

RESOLUTION NO. 13-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF COACHELLA RECOMMENDING THE CERTIFICATION OF THE PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SCH # 2012071061) PREPARED FOR THE LA ENTRADA SPECIFIC PLAN, THE ADOPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

WHEREAS, the La Entrada Specific Plan is a master-planned residential community in the City of Coachella (the "City") that would consist of a mix of residential, commercial, educational, recreation, open-space, and other uses on approximately 2,200 acres (the "Project" or "Proposed Project"); and

WHEREAS, the approximately 1,688 acres of the Proposed Project site is located in the City and approximately 588 acres of the Proposed Project site is located in unincorporated Riverside County ("County") south of Interstate 10, east of the Coachella Branch of the All-American Canal and north of the extension of Avenues 50 and 52.; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000 et seq.), the State California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. §§ 15000 et seq.), and the City's Local CEQA Guidelines (collectively, "CEQA"), the City has determined that a Program Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") should be prepared pursuant to CEQA in order to analyze the potential adverse environmental impacts of the Proposed Project; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to section 21067 of the Public Resources Code, and section 15367 of the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.), the City is the lead agency for the Project; and

WHEREAS, the City circulated a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") on the Draft EIR on or about July 18, 2012, for a period of 30 days pursuant to and as required by State CEQA Guidelines sections 15082(a) and 15375; and

WHEREAS, the City held a public scoping meeting on August 28, 2012, to gather public comments on the Proposed Project and its potential impacts on the physical environment; and

WHEREAS, the City received written comments in response to the NOP, which assisted the City in narrowing the issues and alternatives for analysis in the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, on or about July, 11, 2013, the City initiated a 45-day public review period by filing a Notice of Completion and Availability with the State Office of Planning

and Research and releasing the Draft EIR for public review and comment in the manner required by CEQA; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15086, the City consulted with and requested comments from all responsible and trustee agencies, other regulatory agencies, and others during the 45-day comment period; and

WHEREAS, the City received eleven (11) written comments during the public review period for the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, the City has prepared a Final EIR, consisting of comments received during the 45-day public review and comment period on the Draft EIR, written responses to those comments, and revisions and errata to the Draft EIR. For the purposes of this Resolution, the "EIR" shall refer to the Draft Program EIR, as revised by the Final Program EIR's errata section, together with the other sections of the Final Program EIR; and

WHEREAS, environmental impacts, including environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR as potentially significant but which the Planning Commission of the City of Coachella (the "Planning Commission") finds can be substantially lessened through the imposition of feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and set forth in the Findings of Fact, are described in **Exhibit "A"** hereto; and

WHEREAS, because the Final EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts, the Planning Commission explains its reasoning for recommending the adoption of the Project despite those impacts in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, contained in **Exhibit "B"** hereto; and

WHEREAS, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan sets forth the mitigation measures to which the Planning Commission recommends that the City should bind itself in connection with this Project and is attached hereto as **Exhibit "C"**; and

WHEREAS, as contained herein, the Planning Commission has endeavored in good faith to set forth the basis for its recommendation on the Proposed Project; and

WHEREAS, all the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines have been satisfied by the City in the EIR, which is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project have been adequately evaluated; and

WHEREAS, the EIR prepared in connection with the Proposed Project sufficiently analyzes both the feasible Mitigation Measures necessary to avoid or substantially lessen the Proposed Project's potential environmental impacts and a range of feasible alternatives capable of eliminating or reducing these effects in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, all of the findings, recommendations and conclusions made by the Planning Commission pursuant to this Resolution are based upon the oral and written

evidence presented to it as a whole and not based solely on the information provided in this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, prior to taking action, the Planning Commission has heard, been presented with, reviewed and considered all of the information and data in the administrative record, including the Final EIR, and all oral and written evidence presented to it during all meetings and hearings, all of which is incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Planning Commission and is deemed adequate for purposes of making decisions on the merits of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has not received any comments or additional information that produced substantial new information requiring recirculation or additional environmental review under Public Resources Code sections 21166 and 21092.1 and State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5; and

WHEREAS, on October 16, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on this Resolution, at which time all persons wishing to testify were heard and the Project was fully considered; and

WHEREAS, all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY COACHELLA:

SECTION 1. The Planning Commission finds that it has reviewed and considered the Draft EIR and Final EIR (including the comment letters, responses to comments, and errata) in evaluating the Project, that the Final EIR fully complies with CEQA, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Planning Commission.

