed area. Similarly, the acreage of impacted vegetated	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	streambed and adjacent desert dry wash woodland (currently measured at 16.6 ac) will be recreated within the ultimate drainage system, such that there is no net loss of vegetation associated with the streambeds. Refer to Figure 4.4.3 for the conceptual location of the recreated habitat. The Riparian Habitat Restoration, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan shall contain the following items: o **Responsibilities and Qualifications of the Personnel to Implement and Supervise the Plan.** The responsibilities of the applicant, Specialists, and Maintenance Personnel that would supervise and implement the plan shall be specified. o **Site Preparation and Planting Implementation.** Site preparation shall include: (1) protection of existing native species; (2) trash and weed removal; (3) native species salvage and reuse (i.e., duff); (4) soil treatments (i.e., imprinting, decompacting); (5) temporary irrigation installation (if required); (6) erosion-control measures; (7) seed mix application; and (8) container species planting. o **Schedule.** A schedule shall be developed that includes planting in late fall and early winter, between October 1 and January 30. o **Maintenance Plan/Guidelines.** The Maintenance Plan shall include: (1) weed control; (2) herbivory control; (3) trash removal; (4) irrigation system maintenance (if required); (5)	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	maintenance training; and (6) replacement planting. o **Monitoring Plan.** The Monitoring Plan shall include: (1) qualitative monitoring (i.e., photographs and general observations); (2) quantitative monitoring (i.e., randomly placed transects); (3) performance criteria, as approved by the above-listed resource agencies; (4) monthly reports for the first year and reports every other month thereafter; and (5) annual reports, which shall be submitted to the resource agencies on a yearly basis for 5 years. The applicant shall monitor and maintain the project site for 5 years to ensure successful establishment of habitat within the restored and created areas. o **Long-Term Preservation.** Long-term preservation of the site shall also be outlined in the conceptual Restoration Plan to ensure that the mitigation site is not impacted by future development.	
Threshold 4.4.2: 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 Wildlife		
Of the approximately 218.13 ac of CDFW jurisdiction on the project site, approximately 10.0 ac are considered CDFW vegetated streambed, and 6.6 ac of desert dry wash woodland are considered CDFW jurisdictional vegetation. Based on the most current design plans, approximately 191.60 ac of CDFW jurisdictional area would be impacted (123.49 ac permanent, 68.11 ac temporary) by the proposed project. A CDFW 1602 Agreement would be required prior to any construction in jurisdictional areas. Mitigation Measure 4.4.5 would ensure that project impacts related to CDFW jurisdictional waters are reduced to a less than significant level.	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.4.5, above.	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.4.3: 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		
Based on an analysis of on-site hydrologic conditions, it was preliminarily determined that the relevant reaches have an insubstantial or speculative effect on the chemical, physical, or biological significant nexus to the Whitewater River and Salton Sea. No United States	**4.4.6 United States Army Corps of Engineers and Regional Water Quality Control Board Permits.** Prior to the issuance of any grading	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) jurisdictional waters/wetlands were noted on site, and ACOE jurisdiction is therefore absent because the on-site drainages lack a significant nexus to the Salton Sea. An Approved Determination will be required to verify the preliminary results of ACOE jurisdiction, as required in Mitigation Measure 4.4.6. If the ACOE concurs, a Permit would not be required, but the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) may require a Report of Waste Discharge under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne Act) and issue Waste Discharge Requirements. If the ACOE asserts jurisdiction, an Individual Permit would likely be required, and RWQCB regulation would be through Section 401.	permits, the City of Coachella Director of Development Services shall verify that the project applicant has obtained an Approved Determination, in accordance with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) Regulatory Guidance Letter 08-02 dated June 26, 2008, to verify the preliminary results of ACOE jurisdiction as determined in the Delineation of State and Federal Jurisdictional Waters (RBF Consulting, April 2013). In that case, the applicant shall also demonstrate that Waste Discharge Requirements have been obtained through the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or that a Report of Waste Discharge is not required. In the event the ACOE does assert jurisdiction, then the City of Coachella Director of Development Services shall verify that the project applicant has obtained an Individual Permit, and RWQCB certification through Section 401, if required.	
4.5 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
Less than Significant Impact		
Threshold 4.5.1: ***Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5? "Historical resources" are defined as buildings, structures, districts, sites, or objects that are eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(3))***		
The Coachella Canal in the vicinity of Avenues 50 and 52 west of the project site was determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and is also designated as Site 33-005705 in the California Historical Resources Inventory. A crossing over the Coachella Canal is required to extend Avenues 50 and 52 onto the project site. At that crossing, one or more reinforced concrete box culverts would be constructed. Although the drainage culverts would involve changes to the Coachella Canal, these changes would not impact the historical significance of the Coachella Canal. Therefore, impacts to historical resources are considered less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.5.2: ***Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5***		
There are two historic trail segments and one historic prospecting locale with quartz shatter and areas of scattered cairn rocks in the Phase 1 area on the project site. In previous recommendations at the trail sites, they were not recommended as significant	**4.5.1 Archaeological and Native American Monitors.** Prior to commencement of any grading activity on the project site and consistent with the findings	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
archeological resources under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because these segments are highly fragmented, noncontiguous, disjointed foot paths. In addition, the prospecting site was not recommended as a significant resource under CEQA because little additional research potential exists and the site has already been recorded. Although the project site is not considered sensitive for archeological resources, precautionary mitigation is included in the proposed project to protect archaeological resources in the event of discovery during ground-disturbing construction activities.	and recommendations of the cultural resources surveys and reports regarding the sensitivity of each area on the project site for cultural resources, the City of Coachella (City) Director of Development Services, or designee, shall retain an archaeological monitor and a Native American monitor to be selected by the City after consultation with interested Tribal and Native American representatives. Both monitors shall be present at the pregrade conference in order to explain the cultural mitigation measures associated with the project. Both monitors shall be present on site during all ground-disturbing activities (to implement the project Monitoring Plan) until marine terrace deposits are encountered. Once marine terrace deposits are encountered, archaeological and Native American monitoring is no longer necessary, as the marine deposits are several hundred thousand years old, significantly predating human settlement in this area. **4.5.2 Archaeological Monitoring Plan and Accidental Discovery.** Prior to commencement of any grading activity on the project site and consistent with the findings of the cultural resources surveys and reports regarding the sensitivity of each area on the project site for cultural resources, the City of Coachella (City) shall prepare a Monitoring Plan. The Monitoring Plan shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist and shall be reviewed by the City of Coachella Director of Development Services. The Monitoring Plan should include at a minimum: (1) a list of personnel involved in the monitoring activities; (2) a description of how the monitoring shall occur; (3) a description of frequency of monitoring (e.g., full-time, part-time, spot checking); (4) a description of what resources	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	may be encountered; (5) a description of circumstances that would result in the halting of work at the project site (e.g., what is considered a "significant" archaeological site); (6) a description of procedures for halting work on site and notification procedures; and (7) a description of monitoring reporting procedures. If any significant historical resources, archaeological resources, or human remains are found during monitoring, work should stop within the immediate vicinity (precise area to be determined by the archaeologist in the field) of the resource until such time as the resource can be evaluated by an archaeologist and any other appropriate individuals. Project personnel shall not collect or move any archaeological materials or human remains and associated materials. To the extent feasible, project activities shall avoid such resources. Where avoidance is not feasible, the resources shall be evaluated for their eligibility for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. If a resource is not eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If a resource is eligible, adverse effects to the resource must be avoided, or such effects must be mitigated. Mitigation can include, but is not necessarily limited to: excavation of the deposit in accordance with a cultural resource mitigation or data recovery plan that makes provisions for adequately recovering the scientifically consequential information from and about the resource (see California Code of Regulations Title 43 Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C)). The data recovery plan shall be prepared and adopted prior to any excavation and should make provisions for sharing of information with Tribes that have requested Senate Bill 18 (SB 18) consultation. The data recovery plan shall employ	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	standard archaeological field methods and procedures; laboratory and technical analyses of recovered archaeological materials; production of a report detailing the methods, findings, and significance of the archaeological site and associated materials; curation of archaeological materials at an appropriate facility for future research and/or display; an interpretive display of recovered archaeological materials at a local school, museum, or library; and public lectures at local schools and/or historical societies on the findings and significance of the site and recovered archaeological materials. Results of the study shall be deposited with the regional California Historical Resources Information Center (CHRIS) repository. It shall be the responsibility of the City Department of Public Works to verify that the Monitoring Plan is implemented during project grading and construction. Upon completion of all monitoring/mitigation activities, the consulting archaeologist shall submit a monitoring report to the City of Coachella Director of Development Services and to the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center summarizing all monitoring/mitigation activities and confirming that all recommended mitigation measures have been met. The monitoring report shall be prepared consistent with the guidelines of the Office of Historic Preservation's *Archaeological Resources Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format*. The City of Coachella Director of Development Services or designee shall be responsible for reviewing any reports produced by the archaeologist to determine the appropriateness and adequacy of findings and recommendations.	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	4.5.4 Human Remains. Consistent with the requirements of California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15064.5(e), if human remains are encountered, work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and the County Coroner notified immediately. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the County Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). With the permission of the City Coachella, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Consistent with CCR Section 15064.5(d), if the remains are determined to be Native American and an MLD is notified, the City of Coachella shall consult with the MLD as identified by the NAHC to develop an agreement for the treatment and disposition of the remains. Upon completion of the assessment, the consulting archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results and provide recommendations regarding the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate, and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report should be submitted to the City of Coachella Director of Development Services and the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center. The City of Coachella Director of Development	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	Services, or designee, shall be responsible for reviewing any reports produced by the archaeologist to determine the appropriateness and adequacy of findings and recommendations. **4.5.5 Site Surveys, Record Searches, and Reports for All Phases Except Phase 1.** Prior to the submittal for a Tentative Tract Map (TTM) and prior to any site disturbance, grading, or other construction activities in any areas on the project site other than the Phase 1 area, the project applicant will be required to: 1. Prepare a Cultural Resources Survey Report for the area covered by the TTM, which will include the results of a records search, site survey, Native American consultation, and a Sacred Lands File search. The report will describe whether Measures 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 apply to the site disturbance, grading, and construction activities in the area covered by the TTM and/or if additional mitigation is required. The applicant will submit the Report to the City of Coachella Director of Development Services for review and approval prior to submittal of the TTM. 2. Prepare a Paleontological Resources Survey Report for the area covered by the TTM which will include the results of a locality search and a site survey. The report will describe whether Measure 4.5.3 applies to the site disturbance, grading, and construction activities in the area covered by the TTM and/or if additional mitigation is required. The applicant will submit the Report to the City of Coachella Director of Development Services for review and approval prior to submittal of the TTM.	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	3. Prior to any site disturbance, grading, or construction, the project applicant will be required to modify/revise the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to include any new or modified mitigation measures identified in the Cultural and/or Paleontological Resources Survey Reports and will require the construction contractor to implement those measures in addition to Measures 4.5.1 through 4.5.5.	
Threshold 4.5.3: Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature		
Parts of the project site are located on sediments mapped as having high sensitivity for paleontological resources. There are no known localities on the project site but, based on the locality search and field survey, there are sensitive sediments that may contain fossil remains in the project area, and there is the potential to encounter paleontological resources during all ground-disturbing activities. Mitigation is required to reduce potential adverse impacts to unknown (buried) paleontological resources.	**4.5.3 Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program.** Prior to commencement of any grading activity on the project site and consistent with the findings of the paleontological resources surveys and reports regarding the sensitivity of each area on the project site for paleontological resources, the City of Coachella's Director of Development Services, or designee, shall verify that a qualified paleontologist has been retained and will be on site during all rough grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities in paleontologically sensitive sediments. The paleontologically sensitive sediments that could potentially occur within the Specific Plan site include the fine-grained interbeds of the Ocotillo Formation, the Palm Spring Group, and Lake Cahuilla Sediments. A paleontologist will not be required on site if excavation is only occurring in boulder- and cobble-rich portions of the Ocotillo Formation, Holocene alluvium, or Artificial Fill. Prior to any ground-disturbing activities, the paleontologist shall prepare a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) for the proposed project. The PRIMP should be consistent with the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists (SVP) (1995 and 2010)	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	and should include but not be limited to the following: • Attendance at the pregrade conference in order to explain the mitigation measures associated with the project. • During construction excavation, a qualified vertebrate paleontological monitor shall initially be present on a full-time basis whenever excavation will occur within the sediments that have a High Paleontological Sensitivity rating and on a spot-check basis in sediments that have a Low Sensitivity rating. Based on the significance of any recovered specimens, the qualified paleontologist may set up conditions that will allow for monitoring to be scaled back to part-time as the project progresses. However, if significant fossils begin to be recovered after monitoring has been scaled back, conditions shall also be specified that would allow increased monitoring as necessary. The monitor shall be equipped to salvage fossils and/or matrix samples as they are unearthed in order to avoid construction delays. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment in the area of the find in order to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. • The underlying sediments may contain abundant fossil remains that can only be recovered by a screening and picking matrix; therefore, these sediments shall occasionally be spot-screened through one-eighth to one-twentieth-inch mesh screens to determine whether microfossils exist. If microfossils are encountered, additional sediment samples (up to 6,000 pounds) shall be collected and	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	processed through one-twentieth-inch mesh screens to recover additional fossils. Processing of large bulk samples is best accomplished at a designated location within the project disturbance limits that will be accessible throughout the project duration but will also be away from any proposed cut or fill areas. Processing is usually completed concurrently with construction, with the intent to have all processing completed before, or just after, project completion. A small corner of a staging or equipment parking area is an ideal location. If water is not available, the location should be accessible for a water truck to occasionally fill containers with water. • Preparation of recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation. This includes the washing and picking of mass samples to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils and the removal of surplus sediment from around larger specimens to reduce the volume of storage for the repository and the storage cost for the developer. • Identification and curation of specimens into a museum repository with permanent, retrievable storage, such as the San Bernardino County Museum (SBCM). • Preparation of a report of findings with an appended, itemized inventory of specimens. When submitted to the City of Coachella Director of Development Services or designee, the report and inventory would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Threshold 4.5.4: Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries		
Although no human remains are known to be on site or are anticipated to be discovered, precautionary mitigation is required. Mitigation Measure 4.5.4 would reduce impacts to human remains in the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during project grading.	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.5.4, above.	Less than Significant Impact
4.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS		
No Impact		
Threshold 4.6.5: Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water		
The proposed project would connect to the existing City sewer system and is not anticipated to use septic or alternative waste systems. As a result, the project will not result in impacts related to alternative wastewater disposal systems.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Incorporated		
Threshold 4.6.1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: ***ii) Strong seismic ground shaking***		
There are small-scale inactive faults within the bedrock units underlying the project site. These fractures are associated with major earthquakes along the San Andreas Fault, which runs along the western boundary of the project site. Evidence from the fault investigation indicates that fractures have the potential to develop anywhere on the project site as the result of an earthquake associated with active faults on site. In addition, the project site contains several faults that are capable of strong ground motion. These faults are associated with the San Andreas and Painted Canyon Fault Zones. Mitigation Measure 4.6.1 requires a final geotechnical report to delineate the precise locations of all active faults within each planning area and determine and refine any restricted use zones with known active and potentially active faults. The project design will incorporate the recommendations from the geotechnical report and will adhere to seismic requirements in the California Residential Code, the 2010 California Building Code (CBC), and the City's Municipal Code. Nonetheless, due to the presence of the San Andreas Fault and other active faults on and near the project site, potential adverse impacts resulting from strong seismic shaking cannot be ruled out and are still considered potentially significant.	**4.6.1 Compliance with Geotechnical Investigations.** Prior to approval of any future Tentative Tract Maps, a specific final geotechnical study for each specific planning area shall be completed by the project applicant. These studies shall be submitted for review and approval by the City of Coachella (City) Engineer to ensure that each planning area with future development has been evaluated at an appropriate level of detail by a professional geologist. The location and scope of each final geotechnical report shall be tiered off of the two geotechnical reports prepared for the overall site, *Updated Geotechnical Fault Investigation Report* (Petra Geotechnical, Inc., January 15, 2007) and the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation* (Petra Geotechnical, Inc., April 15, 2013). The final geotechnical report for each planning area shall delineate the precise locations of all active faults and shall determine the appropriate building setbacks and restricted use zones within the planning area. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City Engineer shall confirm that all	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	grading and construction plans incorporate and comply with the recommendations included in the final specific geotechnical report for each planning area. Design, grading, and construction would adhere to all of the seismic requirements incorporated into the 2010 California Residential Code and 2010 California Building Code (CBC) (or most current building code) and the requirements and standards contained in the applicable chapters of the City of Coachella Municipal Code, as well as appropriate local grading regulations, and the specifications of the project geotechnical consultant, including but not limited to those related to seismic safety, as determined in the final area-specific geotechnical studies prepared in association with all future Tentative Tract Map conditions, subject to review by the City of Coachella Director of Development Services Department, or designee, prior to the issuance of any grading permits. Specifications in the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation* (April 15, 2013) are summarized below. • **Grading Plan Review.** Finalized grading and development plans at each Tentative Tract Map submittal shall be reviewed by a qualified geotechnical consultant, and recommendations of the qualified professional geologist shall be incorporated in the grading and development plans prior to submittal to the City of Coachella for review and approval. • **Building Restriction Zones.** The Preliminary Building Restriction Zones identified in the *Updated Geotechnical Fault Investigation Report* (Petra Geotechnical, Inc., January 15, 2007) and the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation* (Petra Geotechnical, Inc., April	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	2013) shall be supplemented with additional mapping and trenching as necessary depending on the developments proposed, area of development, and the scale of maps utilized, particularly in the mapped yellow building restriction zones. Future Tentative Tract Map studies shall be evaluated by a qualified professional geologist to determine whether additional studies are warranted. These subsequent studies shall demonstrate that future development complies with the most current seismic requirements of the CBC and the City of Coachella Municipal Code. • **Excavation.** On-site materials can be excavated with conventional earthmoving equipment. Some pre-ripping may be required in some areas to facilitate excavation where dense to very dense materials occur, including the Palm Spring and Canebrake Formations. • **Soils Suitability for Use as Fill and Backfill.** On-site earth materials are generally considered suitable for use as engineered fills in the construction of building pads, roadways, and fill slopes, as long as specifications in the geotechnical report, including specified earthwork adjustments, are incorporated into project design and construction plans. • **Surface Soils.** Surface soil deposits will require removal from all areas planned to receive fill. The estimated depths of removal range from the upper 1–5 feet, with slopewash areas requiring removal of up to 14 feet, and artificial fill requiring possible removal up to 15 feet. • **Erosion.** Measures to reduce the erosion potential of engineered slopes shall include	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	enhanced compaction of fill slope faces, immediate landscaping of slopes at the completion of grading, consideration of jute matting or chemical stabilization if landscaping cannot be established within a reasonable period of time, and the use of geotextile fabrics in the construction of oversteepened fill slopes or slopes subject to erosion. • **Subdrains.** Subdrains will be required in areas underlain by the Palm Spring Formation where the depth of fill exceeds 15 feet. The locations of subdrains shall be determined by the project geotechnical consultant and shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to approval of any future Tentative Tract Maps. • **Geotechnical Specifications.** All geotechnical specifications as identified in the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation* (April 15, 2013) shall be adhered to, including: o Earthwork Specifications o Slope Specifications o Construction Specifications o Post-Grading Considerations o Preliminary Foundation Design Recommendations o Preliminary Retaining Wall Design Recommendations o Preliminary Masonry Block Wall Recommendations o Preliminary Recommendations for Exterior Concrete Flatwork	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	o Preliminary Pavement Design Specifications • **Corrosive Materials.** Further soil analysis for corrosive materials by a qualified corrosion engineer is warranted for areas where buried metallic building materials such as copper and ductile iron are planned for the project. In the event that sulfates or corrosive materials are found, recommendations to mitigate corrosive soils shall be provided by the qualified corrosion engineer in order to prevent concrete degradation under structures.	
Threshold 4.6.1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: ***iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction***		
The geotechnical investigation determined that if saturated, the Palm Spring Formation is prone to liquefaction and lateral spreading deformation during strong ground shaking. Development of the project site could introduce large volumes of water into the subsoils, which could lead to localized perched water conditions within units that could become susceptible to localized liquefaction during strong ground motion. Mitigation Measure 4.6.1, which requires compliance with the recommendations in required future geotechnical studies, would reduce impacts on the project site related to liquefaction to a less than significant level.	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.6.1, provided above	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.6.1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: ***iv) Landslides***		
The Palm Spring Formation is susceptible to landslides and block failures because of its abundant clay members, localized folding, and preexisting faults. Grading on the project site could potentially decrease slope stability in some areas. In addition, because the tops of ridges and slopes on site are covered with cobbles and boulders, these could potentially come loose during ground shaking associated with earthquakes on or near the project site. Landsliding and rockfall could be a potentially significant impact, particularly on the southwestern part of the project site and in hillside areas. Mitigation Measure 4.6.3 requires area-specific geotechnical studies to be completed to identify the potential for landslides and unstable slope conditions within each planning area.	Refer to Mitigation 4.6.1, provided earlier. **4.6.3 Landslides and Slope Stability.** As planning areas are designed and prior to issuance of grading permits, area-specific geotechnical studies shall be completed by a qualified geotechnical engineer and submitted to the City of Coachella for review and approval by the City Engineer to identify the potential for landslides and unstable slope conditions within each planning area. Specific attention shall be made to areas with a slope gradient of 30 percent or greater. Specifications by the geotechnical engineer prior to grading may include the construction of stabilization and/or	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	buttress fill slopes or the placement of underground drainage systems that may require maintenance programs to ensure their effectiveness.	
Threshold 4.6.2: Result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil		
During a storm event, there is a potential for soil erosion to occur on and in the vicinity of the project site at an accelerated rate. The required Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will identify specific Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented as part of the proposed project to minimize water quality impacts during construction, including those impacts associated with soil erosion. The proposed project would consist of large-scale grading and excavation activities that would alter existing slopes and established drainage paths, thus potentially leading to erosion. The project design would incorporate erosion control devices, such as street gutters, storm drains, culverts, and detention basins to control runoff and prevent erosion to reduce or avoid soil loss on the site due to wind and water erosion. The potential for wind- and runoff-related erosion would be substantially reduced when the project site is fully developed with structures, landscaping, and the erosion control devices described above. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6.1 and 4.9.1 would reduce erosion impacts to a less than significant level.	Refer also to Mitigation Measure 4.6.1, provided earlier, and Mitigation Measure 4.9.1, provided later.	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.6.3: 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 an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, liquefaction or collapse		
Slope Stability. Project grading activities could potentially decrease slope stability in some areas on the project site. The stability analysis of proposed cut-and-fill slopes indicated that the slope stability would meet or exceed minimum requirements for slope stability. Site-specific geotechnical studies will be completed to identify the potential for landslides and unstable slope conditions within each planning area as Tentative Tract Maps are submitted, as required in Mitigation Measure 4.6.3. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6.3 and 4.6.1, which require incorporation of recommended geotechnical measures into the final design plans, would reduce impacts associated with landslides and slope stability to a less than significant level.	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.6.1 and 4.6.3, provided earlier.	Less than Significant Impact
Subsidence. Compressible and collapsible materials are expected to be found in the near-surface parts of the slopewash, landslide deposits, and alluvial deposits on the project site. Removal of these materials would be required prior to placement of fill in those areas. Complete removal of all slopewash and shallow landslide deposits and removal of only the upper several feet of loose soils within alluvial units on the site are anticipated. Because individual development lots would be underlain by soil and bedrock materials with variable expansion potentials, the final foundation design recommendations will be	**4.6.4 Subsidence.** Prior to issuance of grading permits for tentative tract maps or planning areas, area-specific geotechnical studies shall be prepared by the applicant's qualified geotechnical engineer and submitted to the City of Coachella for review and approval by the City of Coachella Engineer. These studies shall include testing for collapsible	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
developed from the project geotechnical studies on a lot-by-lot basis based on the actual expansion, soil, and bedrock characteristics underlying each lot. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6.4 requiring geotechnical investigations and adherence to the recommendations of those geotechnical investigations would reduce the potential for subsidence impacts on the project site to a less than significant level.	soils, Laboratory analysis shall be conducted on selected samples to provide a more complete evaluation regarding remediation of potentially compressible and collapsible materials. Where appropriate, these studies shall contain specifications for overexcavation and removal of soil materials susceptible to subsidence, or other measures as appropriate to eliminate potential hazards associated with subsidence. Per the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation* (Petra Geotechnical, Inc., April 15, 2013), Section 1808.6.2 of the 2010 CBC specifies that slab-on-ground foundations (floor slabs) resting on expansive soils should be designed in accordance with the Wire Reinforcement Institute (WRI) publication "Design of Slab-on Ground Foundation" (last updated in 1996). The design procedures outlined in the WRI publication are based on the expansion potential and the weighted plasticity index of the different soil layers existing within the upper 15 feet of each building site. Since the individual lots will be underlain by soil and bedrock materials with variable expansion potentials, final foundation design recommendations shall be provided by the project geotechnical consultant on a lot-by-lot basis and shall be based on the actual expansion potentials and weighted plasticity indices of the soil and bedrock materials underlying each individual lot.	
Lateral Spreading. Field observations indicated that, if saturated, the Palm Spring Formation is susceptible to liquefaction and lateral spreading during strong ground shaking. However, current geological conditions are much different, and the Palm Spring material is semiconsolidated and much denser. In addition, groundwater is now at greater depths below the ground surface (over 50 feet [ft]). As a result, the potential for lateral spreading at the project site is considered to be low. Because the potential for lateral spreading may increase within future cut slopes graded on the site, proper drainage of irrigation and rain water runoff to avoid saturation of the underlying Palm Spring Formation would minimize the potential for lateral spreading on the project site.	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.6.1, provided earlier.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6.1 would reduce impacts associated with lateral spreading to a less than significant level.		
Liquefaction or Collapse. Refer to the earlier discussion for Threshold 4.6.1.iii, above, regarding potential effects associated with liquefaction or collapse. Mitigation Measure 4.6.1, which requires compliance with the recommendations in the final geotechnical studies, would reduce potential impacts related to liquefaction to a less than significant level.	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.6.1, provided earlier.	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.6.4: Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform California Building Code (1994), creating substantial risk to life or property		
Expansive soils are commonly found on the project site within the Palm Spring Formation. The consequences of expansive soils can include cracked walls, foundations, decks, sidewalks, garage floors, and driveways. Mitigation Measure 4.6.5 requires soil testing for expansive soils prior to construction and prescribes measures to be incorporated in the project design where expansive soils are found in areas proposed for development.	**4.6.5 Expansive Soils.** As planning areas are designed and prior to issuance of grading permits, area-specific geotechnical studies, including laboratory testing for expansive soils, shall be completed by a qualified geotechnical engineer and submitted to the City of Coachella for review and approval by the City Engineer. If expansive soils are found within the area of proposed foundations, geotechnical testing shall be employed such as excavation of expansive soils and replacement with nonexpansive compacted fill, additional remedial grading, utilization of steel reinforcing in foundations, nonexpansive building pads, presoaking, and drainage control devices to maintain a constant state of moisture. In addition to these practices, homeowners shall be advised about maintaining drainage conditions to direct the flow of water away from structures so that foundation soils do not become saturated. Section 1808.6.2 of the 2010 CBC specifies that slab-on-ground foundations (floor slabs) resting on expansive soils shall be designed in accordance with WRI publication "Design of Slab-on-Ground Foundation (last updated 1996). Individual lots will be underlain by soil and bedrock materials with variable expansion potentials; final foundation design recommendations shall be provided by the project geotechnical consultant on a lot-by-lot basis and shall be based on the actual expansion potentials; and weighted plasticity	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	indices of the soil and bedrock materials underlying each individual lot. During construction, the project engineer shall verify that expansive soil mitigation measures recommended in the final foundation design recommendations are implemented, and the City Building Official shall conduct site inspections prior to occupancy of any structure to ensure compliance with the approved measures.	