SECTION 2. The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the CEQA Findings attached hereto as Exhibit A.

SECTION 3. Based on the entire record before the Planning Commission, and all written and oral evidence presented, the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council of the City of Coachella certify the Final EIR, and adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations attached as Exhibit B to this Resolution.

SECTION 4. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6, the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council of the City of Coachella adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan attached to this Resolution as Exhibit C. The Planning Commission further recommends that the City Council determine that – in the event of any inconsistencies between the mitigation measures as set forth in the Draft

EIR or the CEQA Findings in Exhibit A and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan – the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan shall control.

SECTION 5. Based on the entire record before the Planning Commission, all written and oral evidence presented, the CEQA Findings, the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Plan, and all other evidence, the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council of the City of Coachella approve the La Entrada Specific Plan.

SECTION 6. The documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which this Resolution is based are located at the City of Coachella, Development Services Department, 1515 Sixth Street, Coachella, California 92236. The custodian for these records is Luis Lopez, Planning Director. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code section 21081.6.

SECTION 7. The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council of the City of Coachella direct staff to file a Notice of Determination with the Riverside County Clerk within five (5) working days of any Project approval.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of October, 2013, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Eddie Cedeno, Chair
Planning Commission
City of Coachella

ATTEST:

Monica Diaz,
Planning Commission Secretary
City of Coachella

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Best Best & Krieger LLP

Exhibit "A"
[CEQA Findings of Fact]

EXHIBIT "A"
LA ENTRADA SPECIFIC PLAN
FINAL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT REPORT
SCH# 2012071061

STATEMENT OF FACTS AND FINDINGS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") in Public Resources Code Section 21081 provides in part that:

"[N]o public agency shall approve or carry out a Project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the Project is approved or carried out unless both of the following occur:

- (a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect:
 - (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
 - (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
 - (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.
- (b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the Project outweigh the significant effects on the environment."

The City of Coachella (City) Development Services Department circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a 30-day public review period commencing July 18, 2012 to August 18, 2012, and held one public scoping meeting on August 28, 2012. The Development Services Department prepared a Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2012071061) to address "the Project." The scoping meeting notice was also provided in Spanish. A joint City Council/Planning Commission Study Session presentation was held on June 19, 2013. The Project summary slide for this presentation was also presented in Spanish. The Draft EIR for the proposed Project was distributed to trustee and responsible agencies, members of the public, other interested parties, and the California Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse on July 11, 2013 (refer to Appendix A, Draft EIR Noticing). This began the 45-day public review period, which ended on August 26, 2013 according to the State Clearinghouse. Public comments were received by the City of Coachella Development Services Department and have been responded to by the City in accordance with CEQA requirements.

The City of Coachella City Council determines that the Final EIR composed of the Draft EIR, comments received from the public and interested agencies, the Responses to Comments prepared by the City, Errata, and all attachments and documents incorporated by reference is complete and adequate, and has been prepared in accordance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the City's local CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to "Describe any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance." Chapter 4.0, *Existing Environmental Setting, Environmental Analysis, Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, of the Draft EIR analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project. The Draft EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts as discussed further below and in Attachment A, *Statement of Overriding Considerations*. As the Final EIR concludes that implementation of the Project (and the Project alternatives) would result in significant impacts, it is required under the State CEQA Guidelines to make certain findings with respect to these impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091).