Significant Adverse Impacts		
Threshold 4.6.1: 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 Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault***		
Parts of the project site are located in an area with known and potentially active faults. Portions of the project site are located within a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. In addition, the project site and the surrounding areas are anticipated to experience strong ground shaking due to their proximity to the San Andreas Fault and other known active faults in the region. Some subsidiary faults located on the project site are considered tectonically active or potentially active. The proposed project avoids development in areas of known fault zones, with the exception of residential structures planned in the Central Village. Mitigation Measure 4.6.1 requires that final geotechnical reports be prepared as each Tentative Tract Map is submitted to delineate the exact locations of faults on the site as well as compliance with the recommendations in the *Updated Geotechnical Fault Investigation Report* (Petra Geotechnical, Inc. 2007) and the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation* (Petra Geotechnical, Inc. 2013). However, impacts from rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault, cannot be ruled out and is still considered a potentially significant impact.	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.6.1 provided earlier. **4.6.2 California Building Code Compliance and Seismic Standards.** Structures and retaining walls, if proposed, shall be designed in accordance with the seismic regulations as recommended in the CBC. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the project engineer and the Director of the City of Coachella Development Services, or designee, shall review site plans and building plans to verify that structural design conforms to the CBC.	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact
4.7 GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE		
Significant Adverse Impacts		
Threshold 4.7.1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment		
Construction. During construction of the proposed project, greenhouse gases (GHGs) would be generated by the operation of construction equipment and from worker and vendor vehicles, each of which typically uses fossil-based fuels. The combustion of fossil-based fuels creates GHGs such as carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), and nitrous oxide (N_2O).	**4.7.1 Energy Efficiency and Green Building Standards.** The proposed project shall exceed the most current Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) established by the California Energy Commission (CEC) regarding energy conservation and green buildings standards by 20	Significant Unavoidable Impact after Mitigation

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Construction activities produce combustion emissions from various sources such as grading, utility engines, on-site heavy-duty construction vehicles, equipment hauling materials to and from the site, asphalt paving, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew. Exhaust emissions from on-site construction activities would vary daily as construction activity levels change. Architectural coatings used in construction of the proposed project may contain volatile organic compounds (VOCs) that are similar to ROGs and are part of ozone (O_3) precursors. However, there are no significant emissions of GHGs from architectural coatings. **Operation.** Long-term project operations would generate GHG emissions from the proposed mix of residential and commercial land uses. Mobile source GHG emissions would include project-generated vehicle trips associated with on-site facilities (internal and external to the Specific Plan project site) and visitors to the project site. Increases in stationary source emissions would also occur at off-site utility providers as a result of demand for electricity, natural gas, and water by the proposed uses. The GHG emissions generated during the project operations would exceed the SCAQMD-tiered interim GHG significance criteria for Tier 4 and, as a result, the project effects related to GHG emissions would be significant and adverse.	percent. Building plans prepared for each Tentative Tract Map shall include the following components: • Design to United States Green Building Council (USGBC) Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED), GreenPoint Rated standard, or better for all new buildings constructed within the La Entrada Specific Plan • Energy-efficient light-emitting diode (LED) lighting and solar photovoltaic lighting fixtures in all common areas of the site • Energy-efficient appliances (ENERGY STAR or equivalent), and high efficiency heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems within residence and businesses • Green building techniques that increase building energy efficiency above the minimum requirements of Title 24 • Installation of photovoltaic panels on a minimum of 25 percent of the residences/businesses within the site • Utilization of high reflectance materials for paving and roofing materials **4.7.2** **Materials Efficiency.** Project plans for each Tentative Tract Map will include the following materials efficiency measures: • Materials used for buildings, landscape, and infrastructure will be chosen with a preference for the following characteristics: rapidly renewable; increased recycle content (50 percent or greater); locally sourced materials (within the South Coast Air Basin); utilization of sustainable harvesting practices; and	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	materials with low or no volatile organic compounds (VOCs) or off-gassing. • New building construction practices will incorporate on-site and/or off-site separation and recycling of materials designed to achieve a goal of 75 percent diversion of solid waste to landfills • On-site infrastructure materials to include recycled content to the extent feasible and available locally **4.7.3 Water Conservation and Efficiency Measures.** Project plans for each Tentative Tract Map will include the following water efficiency measures: • Utilize appropriate landscaping, nonpotable reclaimed, well, or canal water for irrigation purposes • High-efficiency plumbing fixtures and appliances that meet or exceed the most current CALGreen Code • Efficient irrigation controls to reduce water demand on landscaped areas throughout the project • Reduced amounts of irrigated turf in parks to those uses dependent upon turf areas • Implement an integrated storm water collection and conveyance system • Dual plumbing within recreation areas, landscaped medians, common landscaped areas, mixed use/commercial areas, and parks to allow the use of reclaimed water when available • Support the development of reclaimed water supplies	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	4.7.4 Landscape Design Measures. Project plans for each Tentative Tract Map will include the following landscape design measures: • Promote community-based food production within the project • Use native plant choices to the greatest extent feasible • Develop a plant palette that focuses on shading within developed portions of the site and in areas of pedestrian activity • Promote tree-lined streets to reduce heat island effects • Eliminate turf throughout the development to the extent feasible; utilize artificial turf and/or xeriscaping • Minimize impervious surfaces • Landscape to provide adequate shading within 5 years of occupancy **4.7.5 Vehicle Priority.** Prior to issuance of any Site Development permits, the Director of the City of Coachella (City) Public Works Department, or designee, shall include prioritized parking for electric vehicles, hybrid vehicles, and alternative fuel vehicles. **4.7.6 Energy Efficient Street Lights and Traffic Signals.** The City shall identify energy efficient street lights which are currently available and which, when installed, would provide a 10 percent reduction beyond the 2010 baseline energy use for this infrastructure, and shall require the use of this technology in all new development. All new traffic lights installed within the project site shall use light-emitting diode (LED) technology.	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	4.7.7 Construction Waste Management Plan. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a Construction Waste Management Plan to the City for review and approval. The plan shall include procedures to recycle and/or salvage at least 75 percent of nonhazardous construction and demolition debris and shall identify materials to be diverted from disposal and whether the materials would be stored on-site or commingled. Excavated soil and land-clearing debris do not contribute to this credit. Calculation can be done by weight or volume but must be documented. **4.7.8 Vehicle Idling Limits.** All commercial and retail development shall be required to post signs and limit idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery trucks, to no more than 5 minutes. This condition shall be included on future site development plans for review and approval by the City of Coachella Director of Development Services.	
Threshold 4.7.2: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases		
The proposed project would result in the generation of GHG emissions that would conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs; as a result, it would be considered to exceed Threshold 4.7.2, resulting in a significant unavoidable impact. In addition, because the proposed project would conflict with Threshold 4.7.2, the project climate change impacts with regard to GHG emissions would be considered cumulatively significant because they would contribute to GHG emissions that exceed the AB 32 statewide goals.	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.7.1 through 4.7.8, above, and 4.3.7, provided earlier.	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact after Mitigation
4.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
No Impacts		
Threshold 4.8.4: 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		
The project site is not included on any hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5; therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment related to sites listed pursuant to Government Code Section 65952.5.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Threshold 4.8.5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area		
The project site is approximately 4 miles (mi) northeast of Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport (formerly known as Thermal Airport) and is not within an airport land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working on site.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Threshold 4.8.6: 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		
The project site is not within the vicinity of a public airport or private airstrip and, therefore, would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working on site.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Less than Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.8.3: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school		
The proposed project would not produce any hazardous emissions or handle acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Therefore, the schools that would be located on sites identified in the Specific Plan would not be impacted by hazardous emissions or materials.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Threshold 4.8.7: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan		
The project site is in an area subject to the Riverside County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) and the Riverside County Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP). The proposed project would include multiple direct emergency vehicle access routes to/from the project site. The proposed project would result in increased traffic on roads and around the project site that could potentially result in substantial delays to emergency vehicles. However, the proposed project would accommodate the future development of police and fire stations on the project site and secondary emergency access as part of the project circulation design that would be reviewed for approval by the City Fire Department. As a result, the potential project impacts related to delays to emergency vehicles would be reduced to a less than significant level based on those project features. The proposed project would be consistent with the City's Updated General Plan Safety Element and Fire and Emergency Medical Services Master Plan, which addresses emergency response and evacuation procedures during events such as earthquakes, hazardous materials incidents, floods, national security emergencies, wildfires, and landslides. Therefore, the project effects related to consistency with the General Plan would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.8.8: 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		
The project site is in an area that has a Low to Moderate wildfire hazard potential. The proposed project would comply with the requirements of the City's Fire Code for uses in	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
the Moderate fire risk zone and design components required by the City's Fire Department that would reduce the potential risk of wildfires to a less than significant level. Operation of the proposed project would not increase the potential for wildland fires; therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant adverse risk of loss, injury, or death related to wildland fires.		
Less than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Incorporated		
Threshold 4.8.1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials		
Construction Impacts. Project construction would involve the routine use of hazardous materials, including fuels, paints, and solvents. However, the amounts of these materials used during construction would be limited and regulated and would not pose a significant threat or be considered a significant environmental hazard. The construction contractor would implement BMPs related to hazardous materials storage and use during construction to reduce any potential release of a hazardous material to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure 4.8.1 requires the development of a Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan to address potential impacts associated with contaminated groundwater during subsurface soil disturbance and groundwater activities and the potential to encounter on-site unknown hazards or hazardous substances during construction. Mitigation Measure 4.8.2 requires the development of a Health and Safety Plan for soil and groundwater disturbance that would address potential risks to construction workers during construction. Based on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), impacts associated with asbestos-containing materials (ACMs), lead-based paints (LBPs), and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) containing fixtures would not occur because there are no existing buildings or structures on the project site, and the project does not include any utility relocation. **Operation.** Operation of the proposed project would involve the use and storage of hazardous materials typically associated with residential, commercial, retail, public facility, and park uses such as solvents, cleaning agents, paints, and pesticides. This would result in a less than significant hazard to residents, employees, or visitors based on compliance with existing regulations regarding the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Operation of the proposed project would not produce hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste beyond the typical household and commercial materials described above. Therefore, the proposed project would not create significant hazards to the public or to the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	**4.8.1 Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Riverside County Fire Chief or designee shall review and approve a hazardous materials contingency plan that addresses the potential to encounter on-site unknown hazards or hazardous substances during construction activities. The plan, which will be prepared by the project applicant for review and approval by the City of Coachella Director of Development Services, shall indicate that if construction workers encounter underground tanks, gases, odors, uncontained spills, or other unidentified substances, the contractor shall stop work, cordon off the affected area, and notify the Riverside County Department of Public Health (RCDPH). The RCDPH responder shall determine the next steps regarding possible site evacuation, sampling, and disposal of the substance consistent with local, State, and federal regulations during construction periods. **Disposal of Potentially Hazardous Materials During Construction.** During construction activities, the project applicant shall immediately notify the City of Coachella Building Official and the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD), Health Hazardous Materials Division, Division Chief, if any unknown substances or potentially hazardous materials are encountered. The County Health Hazardous Materials Division Chief shall determine the appropriate procedures for the handling and disposal of the materials in	Less than Significant Impacts with Mitigation

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	accordance with local, State, and federal regulations. **4.8.2 Health and Safety Plan for Soil and Groundwater Disturbance During Construction.** Prior to issuance of any grading permits, the project applicant shall submit a Health and Safety Plan to the City of Coachella Building Official for review and approval. The program shall be consistent with local, State, and federal regulations and shall encompass all subsurface soil disturbance and groundwater activities during construction activities. The Health and Safety Plan shall include the following components: • A summary of all potential risks to construction workers, monitoring programs, maximum exposure limits for all site chemicals, and emergency procedures; • The identification of a site health and safety officer; • Methods of contact, phone number, office location, and responsibilities of the site health and safety officer; • Specification that the site health and safety officer shall be contacted immediately by the construction contractor if evidence of soil or groundwater contamination is encountered during site preparation and construction; and • Specification that the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) shall be notified if evidence of soil contamination is encountered, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board shall be notified if groundwater contamination is encountered.	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Threshold 4.8.2: Create a significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment		
Construction. Project construction would involve the routine use of hazardous materials, including fuels, paints, and solvents. However, due to the fact that the amount of these materials during construction would be limited and regulated, they would not pose a significant threat or be considered a significant environmental hazard. In addition, the City is required to implement BMPs related to hazardous materials storage and use during construction. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.1, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, and impacts are considered less than significant. **Operation.** Project operation would involve the use of potential hazardous materials (i.e., solvents, cleaning agents, paints, and pesticides) typical of residential, commercial, retail, public facility, and park uses; however, when used correctly, these materials would not result in a significant hazard to employees or community members. Operation of the proposed project would not produce hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste beyond the typical household and commercial materials just described. Therefore, the proposed project would not create significant hazards to the public or to the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of materials into the environment since no acutely hazardous materials would be handled on site.	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.8.1 and 4.8.2, provided above.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation
4.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY		
No Impact		
Threshold 4.9.9: 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		
The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. There are no dams or reservoirs upslope of the project site; therefore, the project site is not in the flood zone of a dam. During a seismic event, there is a possibility the Coachella Canal levee could fail. The project site is approximately 750 ft from the levee of the Coachella Canal, and the majority of the project site is higher in elevation than the Coachella Canal. Therefore, flooding from failure of the levee would occur down slope of the project site. As a result, the proposed project would not 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 mitigation is required.	No Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Less than Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.9.2: 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)		
Groundwater supplies and recharge are addressed in detail later in this table in the thresholds under 4.17 Water Supply. As described in 4.17 Water Supply, construction and operation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.9.7: 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, ***and*** ***Threshold 4.9.8: Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows***		
The project site is within Zone X (areas determined to be outside the 0.2 percent annual chance, 500-year floodplain) and Zone D (areas in which flood hazards are undetermined, but possible). Because the majority of the site is in Zone D, there is a potential for the proposed project to place housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. The Sustainable Community Design Strategies include implementation of an integrated storm water collection and a conveyance system designed to provide 100-year flood protection to flood-prone areas, prohibition of development within on-site floodplains, and integration of setbacks/buffers and passive recreational amenities in these areas into the Specific Plan land use plan. Therefore, based on implementation of the Sustainable Community Design Strategies, project structures and housing would be protected from the 100-year flood, and impacts related to placement of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.9.10: Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow		
There are no water retention facilities in proximity to the project site. The on-site retention basins included in the proposed project would temporarily detain runoff and, as a result of their temporary nature, would not constitute a body of water. Therefore, the risk associated with seiche waves is not considered a potential constraint or a potentially significant impact of the project. The project site is not located in a designated tsunami inundation zone. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to exposure of people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of inundation by tsunami. During the geologic mapping for the proposed project, minor debris/mudflows on the site were noted. Because of the minor nature of those debris/mudflows, the risk associated with possible mudflows and mudslides is not considered a potential constraint or a	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance
potentially significant impact of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the exposure of people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of inundation by mudflow.			
Less than Significant Impacts with Mitigation			
Threshold 4.9.1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and Threshold 4.9.6: Otherwise substantially degrade water quality			
Construction. Pollutants of concern during construction include sediments, trash, petroleum products, dry and wet concrete waste, sanitary waste, chemicals, and other materials. The pollutants of concern may be spilled or leaked and have the potential to be transported via storm runoff into the downstream Whitewater River. During construction, excavated soil would be exposed, resulting in increased potential for soil erosion compared to existing conditions. Mitigation Measure 4.9.1 would require the construction of each project phase to comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit, including preparation and implementation of a SWPPP and implementation of the construction BMPs in the SWPPP to minimize erosion, prevent spills, and retain sediment and other pollutants on site so they would not reach receiving waters. This measure would reduce potential impacts related to violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and degradation of water quality to a less than significant level. **Operation.** Pollutants of concern during operation of the proposed project land uses could include sediment, nutrients, organic compounds, trash and debris, oxygen-demanding substances, bacteria and viruses, oil and grease, pesticides, metals, and other materials. The proposed project would result in a permanent increase in impervious surface area on the project site, which would increase the volume of storm water runoff and would more effectively transport pollutants to receiving waters. Mitigation Measure 4.9.2 requires the preparation and implementation of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for each project phase. Site Design, Source Control, and Treatment BMPs specified in the WQMPs would be incorporated in the project design to treat storm water runoff prior to discharge to the storm drain system. Mitigation Measure 4.9.3 requires the preparation and implementation of a Maintenance and Management Program to ensure the ongoing functionality of the storm water facility BMPs. The WQMP, BMPs, and Maintenance and Management Program for each project phase would reduce potential operational impacts related to violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and degradation of water quality to less than significant levels. **Retention Basins.** The Specific Plan allows for the provision of retention basins in open space areas on the project site to provide flood control and water quality benefits as	**4.9.1**	**Construction General Permit.** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall obtain coverage for each phase of the project under the State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, Permit No. CAS000002) (Construction General Permit), or subsequent issuance. The applicant shall provide the Waste Discharge Identification Numbers to the City of Coachella Director of Public Works to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Construction General Permit. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared and implemented for each phase of the project in compliance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. The SWPPPs shall identify construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented to ensure that the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation is minimized and to control the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff as a result of construction activities. **4.9.2** **Water Quality Management Plans.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall submit a Final Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for each phase of the project to the City of Coachella Director of Public Works for review and approval. The WQMPs shall be consistent	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
required by the City's Municipal Code. However, the Drainage Master Plan for the proposed project shows that retention basins are not anticipated to be required because they would be redundant with the existing East Side Dike downstream of the project site. The Drainage Master Plan and associated hydrology are under review by the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD). The Drainage Master Plan shows, subject to CVWD acceptance, that the existing East Side Dike would provide adequate flood control for the project site and that no retention basins would be required. If the retention basins are not required for flood control, the water quality and sediment control functions of those retention basins would be met through water quality basins and other BMP features on the site, which would be developed in the WQMPs prepared for each project phase. If approved by CVWD, the drainage plan without on-site regional retention basins as included in the Specific Plan would modify the Coachella Municipal Code requirements for 100 percent on-site retention. **Vector Control.** If required by the CVWD, the on-site retention basins could provide habitat for larval mosquitoes. The location of the project site downwind from agricultural areas may result in the increased need for fly and eye gnat control. Irrigation on the project site could increase the suitability of the site for red imported fire ants. Mitigation Measure 4.9.4 requires implementation of a vector control program to address the control of mosquitos, flies, eye gnats, and red imported fire ants. Mitigation Measures 4.9.3 and 4.9.4 would reduce the potential impacts related to vectors to less than significant levels.	with the requirements of the Whitewater River Region Water Quality Management Plan for Urban Runoff (January 2011 or subsequent issuance). Project-specific Site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) contained in the Final WQMPs shall be incorporated into final design. The BMPs shall be properly designed and maintained to target pollutants of concern and reduce runoff from the project site. The WQMPs shall include an operations and maintenance plan for the prescribed Treatment Control BMPs to ensure their long-term performance. As detailed in the *Water Quality Assessment Report* (September 2012), Site Design BMPs to be considered and incorporated into the project where feasible include conserving natural areas and minimizing urban runoff, impervious footprint, and directly connected impervious areas. Nonstructural Source Control BMPs to be considered and incorporated into the project where feasible include education/training for property owners, operators, tenants, occupants, or employees; activity restrictions; irrigation system and landscape maintenance; common area litter control; street sweeping of private streets and parking lots; and drainage facility inspection and maintenance. Structural Source Control BMPs to be considered and incorporated into the project where feasible include storm drain inlet stenciling and signage; landscape and irrigation system design; protection of slopes and channels; provision of community car wash racks; provision of wash water controls for food preparation areas; and proper design and maintenance of fueling areas, air/water supply area drainage, trash storage areas, loading docks,	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	maintenance bays, vehicle and equipment wash areas, outdoor material storage areas, and outdoor work areas or processing areas. Treatment Control BMPs to be considered and incorporated into the project where feasible include biofilters (grass swales, grass strips, wetland vegetation swales, and bioretention), detention basins (extended/dry detention basins with grass lining and extended/dry detention basins with impervious lining), infiltration BMPs (infiltration basins, infiltration trenches, and porous pavement), wet ponds or wetlands (permanent pool wet ponds and construction wetlands), filtration systems (sand filters and media filters), water quality inlets, hydrodynamic separator systems (hydrodynamic devices, baffle boxes, swirl concentrators, or cyclone separators), and manufactured or proprietary devices. **4.9.3** **Best Management Practices (BMP) Maintenance and Management Program.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a detailed maintenance and management program for construction and post-construction storm water facilities shall be prepared that includes, but is not be limited to: detailed landscaped design criteria, a detailed plan for the control of vectors indigenous to wetlands, a detailed plan for the control of mosquitos (in addition to a separate Vector Control Program for non-storm water facilities per Mitigation Measure 4.9.4), and a plan to evaluate the overall health of the facility on a regular schedule and implement any corrective actions necessary to maintain the facility's ability to improve water quality. **4.9.4** **Vector Control Program.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall develop a	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	Vector Control Program in coordination with the Coachella Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District. The Vector Control Program shall address control of flies, eye gnats, imported red fire ants, and mosquitos. The vector control program shall include measures such as landscape maintenance, removal of vegetation and landscape clippings, irrigation management, use of desert landscaping, irrigation management, and turf management.	
Threshold 4.9.3: ***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*** ***and*** ***Threshold 4.9.4:*** ***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 which would result in flooding on or off site***		
Construction. Because the project site would be graded and excavated, soil would be exposed during construction and there would be increased potential for soil erosion compared to existing conditions. During a storm event, soil erosion and sedimentation could occur at an accelerated rate. In addition, grading and construction activities would compact soil, and construction of structures would increase the impervious area, which can increase runoff during construction. Mitigation Measure 4.9.1 requires preparation and implementation of a SWPPP and Construction BMPs for each project phase to reduce water quality impacts during construction, including impacts associated with soil erosion and increased runoff. That measure, which also requires compliance with the requirements of the General Construction Permit, would reduce potential construction impacts related to erosion, siltation, and flooding to less than significant levels. **Operation.** The proposed project would change on-site drainage patterns and increase storm water runoff by substantially increasing the impervious surfaces on the site. The proposed project would include a comprehensive drainage system to collect and convey on-site storm flows. Mitigation Measure 4.9.5 requires the preparation of a detailed hydrology study for each project phase to ensure that the on-site storm collection and drainage facilities are appropriately sized to prevent on-site or off-site flooding. Treatment BMPs, including bioswales and retention basins, would be incorporated in each project phase as required in Mitigation Measure 4.9.2. These BMPs would be designed to convey storm water and minimize on-site erosion and siltation. The Specific Plan allows for retention basins in the on-site open space areas to retain 100 percent of the 100-year, 24-hour storm event on site and would not result in substantial	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.9.1 and 4.9.2, provided earlier. **4.9.5 Hydrology Reports.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall submit a final hydrology report for each phase of the project to the City of Coachella Director of Public Works for review and approval. The hydrology reports shall demonstrate, based on hydrologic calculations, that the project's on-site storm conveyance and retention facilities are designed in accordance with the requirement of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Hydrology Manual.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
erosion, siltation, or flooding off site. Subject to CVWD acceptance, the existing East Side Dike would provide adequate flood control for the project site and land uses, and the retention basins would not be required. In that case, runoff from the site would continue to be retained temporarily by the East Side Dike and then discharged to the Whitewater River (Coachella Valley Storm Drain Channel) via Wasteway No. 2. The project site is on the east side of the existing East Side Dike flood control embankment. As a result, the project would not substantially alter existing regional flows that create ponding adjacent to the East Side Dike during a major event. As discussed in the Drainage Master Plan, the proposed project would increase runoff volume from the site by 296 acre-feet (af) for a 1 percent annual chance 24-hour storm event and by 196 af for the Standard Project Flood, which would increase the water surface elevation in the East Side Dike. Compared to existing conditions, the change in velocity of flows leaving the project site would be minimal and is not anticipated to result in erosion. Changes to the flow conditions (peak flow, volume, and concentration) at the East Side Dike would be minor compared to existing conditions and are not anticipated to result in erosion of the dike. The proposed project would reduce overland flows that currently inundate the project site during large storm events. The flood limits and runoff velocities on the project site would be substantially reduced in the with-project condition. As a result, the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding off site and, with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.9.2 and 4.9.5, those potential impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.		
Threshold 4.9.5: Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff		
Construction. Construction of the proposed project has the potential to introduce pollutants into the storm water drainage system as a result of erosion, siltation, and accidental spills. Grading and construction would compact soil. The proposed project would increase the impervious areas on the site, which can increase runoff during construction. Mitigation Measure 4.9.1 requires preparation and implementation of a SWPPP and Construction BMPs to reduce impacts to water quality. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.9.1, which also requires compliance with the Construction General Permit and implementation of BMPs during construction, construction impacts related to exceeding the capacity limits of, and providing additional sources of polluted runoff to, storm water drainage systems would be reduced to less than significant levels. **Operation.** Each phase of the proposed project would include a comprehensive drainage system to collect and convey on-site storm flows. The detailed hydrology studies for each	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.9.1, 4.9.2 and 4.9.5, provided earlier.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
phase required in Mitigation Measure 4.9.5 would ensure that the on-site storm drain facilities are appropriately sized to prevent on-site flooding. If on-site retention basins are included in the proposed project, storm water runoff would be retained on site and, therefore, would not contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of the downstream storm drain facilities. If the on-site retention basins are determined to not be required, the increased runoff from the site would continue to be retained temporarily by the East Side Dike with sufficient freeboard before being discharged to the Whitewater River (Coachella Valley Storm Drain Channel) via Wasteway No. 2. Therefore, the operation of the proposed project would not exceed the capacity of the downstream storm drain system. In addition, as required in Mitigation Measure 4.9.2, the proposed project, with or without the on-site retention basins, would include Site Design, Source Control, and Treatment BMPs to target pollutants of concern in runoff from the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.9.2 and 4.9.5, operational impacts related to exceeding the capacity limits of, and providing additional sources of polluted runoff to, storm water drainage systems would be reduced to a less than significant level.		