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT PROPOSED FOR APPROVAL

The La Entrada Specific Plan (the "Project") consists of a Specific Plan Amendment, General Plan Amendment, Zone Change/Pre-Annexation Zoning, Development Agreement, LAFCO Annexation, and Subdivision Map approval. Various other discretionary approvals will also be required, as described further in the Draft EIR (Section 2, *Project Description*), and in the October 16, 2013 Planning Commission Staff Report.

The following Project Design Features (PDFs) have been incorporated into the La Entrada Specific Plan. These features are considered in each impact section of the EIR and either avoid, reduce, offset, or otherwise minimize identified potential adverse impacts of the Project or provide significant benefit to the community and/or to the physical environment. The PDFs would be identified in the Project's Conditions of Approval to ensure implementation as assumed in this EIR.

Aesthetics

- The La Entrada Specific Plan has been designed to retain the steeper slopes in natural open space.
- Mass-graded areas would be revegetated at the completion of the mass grading process, pursuant to the City's Municipal Code and the Specific Plan.
- The La Entrada Specific Plan contains grading standards and guidelines and landscape guidelines that provide plans and standards for landscape plant palettes, architectural guidelines (including colors and materials), streetscape enhancements, park treatments, perimeter and interior fencing, walls, and other design components.
- The Project entries incorporate palm-themed intersection and gateway treatments consistent with the City's median guidelines.
- Common area landscaping, including enhanced streetscape, private parks, and fuel modification zones, would be maintained by a Homeowner's Association (HOA) or by a Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District (LLMD) that could be formed as part of the Project financing to ensure a uniform level and high standard of maintenance to maintain the long-term appearance of the community.
- The proposed grading plan incorporates contour grading in hillside areas designed to blend the Project's manufactured slopes with existing natural terrain as required by Specific Plan Section 3.2.5, Hillside Design.

- The proposed Specific Plan's open space and parks sites throughout the Project would provide scenic viewpoints.
- The Specific Plan's design and development guidelines include specific requirements and restrictions regarding site lighting, including:
 - Architectural lighting and landscape accents that shall be aesthetically pleasing and nonobtrusive; and
 - Shielded lights that would be utilized in park lighting to reduce light glare.

Agricultural Resources

- Interim agricultural uses as defined in Section 4.0 of the Specific Plan shall be permitted in any planning area ultimately planned for development uses prior to entitlement for the area's primary permitted uses.
- Agricultural and community garden uses are permitted within park areas of the Specific Plan.

Air Quality

- The Specific Plan development is proposed to be phased, with the initial Phase 1 grading limited to the area necessary to achieve mass balancing and proper drainage of the overall property, leaving the balance of the site in its current condition until such time that the remaining phases begin to develop. This phased development would reduce the overall area being disturbed at any one time and will substantially reduce the overall annual grading emissions.
- The Specific Plan provides for a mix of residential and employment uses as well as nonvehicular circulation (e.g., bike and pedestrian trails) that would serve to reduce VMT and associated air emissions.

Biological Resources

- The Specific Plan development is proposed to be phased, with the initial Phase 1 grading limited to the area necessary to achieve mass balancing and proper drainage of the overall property, leaving the balance of the site in its current condition until such time that the remaining phases begin to develop. This phased development would minimize impacts to biological resources.
- The proposed Specific Plan includes approximately 557 ac of open space, including 175.8 ac of soft-bottomed drainage areas that are available for mitigation, and approximately 344.7 ac of passive and active recreation. Retention basins for drainage and water quality, if required by the CVWD, would be vegetated, and the landscaping of active recreational areas would increase plant cover and trees on site, thereby providing habitat for birds and forage for birds of prey. The northern portion of the regional Special-Use Park is proposed as natural open space to avoid impacts to a jurisdictional drainage in that location.
- The Specific Plan's Conceptual Drainage Plan incorporates drainage and water quality features that would maintain water quality within the on-site drainages and preserve/enhance downstream water quality, thereby indirectly protecting the biological resources and functions of the drainage.