4.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING		
No Impacts		
Threshold 4.10.1: Physically divide an established community		
The project site is currently vacant. Development associated with the proposed project would occur on approximately 1,600 ac of the project site. Although the proposed project would extend Avenues 50 and 52 across the project site, the proposed project would not divide established communities; therefore, no impacts to existing development would occur.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Threshold 4.10.3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP)		
The proposed project is within the planning area of the CVMSHCP, which encompasses over 1,000,000 ac in the Coachella Valley. Although the project site is in the planning area of the CVMSHCP, the project site is adjacent to but not located in any of the 27 designated Conservation Areas intended to preserve natural communities in the Coachella Valley. Indirect impacts of the proposed project on those adjacent Conservation Areas would be addressed based on compliance with the CVMSHCP Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the CVMSHCP.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Less than Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.10.2: 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		
General Plan Consistency. The proposed project would modify the General Plan land use designations on the project site and would change the designation of the General Plan	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Land Use Map from the McNaughton Specific Plan to the La Entrada Specific Plan. The proposed project would expand the Specific Plan boundaries to include within the City boundary approximately 588 ac that are currently located in unincorporated Riverside County. The proposed project would require a General Plan Amendment (GPA) and Zone Change to reflect the Specific Plan land uses. If the proposed project is approved subsequent to completion of the General Plan update, the proposed project would be already be incorporated into the General Plan and Zoning Code and would not require a GPA or Zone Change. The City's General Plan Land Use Element contains goals and policies applicable to the proposed project. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable policies in the General Plan. Approval of a GPA and Zone Change would enable the La Entrada Specific Plan to serve as the guiding land use and zoning document for the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the City's General Plan. **City Zoning Code.** The proposed project would modify the existing zoning designations for the site to allow for the land uses in the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, a zone change would be required prior to approval of the proposed project to change the existing zoning on site, with an overall zoning designation of "Specific Plan" for the entire project site. Approval of a Zone Change to reflect the specific zoning designations in the La Entrada Specific Plan would ensure that the proposed project would be consistent with the City's Zoning Ordinance. **SCAG RCP.** The project site is immediately adjacent to I-10. The proposed extensions of Avenues 50 and 52 across the project site would connect to a future proposed interchange at I-10. The proposed interchange is a separate project and is not considered in the environmental analyses in this Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The proposed Specific Plan development includes housing, commercial, and office uses that would further achievement of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) jobs/housing balancing objective. The proposed project includes multipurpose trails, neighborhood electric vehicles (NEVs), Class 1 and 2 bike lanes, pedestrian/hiking trails, and equestrian trails. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) policies encouraging the use of alternative transportation near new industrial, commercial, and residential development. **Riverside County LAFCO Annexation Process.** The proposed project would be consistent with most of the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) goals and policies for annexation. Development of the proposed project would be inconsistent with LAFCO's policy of encouraging development to be consistent with its surrounding area		

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
and encouraging development in areas of annexation to occur within 10 years. The proposed project would be implemented over a period of 30 years. Because the project proposes a large-scale master planned community, it would be inconsistent with surrounding areas. Some public services and utilities may not be provided to the project site in a timely manner. Therefore, the proposed project would be inconsistent with LAFCO's policy requiring areas of annexation to demonstrate that services and utilities can be provided in a timely manner. However, approval of annexation of the 588 ac parcel to the City by LAFCO would ultimately override/mitigate any inconsistencies between the proposed project and LAFCO policies.		
4.11 MINERAL RESOURCES		
No Impact		
Threshold 4.11.2: Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan		
The project site has not been identified as a locally important mineral resource recovery site in either of the City or County General Plans, the adopted McNaughton Specific Plan, or any other land use plan. Therefore, there would be no loss in the availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site as a result of the proposed project.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Less than Significant Impact		
Threshold 4.11.1: 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		
The project site is within Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 3 and contains aggregate mineral deposits such as sand and gravel. During construction, a substantial amount of sand and gravel that may be suitable for aggregate would be reused on site and would not be available for other future uses. During project operation, no access to sand and gravel resources on the project site would be available; therefore, those resources would not be available for use in the future. There is nothing unique about these sand and gravel materials that would classify them as significantly important. Existing commercial aggregate sources and undeveloped local and regional sources would adequately meet existing and future needs in the City and the Coachella Valley.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
4.12 NOISE		
No Impacts		
Threshold 4.12.5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels ***and*** ***Threshold 4.12.6: 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***		
The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a public airport or private airstrip. The closest airport is Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport (formerly known as Thermal Airport), approximately 4 mi southwest of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working on the project site to excessive aviation-related noise levels.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Less than Significant Impact		
Threshold 4.12.2: Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.		
Construction. Ground-borne noise and vibration from construction activities would be mostly low to moderate unless pavement breaking and/or sheet pile vibration are used on site or when bulldozers and other heavy-tracked equipment are used. Those activities would temporarily impact receptors during the site preparation project phase. However, the ground-borne noise and vibration would not be excessive and would not cause any damage to the buildings or impact outdoor activities. **Operation.** Ground-borne noise and vibration from vehicular traffic during project operation would not result in a significant impact because the roads on the project site would be new roads with smooth pavement, thereby reducing noise and vibration associated with discontinuity on road surfaces (i.e., vehicles crossing over potholes, bumps, expansion joints, etc.).	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated		
Threshold 4.12.1: 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		
Construction. The proposed project would expose residences constructed in the earlier project phases within 100 ft of construction areas in later phases to construction noise levels up to 85 dBA L_{max} (maximum noise level measured in A-weighted decibels) during site preparation. This noise is associated with the transport of construction equipment and materials, excavation, grading, and construction activities. Mitigation Measure 4.12.1 would ensure that noise generated during the project construction phases would comply with the time periods specified in the City's Municipal Code.	**4.12.1 Construction Noise.** During construction activities, the Construction Contractor shall implement the following standard noise reduction measures and shall adhere to the City of Coachella's (City) construction noise hours indicated in the City's Municipal Code Sub-Chapter 7.04.070, Construction Activities, as listed below: • The construction contractor shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards. • The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors to the west of the site. • The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors to	Less than Significant with Mitigation

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	the west of the site during all project construction. • All construction, maintenance, or demolition activities within the City boundary shall be limited to the following hours: o October 1 through April 30 Monday–Friday: 6:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Saturday: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Sunday: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Holidays: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. o May 1 through September 30 Monday–Friday: 5:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Saturday: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Sunday: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Holidays: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.	
Operation. Residences in the Medium Density Residential area in Planning Area G12 that are within 256 ft of the Avenue 50 centerline would be exposed to traffic noise exceeding the exterior noise standards for residential uses (over a 24-hour period). To reduce exterior noise levels to 60 dBA CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent level measured in A-weighted decibels) or lower, sound walls would need to be constructed for residences with outdoor living areas (backyard, patio, balcony, or deck). Uses proposed in the Mixed-Use Planning Areas include retail commercial, office commercial, high-density residential, and community/public facilities (Planning Areas G7, G8, G9, G10, and G11) along Avenue 50. If residences are proposed in Planning Areas G9, G10, and G11 that are within the noise impact zones, they would require sound walls and/or interior upgrade requirements. Depending on the location of the recreational facility within the proposed parks/recreation zone, sound walls and/or interior upgrades may be required if they are located within the 65 dBA CNEL impact areas. Even with the recommended sound walls, residences along Avenue 50 would be exposed to traffic noise exceeding 57 dBA CNEL. With windows open, rooms exposed to traffic noise higher than 57 dBA CNEL would not meet the 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard. To ensure that windows can remain closed for prolonged periods of time, a mechanical ventilation system, such as an air-conditioning system, would be required to achieve the interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL at those residences.	**4.12.2** **Noise Reduction at Planning Areas G12, G9, G10, and G11 Along Avenue 50.** The project proponent shall conduct site-specific noise analyses for sensitive receptors within Planning Areas G12, G9, G10, and G11 along Avenue 50 for review and approval by the City of Coachella (City) prior to approval of the Tentative Tract Map. The purpose of these analyses will be to confirm the applicability of the following building upgrades for each structure, as well as the location/height of sound walls: • Areas exceeding 70 A-weighted decibels (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) (within 58 feet [ft] from centerline of Avenue 50): 8 ft sound wall for ground level outdoor areas and 5 ft sound wall for upper floor outdoor areas; • Areas exceeding 65 dBA CNEL (within 120 ft from centerline of Avenue 50): 6 ft sound wall for ground level outdoor areas and 5 ft sound wall for upper floor areas;	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	• Areas exceeding 60 dBA CNEL (within 256 ft from centerline of Avenue 50): 5 ft sound wall for both ground floor and upper floor outdoor areas; • Structures that would be exposed to exterior noise exceeding 69 dBA CNEL (within 68 ft of Avenue 50 centerline) would require upgrades, such as windows with sound transmission class (STC) ratings of STC-28 or higher; and • Air-conditioning systems are required for residential structures directly adjacent to Avenue 50. **4.12.3 Noise Reduction at Planning Areas G6 and G7 Along Avenue 50.** The project proponent shall conduct site-specific noise analyses for sensitive receptors within Planning Areas G6 and G7 along Avenue 50 for review and approval by the City of Coachella (City) prior to approval of the Tentative Tract Map. The purpose of these analyses will be to confirm the applicability of the following building upgrades for each structure, as well as the location/height of sound walls: • Areas exceeding 70 A-weighted decibels (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) (within 54 feet [ft] from centerline of Avenue 50): 8 ft sound wall for ground level outdoor areas and 5 ft sound wall for upper floor outdoor areas; • Areas exceeding 65 dBA CNEL (within 110 ft from centerline of Avenue 50): 6 ft sound wall for ground level outdoor areas and 5 ft sound wall for upper floor areas; • Areas exceeding 60 dBA CNEL (within 235 ft from centerline of Avenue 50): 5 ft sound wall	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	for both ground floor and upper floor outdoor areas; • Structures that would be exposed to exterior noise exceeding 69 dBA CNEL (within 63 ft of Avenue 50 centerline) would require upgrades, such as windows with sound transmission class (STC) 28 or higher; and • Air-conditioning systems are required for residential structures directly adjacent to Avenue 50.	
Residences in Planning Areas G5 (High Density Residential), G8 (High Density Residential), G19 (Medium Density Residential), and G20 (Low Density Residential) within 2,100 ft, 975 ft, and 453 ft of the I-10 centerline, respectively, would be exposed to traffic noise exceeding the exterior residential noise standards. To reduce exterior noise levels, sound walls would be required for residential units with outdoor living areas (backyard, patio, balcony, or deck) along the segments of I-10 adjacent to those zones. Because it is not known at this time what specific types of mixed uses would be developed in Mixed-Use Planning Areas G6 and G7 along I-10, it is not feasible to identify location-specific sound reduction mitigation measures for the future land uses directly adjacent to I-10. Nonetheless, even with recommended sound walls implemented, residences along I-10 would be exposed to traffic noise exceeding 57 dBA CNEL. Because all the frontline residences along I-10 are expected to be exposed to traffic noise higher than 57 dBA CNEL, an air-conditioning system is required for residences directly adjacent to I-10.	**4.12.4** **Noise Reduction at Planning Areas G5, G8, G19, and G20 Along I-10.** The project proponent shall conduct site-specific noise analyses for sensitive receptors within Planning Areas G5, G8, G19, and G20 along I-10 for review and approval by the City of Coachella (City) prior to approval of the Tentative Tract Map. The purpose of these analyses will be to confirm the applicability of the following building upgrades for each structure, as well as the location/height of sound walls: • Areas exceeding 70 A-weighted decibels (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) (within 619 feet [ft] from centerline of Interstate 10 [I-10]): 8 ft sound wall for ground level outdoor areas and 5 ft sound wall for upper floor outdoor areas; • Areas exceeding 65 dBA CNEL (within 1,333 ft from centerline of I-10): 6 ft sound wall for ground level outdoor areas and 5 ft sound wall for upper floor areas; • Areas exceeding 60 dBA CNEL (within 2,871 ft from centerline of I-10): 5 ft sound wall for both ground floor and upper floor outdoor areas; • Structures that would be exposed to exterior noise exceeding 69 dBA CNEL (within 722 ft	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	of I-10 centerline) would require upgrades, such as windows with sound transmission class (STC) 28 or higher; and • Air-conditioning systems are required for residential structures directly adjacent to I-10.	
Threshold 4.12.3: A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project		
There would be an increase in traffic noise levels on several road segments in the project vicinity as a result of the proposed project. However, there are either no existing noise-sensitive land uses or no noise-sensitive outdoor living areas that would be exposed to the traffic noise along those roads.	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.12.3 and 4.12.4, provided earlier.	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation
Threshold 4.12.4: A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project		
Cconstruction at the project site would temporarily increase ambient noise levels above existing levels without the project. The high noise levels that would occur during site preparation for each project phase would be short term. Other construction activities would generate lower noise levels, and the majority of the construction activity would occur more than 100 ft from the nearest noise sensitive receptors. In addition, the proposed project would comply with the time periods for construction specified in the City's Municipal Code as required in Mitigation Measure 4.12.1.	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.12.1, provided earlier.	Less than Significant Impact
4.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING		
No Impacts		
Threshold 4.13.2 Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere and Threshold 4.13.3 Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere		
The project site is currently vacant and has not historically been used for residential uses. The construction and operation of the proposed project would not displace existing housing or residents or require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere in the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to existing housing, the displacement of residents, or the need for replacement housing.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Less than Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.13.1 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)		
The project proposes 7,800 dwelling units on the project site, which would result in approximately 35,958 residents. The approved McNaughton Specific Plan proposed 8,000 dwelling units on 1,877 ac in the City of Coachella. The City General Plan and zoning designations were amended to reflect that approved development on that parcel. The 35,958 residents forecast for site under the La Entrada Specific Plan are accounted for in the SCAG and City projections because the land uses under the approved McNaughton Specific Plan were provided to SCAG as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impacts

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
and included future population growth forecasts. As a result, because the La Entrada Specific Plan proposes fewer dwelling units, implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to population growth. The proposed project would create construction jobs during each project phase that would be temporary or seasonal and specific to the variety of construction activities. These short-term jobs are anticipated to be filled by existing workers who, for the most part, reside in the Coachella Valley area. Therefore, construction jobs for the proposed project would not generate a permanent increase in population in the project area. The project proposes approximately 1.5 million square feet (sf) of nonresidential uses, which would result in up to 3,355 jobs. These new jobs would maintain the City's current jobs-to-housing ratio by providing jobs for local area residents. While the place of residence of the persons accepting employment provided by the proposed use is uncertain, due to the City's projected jobs-to-housing ratio, it is reasonable that a large percentage of these jobs would be filled by persons already living in the City or surrounding areas. Therefore, no significant increase in population in the City or surrounding areas would result from the operation of the proposed on-site uses. The population growth anticipated under the Specific Plan would not induce growth beyond the growth the City has already anticipated with respect to utilities and infrastructure. Because the proposed Specific Plan was identified and planned for under the General Plan and planned infrastructure improvements would not be oversized to serve additional growth beyond that described in the Specific Plan, the proposed Specific Plan would not result in growth-inducing impacts and no mitigation is required.		
4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES		
Less than Significant Impacts with Payment of Required School Fees		
Threshold 4.14.3: ***Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools***		
Elementary and Middle Schools. The four proposed school sites included in the Specific Plan total approximately 69.8 ac and range from 15 to 25 ac in size per school. Approximately 5,837 new students would be added as a result of the proposed project. Although the proposed project would not specifically develop the proposed school facilities, it would accommodate future development by reserving sites for the proposed schools. The proposed project would include a Project Design Feature requiring the project to pay school fees at the issuance of each grading permit. Payment of these fees would fully mitigate potential long-term impacts to school facilities by providing funds for the future development of schools on the project site. Because most elementary and	No mitigation, beyond the payment of the required school fees, is required.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
middle schools that serve the project area are overcapacity, the students generated at each phase of project development would result in significant interim impacts to existing school facilities until the proposed schools are constructed. Pursuant to Education Code Section 17620, the payment of the School Impact Fees would fully mitigate the impacts of the project on elementary and middle school facilities. **High School.** The proposed Specific Plan would generate approximately 1,575 high school level students who would attend the existing Coachella Valley Union High School. That high school is currently operating above capacity; therefore, the increased demand at that high school would be an adverse effect of the proposed project. However, pursuant to Education Code Section 17620, the payment of School Impact Fees would fully mitigate the impacts of the project on high school facilities.		
Less than Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.14.5: 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 public transportation		
Each phase of the proposed project would accommodate existing Sunline Transit Agency Lines 90 and 91, extending those bus routes into the project site to loop through "Street A." As a result, the impacts of the proposed project on public transportation would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. The proposed project would include NEVs that consist of golf carts and other electronically powered low-speed vehicles. The NEVs would provide alternative modes of transportation and reduce vehicle miles traveled within the Specific Plan area. The project would also provide bicycle facilities (i.e., lanes and paths) throughout the Specific Plan area.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.14.6: 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 other public utilities		
Verizon Wireless and Time Warner Cable would extend their current facilities to the proposed project to meet the need for telephone, internet, and cable services associated with the proposed project. The proposed project would ensure the provision of telecommunication services by requiring plan checks and tract map approval during each project phase. Therefore, because Verizon Wireless and Time Warner Cable would be able to provide adequate telephone, internet, and cable services to the proposed project, no adverse impact would occur to these services.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.14.7: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board		
The City's wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) does not have adequate capacity to accommodate the increase in wastewater generated by the proposed project. Because		Less than Significant

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
wastewater from the Specific Plan would be regulated under the Colorado River Basin RWQCB WDR Order No. R7-2005-0083, compliance with the WDR Order permit requirements would ensure that wastewater discharges coming from the Specific Plan site and treated by the WWTP would not exceed applicable Colorado River Basin RWQCB wastewater treatment discharge requirements.		
Threshold 4.14.8: Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects		
Storm water on the project site would require the construction of new storm water collection and drainage facilities and the expansion of existing facilities. Regional flows from north of the project site flow through seven alluvial drainages on the site and are directed toward the East Side Dike at the southwest edge of the project site and farther south to Wasteway No. 2. Runoff would also flow through storm drains or within streets to: (1) on-site retention basins where it would be held until it percolates the soil if the on-site retention basins are included in the project, or (2) directed into water quality basins that would treat runoff before discharging the runoff into the alluvial drainages. The proposed project includes channelizing these drainages in a soft-bottom condition with side walls. Storm water on the project site would flow through backbone streets to a network of storm drains and then on-site drainage channels. All storm water on the project site would be accommodated by the storm water drainage facilities included in the project. If the on-site retention basins are included in the project, the proposed project would retain storm water runoff on site and would therefore not contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of the downstream storm drain facilities. If the on-site retention basins are determined to not be required, the on-site channels would convey storm water flows to the East Side Dike. In that case, the increased runoff from the site would continue to be retained temporarily by the East Side Dike with sufficient freeboard before being discharged to the Whitewater River (Coachella Valley Storm Drain Channel) via Wasteway No. 2. Therefore, the proposed project without the on-site retention basins would not exceed the capacity of the downstream storm drain system, and the project-related impacts to storm water drainage facilities would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.14.9 Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered energy transmission facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable levels of service		
Electricity. The proposed project would generate a total monthly electricity demand of 7,560,220 kilowatt-hours (kWh), which would require the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) to install two new distribution substations on the project site and extending the existing 92-kilovolt (kV) transmission lines from the existing substation near Avenue 52 across the canal to the project site. IID would need to relocate or rearrange segments of the existing 92 kV overhead transmission lines and some existing 13 kV lines to integrate these facilities with the new on-site electric distribution facilities. The installation of two new substations and the expansion of existing transmission lines would ensure that	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
electricity demands associated with each project phase would be met. The proposed project would include energy conservation detailed in the Specific Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on electricity generation and transmission facilities. **Natural Gas.** The proposed project would generate a monthly demand of 24,512,076 cubic feet (cf) of natural gas. The proposed project would require the Southern California Gas Company (SCG) to construct a gas regulator station near an existing transmission line to provide an additional natural gas source to serve the project site. With these infrastructure improvements, the proposed project would receive acceptable levels of service related to natural gas during each project phase. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to natural gas transmission facilities.		
Threshold 4.14.12: Conflict with any federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste.		
The proposed project would comply with all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, including the solid waste diversion requirements established by the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code) and the California Integrated Water Management Act of 1989. The proposed project would require the diversion of at least 75 percent of solid waste and would adhere to Sustainable Community Design Strategies for materials efficiency that would promote recycling and the reuse of materials within the project design. Therefore, the proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and no mitigation is required.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Significant Adverse Interim Impacts		
Threshold 4.14.1: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection		
The proposed project would result in a population of approximately 35,958 residents on the project site, which would result in an increased demand on existing fire facilities and may increase response times. Therefore, the two existing fire stations that are expected to serve the proposed project would not be able to accommodate the total increase in demand for fire services at project build out. The project site would include three above-ground storage tanks and infrastructure to provide fire flow to all areas of the site. All residences would be equipped with fire protection sprinkler systems. The project applicant would be required to pay Fire Impact Fees to fund future fire facilities to serve the project site. The proposed project would provide a site for future development of a fire station, but would not include construction of that fire station. Therefore, there would be significant adverse unavoidable interim impacts during construction and operation of the proposed project to existing fire services until the proposed fire station is constructed and operational.	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant Adverse Interim Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Subsequent to the opening of the operational fire station, impacts related to fire services and facilities would be considered less than significant.		
Threshold 4.14.2: ***Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection***		
The 35,958 residents on the project site would increase demand on existing police facilities and services and may increase response times. Although the proposed project would reserve a site in Phase 2 for the future development of a police station, the proposed project does not include the construction of that station. Therefore, there would be significant adverse unavoidable interim impacts during construction and operation of the proposed project to existing police services until the proposed police station is constructed and operational. Subsequent to the opening of the operational police station, impacts to police facilities would be considered less than significant.	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant Adverse Interim Impact
Significant Adverse Impacts		
Threshold 4.14.4: ***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 library services***		
According to City standards for library services, the proposed project would result in the need for an additional 17,979 sf of library space and 43,150 library materials (35,958 * 1.2 = 43,150). Therefore, the proposed project would result in increased demand for library square footage and materials during each project phase of construction that would exceed the City's existing library facilities. The applicant would be required to pay Library Impact Fees based on the number of dwelling units proposed in each phase, consistent with requirements in the City's Municipal Code; those fees would be used for the land acquisition and construction costs of new public libraries throughout the City. Although the proposed project would include several design features and would pay Library Impact Fees that would reduce impacts to existing library facilities, the increase in population associated with project build out would result in the need for additional library facilities and library materials that would not be accommodated by the project development. Therefore, the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable adverse impacts on library facilities until future library facilities are built.	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact
Threshold 4.14.10: ***Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments***		
Wastewater from development on the Specific Plan site would be handled by the Coachella Sanitary District (CSD) and conveyed to the City's WWTP. The project sewer system would be constructed in phases as each phase of the proposed project is implemented. The WWTP would require expansion to accommodate the proposed project before complete build out of the Specific Plan area. Depending on the progress of other land development in the City and whether/when the capacity of the WWTP has been	There is no feasible mitigation for the wastewater impacts.	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact for Phase 5 until the Capacity of the WWTP is Increased

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
expanded, the City may have to expand the WWTP or make other changes to its wastewater treatment system to accommodate the project development that occurs after 60 percent build out of the Specific Plan. Mitigation Measure 4.14.1 would reduce potential wastewater treatment capacity impacts associated with those later project phases to a less than significant level. The Specific Plan would also be conditioned to pay all applicable development impact fees related to sewer infrastructure and to construct all associated sewer lines and infrastructure needed to serve the project site.		
Threshold 4.14.11: Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs		
At build out, the proposed project would generate approximately 91 tons of solid waste per day, which would represent approximately 2 and 3 percent of the maximum daily permitted capacity of the Badlands and Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfills, respectively. These Landfills are anticipated to close prior to project build out. Although it is anticipated that solid waste generated by the proposed project would be routed to these two Landfills prior to their closure, the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan does not identify where solid waste generated in the City of Coachella would go after these Landfills are closed. Therefore, subsequent to the closure of these Landfills, the proposed project would have a significant adverse impact related to solid waste.	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact
4.15 RECREATION		
Less than Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.15.1: 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		
The proposed project would result in an increase in the City's population by up to 35,958 people. These residents would result in an increased demand for parks and recreational facilities. The proposed project would be required to provide 107.9 ac of parkland to meet the City requirement of 3.0 ac of parkland per 1,000 residents. The proposed project includes approximately 344.7 ac of parkland, 381.1 ac of open space, and 175.8 ac of drainage/wash area. The proposed project also includes a network of multipurpose trails and bicycle trails throughout the project site. The City currently has a deficit of approximately 36.2 ac of parkland. Although the La Entrada Specific Plan would increase the total population in the City, it would provide sufficient parkland to offset the existing deficit of parkland in the City. Because the Specific Plan would result in an overall surplus of nearly 200 ac of parkland in the City, the project would not adversely affect existing parks or other recreational facilities. As discussed in Chapter 3.0, Project Description, each of the three villages in the Specific Plan includes parks/recreation and open space uses. Those uses would be developed as the residential uses in the villages are developed so that the residents in each village would have parks/recreation and open space uses available for their use. Because there would be	Although the Specific Plan would not result in potentially significant impacts related to recreation resources and no mitigation is required, Measure 4.15.1 is provided to document the commitment in the Specific Plan for the provision of 344.7 ac of parkland. **4.15.1 Parkland.** The Specific Plan will provide a total of 344.7 ac of land for four categories of public and private parks on the Specific Plan site (special use, community, neighborhood, and linear parks). These parks will be located throughout the individual planning areas on the Specific Plan site and will be constructed within each planning area when the development in that planning area is constructed. The parks will be identified on each Tentative Tract Map submitted to the City of Coachella Director of Development Services.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
no deficiency in parkland with the implementation of the Specific Plan and the parks/recreation and open space uses would be developed as the residential uses are developed, it is anticipated that the increase in population associated with the proposed project would not result in the physical deterioration of existing recreational facilities.		
Threshold 4.15.2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction of or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment		
The Specific Plan would result in the provision of approximately 381.1 ac of open space, 175.8 ac of drainage/wash areas, and 344.7 ac of active parkland. The Specific Plan would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond those already included in the proposed project. As a result, the proposed project would not result in adverse physical effects on the environment as a result of the construction or expansion of recreational facilities outside the boundary of the Specific Plan.	Although the Specific Plan would not result in potentially significant impacts related to recreation resources and no mitigation is required, Measure 4.15.1, provided above, documents the commitment in the Specific Plan for the provision of 344.7 ac of parkland.	Less than Significant Impact
4.16 TRAFFIC		
No Impact		
Threshold 4.16.3: Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, which results in substantial safety risks		
Two general aviation airports in the vicinity of the project site provide limited commercial service: Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport (4.25 mi southwest of the project site) and Bermuda Dunes Airport (8.5 mi west of the project site). The project site is not within an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. The maximum height of structures on the project site would be 55 ft, which would not extend into any air traffic control zones above the site or require any modification to existing air traffic control patterns at those airports. The project land uses may result in some demand for travel at those airports by residents or employees, but any such demand would not be substantial and would not be expected to affect traffic levels at those airports. As a result, the proposed project would not result in an increase in traffic levels or air traffic patterns or any substantial aviation-related safety risks.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Less than Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.16.4: Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)		
Construction. Construction of the proposed project may result in the need to temporarily restrict or detour vehicular traffic or cause temporary hazards. The project construction would be required to include adequate measures to facilitate the passage of people and vehicles through/around road or lane closures or other potential construction effects on vehicular access to/from and around the project site, as part of an overall construction traffic management plan. As a result, the project construction would result in a less than significant impact related to road or design hazards. **Operation.** The road improvements on and around the project site would be designed and constructed consistent with applicable City and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) design requirements, which will result in safe and efficient flow. Adherence to	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
the Specific Plan general street alignments, street cross-sections, and other applicable City requirements for the design of streets would ensure the proposed project does not result in sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or other design hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase hazards due to design features and would result in a less than significant impact. No mitigation is required.		
Threshold 4.16.5: Result in inadequate emergency access		
Construction. Construction activities may temporarily restrict or delay emergency vehicles on and around the project site. The project construction would be required to implement adequate measures to facilitate the passage of emergency vehicles through/around road or lane closures, or other potential construction effects on emergency vehicle access to/from and around the project site, as part of an overall construction traffic management plan. As a result, the project construction would result in a less than significant impact related to emergency access. No mitigation is required. **Operation.** Adherence to the Specific Plan general street alignments and street cross-sections and other applicable City requirements for the design of streets would ensure the proposed project does not result in conditions that would impede emergency response vehicles. In the absence of any emergency access restrictions, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Threshold 4.16.6: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities		
The proposed project includes a network of on- and off-street non-motorized circulation elements to promote walkability and reduce vehicle miles traveled within the project site for bicycles and pedestrians as well as allowing for NEVs. Trails would be provided throughout the project site. These project features and components would support the use of non-motorized travel modes. The proposed non-motorized and NEV circulation plan for the La Entrada Specific Plan would not conflict with the policies and goals in the Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG) Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. Therefore, the impacts of the proposed project regarding conflicts with plans for alternative transportation modes would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact
Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.16.1: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways, and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit		
Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.16.1 through 4.16.5, the proposed project would result in significant unavoidable adverse traffic impacts to intersections outside of the City's jurisdiction. The reason for these significant unavoidable adverse impacts is that the City cannot control the timing of improvements that are not fully within its own jurisdiction. For this reason, local intersection improvements wholly or partly in	**4.16.1 Intersection Improvements Existing Plus Phases 1 through 4.** Prior to the approval of each Tentative Tract Map within project Phases 1 through 4, the project applicant shall submit a report that analyzes existing plus traffic generated	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
the City of Indio or Riverside County and local intersection improvements also wholly or partly on State facilities (i.e., State Route 111 [SR-111], State Route 86 [SR-86], and I-10) cannot be controlled by the City. However, it should be noted that the proposed project is consistent with the City's General Plan; therefore, the associated land uses have been included in the regional transportation planning efforts conducted by SCAG and CVAG, as well as the citywide transportation planning efforts of the City. For this reason, there is no feasible mitigation for impacts to the following intersection and freeway locations. **Existing Plus Phases 1 through 4.** Project direct impacts from Existing Plus Phases 1 through 4 (without the Avenue 50 Interchange) to the following intersections: 1. Jackson Street/50th Avenue (Indio) 4. Calhoun Street/52nd Avenue (County of Riverside) 5. Van Buren Street/Avenue 48 (Indo/Coachella) 6. Van Buren Street/Avenue 52 (Coachella/County of Riverside) 7. SR-86/Tyler Street (Caltrans) 8. SR-86/52nd Avenue (Caltrans) 9. Fillmore Street/52nd Avenue (Coachella/County of Riverside) 10. Pierce Street/52nd Avenue (Coachella/County of Riverside) 11. SR-111/62nd Avenue (Caltrans) **Existing Plus Project Build-out.** Project direct impacts from Existing Plus Project Build-out (with the Avenue 50 Interchange) to the following intersections: 1. Jackson Street/50th Avenue (Indio) 12. Calhoun Street/52nd Avenue (County of Riverside) 13. Van Buren Street/Avenue 48 (Indo/Coachella) 14. Van Buren Street/Avenue 52 (Coachella/County of Riverside) 15. Dillon Road/I-10 eastbound ramps (Caltrans) 16. SR-86/Tyler Street (Caltrans) 17. SR-86/52nd Avenue (Caltrans) 18. Fillmore Street/52nd Avenue (Coachella/County of Riverside) 19. Avenue 50/I-10 eastbound ramps (Caltrans) 20. Pierce Street/52nd Avenue (Coachella/County of Riverside) 21. SR-111/62nd Avenue (Caltrans) 22. Monroe Street/I-10 eastbound ramps (Caltrans) Project direct impacts from Existing Plus Project Build-out (with the Avenue 50 Interchange) to the following 3 I-10 freeway mainline lanes and 4 I-10 freeway ramp merge/diverge locations:	by the Tentative Tract Map to determine which, if any, of the improvements from the list below is triggered (i.e., necessary to avoid a significant impact). The improvements identified in the report shall be constructed by the project applicant prior to issuance of occupancy permits. Each individual Tentative Tract Map traffic report is required to be approved by the City of Coachella (City) Director of Public Works or designee. The Director of Public Works or designee shall review and approve the improvement plans for these improvements prior to start of construction. Table 4.16.AC identifies the specific improvements required, project responsibility, and applicable fee programs (local Development Impact Fees [DIFs] or Coachella Valley Association of Governments [CVAG] Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee [TUMF]) for the improvements required to mitigate intersection impacts from project Phases 1 through 4 (without Avenue 50 Interchange). As shown in Table 4.16.AC, there are 15 affected intersections where mitigations have been identified. However, mitigation is provided for the six impact locations that are fully within the City of Coachella and for which the City can control when the improvements are constructed. Additionally, there are two intersections adjacent to the project that the project would be constructing (Avenue 50/Street C and Pierce Street/52nd Avenue). • **Calhoun Street/50th Avenue:** Install a traffic signal. • **50th Avenue/Tyler Street:** Install a traffic signal and add two northbound left-turn lanes, re-stripe the eastbound left-turn lane to an eastbound left/right-turn lane, and add eastbound right overlap phasing. • **Tyler Street/52nd Avenue:** Install a traffic signal.	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
1. I-10 eastbound between SR-86 and Dillon Road 2. I-10 eastbound between Dillon Road ramps 3. I-10 eastbound between Dillon Road and Avenue 50 4. I-10 eastbound at the Monroe Street off-ramp 5. I-10 eastbound at the Dillon Road off-ramp 6. I-10 eastbound at the Dillon Road on-ramp 7. I-10 eastbound at the Avenue 50 off-ramp **Cumulative Year 2035 Plus Project Build-out.** Cumulative Year 2035 impacts to the following 44 intersections: 1. Jackson Street/SR- 111 (Caltrans) 2. Jackson Street/Avenue 48 (Indio) 3. Jackson Street/50th Avenue (Indio) 4. Jackson Street/52nd Avenue (Indio/County of Riverside) 5. Golf Center Drive-Lorraine Street/SR-111 (Caltrans) 6. Golf Center Parkway/Avenue 45 (Indio) 7. Calhoun Street/52nd Avenue (County of Riverside) 8. Golf Center Parkway-Indio Center Drive/Avenue 44 (Indio) 9. Golf Center Parkway/Indio Springs Drive-Vista Del Norte (Indio) 10. Golf Center Parkway/I-10 westbound ramps (Caltrans) 11. Golf Center Parkway/I-10 eastbound ramps (Caltrans) 12. Dillon Road/SR-86 northbound ramps (Caltrans) 13. Dillon Road/SR-86 southbound ramps (Caltrans) 14. Harrison Street/SR-111 (LOS) 15. Harrison Street/Avenue 50 (LOS) 16. Dillon Road/I-10 westbound ramps (Caltrans) 17. Dillon Road/I-10 eastbound ramps (Caltrans) 18. Dillon Road/Fargo Canyon Road (County of Riverside) 19. SR-86 northbound ramps/Tyler Street (Caltrans) 20. SR-86 southbound ramps/Tyler Street (Caltrans) 21. Tyler Street/Airport Boulevard (County of Riverside) 22. SR-86 northbound ramps/52nd Avenue (Caltrans) 23. SR-86 southbound ramps/52nd Avenue (Caltrans) 24. SR-86/54th Avenue (Caltrans and LOS) 25. Polk Street/Airport Boulevard (County of Riverside) 26. SR-111/Airport Boulevard (Caltrans) 27. Polk Street/62nd Avenue (County of Riverside) 28. Fillmore Street/53rd Avenue (County of Riverside)	• **Polk Street/50th Avenue:** Install a traffic signal. • **Polk Street/52nd Avenue:** Install a traffic signal. • **Fillmore Street/50th Avenue:** Install a traffic signal. • **Avenue 50/Street C:** Add a northbound right-turn lane and a westbound left-turn lane. **4.16.2 Intersection Improvements Existing Plus Project Build-out.** The proposed project is conditioned upon the I-10/Avenue 50 Interchange becoming operational (or committed to be operational [i.e., funded and approved]) prior to approval of any Tentative Tract Map in Phase 5. Additionally, the project is conditioned upon the I-10/Avenue 50 Interchange being operational prior to occupancy of any units in Phase 5. Subsequent to construction of the I-10/Avenue 50 Interchange and prior to issuance of occupancy permits for project Phase 5, the project applicant shall submit a report that analyzes the existing plus traffic generated by the Tentative Tract Map to determine which, if any, of the improvements from the list below is triggered (i.e., necessary to avoid a significant impact). The improvements identified in the report shall be constructed by the project applicant prior to issuance of occupancy permits. Each individual Tentative Tract Map traffic report is required to be approved by the City Director of Public Works or designee. The Director of Public Works or designee shall review and approve the improvement plans for these improvements prior to start of construction. Table 4.16.AD identifies the specific improvements required, project responsibility, and applicable fee programs (local DIFs or CVAG TUMF) for the improvements required to mitigate intersection	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
29. SR-86 southbound ramps/Airport Boulevard (Caltrans) 30. SR-86 northbound ramps/Airport Boulevard (Caltrans) 31. Fillmore Street/62nd Avenue (County of Riverside) 32. Avenue 50/I-10 westbound ramps (Caltrans) 33. Avenue 50/I-10 eastbound ramps (Caltrans) 34. Pierce Street/53rd Avenue (County of Riverside) 35. Pierce Street/54th Avenue (County of Riverside) 36. Pierce Street/Airport Boulevard (County of Riverside) 37. Pierce Street/62nd Avenue (County of Riverside) 38. SR-111/62nd Avenue (Caltrans) 39. SR-86/62nd Avenue (Caltrans) 40. Buchanan Street/62nd Avenue (County of Riverside) 41. Monroe Street/I-10 westbound ramps (Caltrans) 42. Monroe Street/I-10 eastbound ramps (Caltrans) 43. Jackson Street/I-10 westbound ramps (Caltrans) 44. Jackson Street/I-10 eastbound ramps (Caltrans) Cumulative Year 2035 impacts to the following 21 I-10 freeway mainline lanes, 1 SR-86 mainline lane, 20 I-10 freeway ramp merge/diverge locations, and 2 SR-86 freeway ramp merge/diverge locations: 1. I-10 eastbound west of Monroe Street 2. I-10 eastbound between Monroe ramps 3. I-10 eastbound between Monroe Street and Jackson Street 4. I-10 eastbound between Jackson Street ramps 5. I-10 eastbound between Jackson Street and Golf Center Parkway 6. I-10 eastbound between Golf Center Parkway ramps 7. I-10 eastbound between Golf Center Parkway and SR-86 8. I-10 eastbound between SR-86 and Dillon Road 9. I-10 eastbound between Dillon Road ramps 10. I-10 eastbound between Dillon Road and Avenue 50 11. I-10 eastbound east of Avenue 50 12. I-10 westbound west of Monroe Street 13. I-10 westbound between Monroe Street ramps 14. I-10 westbound between Monroe Street and Jackson Street 15. I-10 westbound between Jackson Street ramps 16. I-10 westbound between Jackson Street and Golf Center Parkway 17. I-10 westbound between Golf Center On-Ramp and Lane Drop 18. I-10 westbound between Lane Drop and Golf Center Parkway off-ramp	impacts from project build-out (with the Avenue 50 Interchange). As shown in Table 4.16.AD, there are 18 affected intersections where mitigations have been identified. However, mitigation is provided for the nine impact locations that are fully within the City of Coachella; therefore, the City can control when the improvements are constructed. Additionally, there are three intersections adjacent or within the project that the project would be constructing (Avenue 50/52nd Avenue – Street A, Avenue 50/Street C, and Pierce Street/52nd Avenue). • **Calhoun Street/50th Avenue:** Install a traffic signal. • **Dillon Road/Vista Del Norte:** Convert to all-way stop control. • **50th Avenue/Tyler Street:** Install a traffic signal. Add two northbound left-turn lanes and restripe the eastbound left-turn lane to a shared eastbound left-turn/through/right-turn lane. • **Tyler Street/52nd Avenue:** Install a traffic signal. • **Polk Street/50th Avenue:** Install a traffic signal. • **Polk Street/52nd Avenue:** Install a traffic signal. • **Fillmore Street/50th Avenue:** Install a traffic signal. • **Avenue 50/52nd Avenue – Street A:** Install a traffic signal. Add a northbound left-turn lane, two northbound through lanes, a shared northbound through/right-turn lane, two southbound left-turn lanes, two southbound through lanes, a shared southbound	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
19. I-10 westbound between Golf Center Parkway and SR-86 20. I-10 westbound between SR-86 and Dillon Road 21. I-10 westbound between Dillon Road and Avenue 50 22. SR-86 northbound between I-10 and Dillon Road 23. I-10 eastbound at the Monroe Street off-ramp 24. I-10 eastbound at the Monroe Street on-ramp 25. I-10 eastbound at the Jackson Street off-ramp 26. I-10 eastbound at the Jackson Street on-ramp 27. I-10 eastbound at the Golf Center Parkway off-ramp 28. I-10 eastbound at the Golf Center Parkway on-ramp 29. I-10 eastbound at the SR-86 off-ramp 30. I-10 eastbound at the Dillon Road off-ramp 31. I-10 eastbound at the Dillon Road on-ramp 32. I-10 eastbound at the Avenue 50 off-ramp 33. I-10 westbound at the Monroe Street on-ramp 34. I-10 westbound at the Monroe Street off-ramp 35. I-10 westbound at the Jackson Street on-ramp 36. I-10 westbound at the Jackson Street off-ramp 37. I-10 westbound at the Golf Center Parkway on-ramp 38. I-10 westbound at the Golf Center Parkway off-ramp 39. I-10 westbound at the SR-86 on-ramp 40. I-10 westbound at the Dillon Road on-ramp 41. I-10 westbound at the Dillon Road off-ramp 42. I-10 westbound at the Avenue 50 slip on-ramp 43. SR-86 northbound at the Dillon Road on-ramp 44. SR-86 northbound at the Dillon Road off-ramp	through/right-turn lane, two eastbound left-turn lanes, a shared eastbound through/right-turn lane, a shared westbound through/left-turn lane, and a westbound right-turn lane. • **Avenue 50/Street C – Street A:** 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 shared westbound left-right turn lane. **4.16.3 Intersection Improvements Year 2035 Plus Project Build-out.** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall pay the appropriate DIF payment to cover the applicant's fair share of traffic impacts to the citywide street system. **4.16.4 Intersection Improvements Year 2035 Plus Project Build-out.** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall participate in the CVAG TUMF Program and pay the project's fair share for regional circulation improvements. **4.16.5 Off-Site Intersection Improvement Impacts.** Improvement plans shall be prepared for each project-related off-site traffic improvement within the City of Coachella and approved by the City Engineer. These plans are subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review prior to approval by the City Engineer. Improvement plans shall incorporate the following components, as applicable: • Obtain encroachment permit(s) from the applicable jurisdiction(s) for off-site improvements; • Through creative design techniques, where determined feasible and consistent with City	

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	policy, modify roadway geometry to reduce potential impacts to existing developed areas (such as reduced lane widths, reduced or eliminated medians, reduced turn lane transition zones, and/or shifting intersection approaches to widen intersection quadrants where associated impacts would be reduced); • Maintain access for existing residences and businesses at all times; • Replace landscaped areas within the affected parcel and along the parcel frontage as applicable; • Assist the affected property owner in restriping affected parking areas and/or reconfiguring affected driveways to avoid or offset improvement-related impacts; and • Compensate the affected property owner based on fair market valuation of the acquired right-of-way in accordance with applicable local, State, and federal regulations.	
Threshold 4.16.2: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways		
The Congestion Management Program (CMP) uses level of service (LOS) E as the LOS standard. The project intersection impact analyses were conducted using the more restrictive LOS D standard from the local jurisdiction in which each intersection is located. As result, the analyses in this EIR meet and exceed the CMP LOS standard for intersection analyses, resulting in a less than significant impact. No additional mitigation is required. The CMP utilizes a LOS standard of LOS E, except for non-exempt locations where the standard is LOS F. The project intersection impact analysis is based on the more restrictive LOS D. The analysis of freeway mainline lanes and merge/diverge locations is based on the CMP LOS E standard. Thus, this EIR meets and exceeds the CMP LOS standard for intersection analyses and meets the CMP LOS standard for freeway mainline lanes and merge/diverge locations. Three study area intersections on SR-111, SR-86, or I-10 are forecast to operate at less than the CMP LOS E standard in the existing baseline plus project conditions. Because the	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.16.1, provided above.	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
proposed project causes the LOS to fall below the standard or causes further degradation at these intersections, this is considered to be a project direct significant impact and mitigation is required. Mitigation Measure 4.16.1 would reduce the significant impacts; however, the City cannot control the timing of when the intersection improvements for the locations on Caltrans facilities (i.e., SR-111, SR-86, and I-10) are implemented. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.16.1, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at these locations. Six study area intersections on SR-111, SR-86, or I-10 are forecast to operate at less than the CMP LOS E standard in the existing baseline plus project build-out (with the Avenue 50 Interchange) conditions. Because the proposed project causes the LOS to fall below the standard or causes further degradation at these intersections, this is considered to be a project direct significant impact and mitigation is required. Mitigation Measure 4.16.2 would reduce the significant impacts; however, the City cannot control the timing of when the intersection improvements for the locations on Caltrans facilities (i.e., SR-111, SR-86, and I-10) are implemented. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.16.2, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at these locations. Three study area freeway mainline lanes are forecast to operate at less than the CMP LOS E standard in existing baseline plus project build-out (with the Avenue 50 Interchange) conditions. Because the proposed project causes the LOS to fall below the CMP standard at these freeway mainline lanes, this is considered to be a project direct significant impact and mitigation is required. However, there is no feasible mitigation for this significant impact because there is no mechanism for the City to design, fund, and construct improvements on State highways and freeways. All improvements to State highways and freeways are controlled by Caltrans. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at these locations. Four study area freeway ramp merge/diverge locations are forecast to operate at less than the CMP LOS E standard (the same standard used in Threshold 4.16.1 for freeway mainline lanes and merge/diverge locations) in existing baseline plus project build-out (with the Avenue 50 Interchange) conditions. Because the proposed project causes the LOS to fall below the standard at these freeway merge/diverge locations, this is considered to be a project direct significant impact and mitigation is required. However, there is no feasible mitigation for this significant impact because there is no mechanism for the City to design, fund, and construct improvements on State highways and freeways. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at these locations. There are 18 study area intersections that are forecast to operate at less than the CMP LOS E standard with Year 2035 plus project traffic. However, the forecast intersection LOS		

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
deficiencies are caused by future traffic volume growth from the combination of traffic volume increases projected by the traffic model that are attributable to other cumulative projects and the traffic volume increases from the proposed project. For this reason, these impacts represent a significant cumulative impact, and mitigation is required. Mitigation Measures 4.16.3 and 4.16.4 would reduce the significant impacts by requiring the project's fair share contribution in the form of Development Impact Fee (DIF) and Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) payments towards the future intersection improvements; however, the City cannot control the timing of when the intersection improvements for the locations on Caltrans facilities (i.e., SR-111, SR-86, and I-10) are implemented. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.16.3 and 4.16.4, cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at these locations. There are 22 study area freeway mainline lanes forecast to operate at less than the CMP LOS E standard with Year 2035 plus project traffic. However, the forecast freeway mainline LOS deficiencies are caused by future traffic volume growth from the combination of traffic volume increases projected by the traffic model that are attributable to other cumulative projects and the traffic volume increases from the proposed project. These impacts represent a significant cumulative impact, and mitigation is required. However, there is no feasible mitigation for this significant impact because there is no mechanism for the City to design, fund, and construct improvements on State highways and freeways. All improvements to State highways and freeways are controlled by Caltrans. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at these locations. There are 22 study area freeway merge/diverge locations forecast to operate at less than the CMP LOS E standard with Year 2035 plus project traffic. However, the forecast freeway ramp merge/diverge location LOS deficiencies are caused by future traffic volume growth from the combination of traffic volume increases projected by the traffic model that are attributable to other cumulative projects and the traffic volume increases from the proposed project. These impacts represent a significant cumulative impact, and mitigation is required. However, there is no feasible mitigation for this significant impact because there is no mechanism for the City to design, fund, and construct improvements on State highways and freeways. All improvements to State highways and freeways are controlled by Caltrans. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at these locations.		

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
4.17 WATER SUPPLY		
Less than Significant Impacts		
Threshold 4.17.1: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed		
Short-Term Construction Impacts. Short-term demand for water may occur during demolition, excavation, grading, and construction of the proposed project. Water demand for soil watering (fugitive dust control), cleanup, masonry, painting, and other activities would be temporary and would cease at project build out. It is estimated that a total of approximately 1,628 af would be used for construction purposes over buildout of the entire project. The proposed project includes five development phases. Therefore, water usage for construction purposes would be phased in conjunction with the project development, with an average construction water demand of approximately 325 af per phase. The main source of water for the proposed project is the Coachella Valley Groundwater Basin, specifically the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin, which is continuously replenished at the local and regional levels pursuant to a variety of water supply projects and programs. The *2010 Coachella Valley Water Management Plan Update* (2010 CVWMP Update) and *2011 Subsequent Programmatic Environmental Impact Report* (2011 SPEIR, State Clearinghouse No. 2007091099) show that the total projected water supplies available to the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin area during normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year periods through 2045 are sufficient to meet the water needs of existing uses and projected growth, specifically including the future water needs in the City of Coachella and its Sphere of Influence, including the proposed project. Overall, construction activities would require minimal water and are not expected to have any adverse impacts on the existing water system or available water supplies. Specific building approvals are not being sought for any phase of the proposed project at this time. Pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 221, the approval of any future Tentative Tract Maps for the project that include subdivisions must be conditioned on obtaining a written verification from the Coachella Water Authority (CWA). Therefore, impacts on water supplies associated with construction activities are considered less than significant. **Long-Term Operational Impacts.** The CWA would provide water service to the proposed project. In accordance with SB 610 and CEQA, the CWA *Water Supply Assessment* (provided in Appendix M) concludes that the total projected water supplies available to the CWA during normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year periods over the 20-year projection period for the project and beyond are sufficient to meet the projected demands associated with the proposed project in addition to existing and planned future uses in the CWA service area, including agricultural and manufacturing uses.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
As noted above, the main source of water supply for the proposed project is the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin. The Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD) has concluded that the total projected water supplies available to the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin area during normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year periods over the 20-year projection period and beyond are sufficient to meet the water needs of existing uses and projected growth, specifically including the future water needs in the City and its Sphere of Influence. The demands associated with the proposed project have been specifically accounted for as part of the CVWD's regional water supply planning efforts and conclusions of water supply sufficiency (where the project was previously referred to as the Lomas del Sol project). CVWD's supplemental water supplies and entitlements are specifically available to the CWA to serve the proposed La Entrada Specific Plan pursuant to the 2009 and 2013 Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) between the City and CVWD, which provide a mechanism by which the City can finance and acquire supplemental water supplies from CVWD to meet the projected demands of new development projects. The 2013 MOU expressly acknowledges and applies to the proposed La Entrada Specific Plan, and the supplemental water supplies referred to in the 2013 MOU have been analyzed by CVWD as part of the 2010 CVWMP Update and the 2011 SPEIR, which concluded that implementing the water supply projects and programs in the 2010 CVWMP Update will have a beneficial effect on groundwater resources. Pursuant to SB 221, the approval of any development agreement or Tentative Tract Map for the project that includes a subdivision must be conditioned on obtaining a written verification from the CWA. The potential project impacts related to sufficient water supplies and entitlements would be less than significant.		
Threshold 4.17.2 Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment or collection facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects		
As stated above, the 2010 annual production from the City's eight wells was approximately 2,700 million gallons. The proposed project's projected demand of 5,365.8 af per year equates to approximately 1,748 million gallons annually, which, when added to the current annual production of 2,700 million gallons, is still within the production capacity of the City's existing wells (approximately 18 million gallons per day, or 6,570 million gallons annually). The proposed project would be served primarily by the existing City-owned backbone water infrastructure. Based on the location of the project site in proximity to the City's existing water system, the proposed project would supplement the City facilities with two off-site production wells for potable use. The first would be south of 50th Avenue between Polk Street and Fillmore Street, and the second would be north of 52nd Street between Fillmore Street and Pierce Street. The closest existing City well is	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
north of 48th Avenue and east of Tyler Street, approximately ¾ of a mile from the closest proposed well. This distance exceeds local standards requiring a minimum distance of 1,000 feet between well sites. The proposed project would also install five booster stations and four pressure-reducing stations, a total storage volume of 14 million gallons in storage reservoirs (tanks), and new water pipelines, including larger transmission mains sized at 14 and 18 inches for conveyance of water from the reservoirs and booster stations. The project water infrastructure would be integrated into the City's water facilities system. The physical disturbance of undeveloped land associated with the proposed project has been evaluated in the EIR in Sections 4.1, Aesthetics; 4.2, Agriculture; 4.3, Air Quality; 4.4, Biological Resources; 4.5, Cultural and Paleontological Resources; 4.6, Geology and Soils; 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials; 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality; and 4.12, Noise. It is not feasible to determine the scope of the impacts of any off-site water infrastructure improvements because the footprint of those improvements is not known at this time. Any off-site improvements that are a result of the extension of water infrastructure would be subject to CEQA at such time as the improvement plans are submitted to the City for review and approval.		
Threshold 4.17.3: ***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)***		
Short-Term Construction Impacts. Because groundwater at the site is greater than 50 feet below ground surface, the groundwater table is not anticipated to be encountered and dewatering is not anticipated to be required during construction. Project grading and construction would compact soil, which can decrease infiltration during construction, yet construction activities would be temporary. Reduced infiltration during construction would not result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, and thus construction impacts would be less than significant. Refer also to the discussion under Threshold 4.17.1. **Long-Term Operational Impacts.** The CWA would provide water service to the proposed project. In accordance with SB 610 and CEQA, the CWA *Water Supply Assessment* concludes that the total projected water supplies available to the CWA during normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year periods over the 20-year projection period and beyond are sufficient to meet the projected demands associated with the proposed project in addition to existing and planned future uses in the CWA service area, including agricultural and manufacturing uses. The main source of supply for the proposed project is the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin, which is continuously replenished at the local and regional levels pursuant to a variety of water supply projects and programs. The CVWD has concluded that the total projected water supplies available to the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin area during normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year periods over the	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact

Table 1.A: La Entrada Specific Plan Environmental Impact Summary

Issues/Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
20-year projection period and beyond are sufficient to meet the water needs of existing uses and projected growth, specifically including the future water needs in the City and its Sphere of Influence. The demands associated with the proposed project have been specifically accounted for as part of CVWD's regional water supply planning efforts and conclusions of water supply sufficiency (where the project was previously referred to as the Lomas del Sol project). CVWD's supplemental water supplies and entitlements are specifically available to CWA to serve the proposed La Entrada Specific Plan pursuant to the 2009 and 2013 MOU between the City and CVWD, which provide a mechanism by which the City can finance and acquire supplemental water supplies from CVWD that are recharged to the groundwater basin to meet the projected demands of new development projects. The 2013 MOU expressly acknowledges and applies to the proposed La Entrada Specific Plan, and the supplemental water supplies referred to in the 2013 MOU were analyzed by the CVWD as part of the 2010 CVWMP Update) and the 2011 SPEIR, which concluded that implementing the water supply projects and programs contained in the 2010 CVWMP Update will have a beneficial effect on groundwater resources. Development of the proposed project will increase the amount of impervious surfaces within the project site; however, the City and CVWD do not use the project site to support the regional recharge programs identified in the 2010 CVWMP Update that recharge the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin. The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater 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. Therefore, project impacts related to groundwater levels would be less than significant. Refer also to the discussion under Threshold 4.17.1.		

This page intentionally left blank