- Specific Plan implementation would result in increased desert vegetative cover on site, including trees and shrubs that could enhance the availability of nesting sites for migratory birds in the Project area.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

- The La Entrada Specific Plan has been designed to preserve the northeastern and southeastern portions of the Specific Plan site in permanent open space, thereby reducing the potential for disturbance of previously unidentified paleontological and archaeological resources in those areas.

Geology and Soils

- The Specific Plan and associated Tentative Tract Maps have been designed to avoid grading the steeper northern/northeastern and southeastern portions of the site, and also incorporate a setback area to ensure structures are not placed on the identified fault traces within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Hazard Zone identified on the Project site.
- The Specific Plan has incorporated areas with identified earthquake fault traces into the open space and park components of the plan.
- School sites have been located on the Specific Plan Land Use Plan to ensure adequate separation from existing fault zones.
- The fully developed Specific Plan would result in substantially reduced wind- and runoff-induced erosion.
- Project development would adhere to all of the seismic requirements incorporated in the 2010 California Residential Code and 2010 (or most current) California Building Code (CBC) and the requirements and standards contained in the applicable chapters of the City of Coachella Municipal Code.
- Project development would include the implementation and maintenance of BMPs to reduce or avoid soil loss due to wind and water erosion.
- Prior to development of any upstream areas of the site, the on-site drainage facilities would be designed to control debris potentially conveyed from the off-site watershed areas.

Global Climate Change

- The Specific Plan development is proposed to be phased, with the initial Phase 1 grading limited to the area necessary to achieve mass balancing and proper drainage of the overall property, leaving the majority of the site in its current condition until such time that the remaining phases begin to develop. This phased development would reduce the overall area being disturbed at any one time and would reduce the overall annual grading emissions.
- The Project's sustainability strategies commit to the use of solar photovoltaic panels on a minimum of 25 percent of homes and businesses, and promoting green building techniques in excess of Title 24 requirements, thereby reducing GHG emissions associated with energy usage.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- The Specific Plan proposes low-density residential uses with large lots in the northern portion of the site to allow incorporation of fuel modification zones into lots abutting open space areas and to allow for better compatibility with the existing landforms. Maintenance of fuel modification/management zones would be the responsibility of individual homeowners on private property.
- School sites have been located to ensure adequate separation from existing power lines and the adjacent I-10 freeway.

Hydrology and Water Quality

- The Specific Plan development areas shall conform to all of the requirements imposed by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Hydrology Manual, the requirements of the City of Coachella's adopted Stormwater Management Ordinance (Title 13.16 of the Municipal Code), the requirements of the Whitewater River Watershed Stormwater Management Plan, and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit. If the Project Drainage Master Plan without retention basins is approved by the CVWD, the Municipal Code requirements for 100 percent on-site drainage retention would be modified.
- The Project has incorporated a comprehensive drainage and water quality program into the site, consisting of the surface drainage system and water quality features. This will reduce storm water runoff volume and velocity, improve storm water runoff water quality during storm events and low-flow irrigation volumes, and create biological resource habitat. Key system features are summarized in the Draft La Entrada Specific Plan as well as in the Project's hydrology study and Water Quality Assessment Report that are provided in Appendix I to this EIR.
- The proposed Specific Plan includes up to 175.8 ac of soft-bottomed drainages.

Land Use and Planning

- The entire Specific Plan has been designed in a manner to minimize impacts to the environment, as emphasized in the *Sustainable Community Design Features* section.

Noise

- The Specific Plan is proposed to be developed in phases, which include five mass grading phases and five development phases. The initial Phase 1 grading would be limited to the area necessary to achieve a balanced site and proper drainage, thereby reducing the noise impacts associated with mass grading during the interim implementation phase.
- The Specific Plan will be constructed in compliance with all applicable provisions of the City's Municipal Code, including observing all time limitations on construction noise that exceeds Base Ambient Noise Levels.
- Based on a design-level acoustical study, all residential structures built on the Project site shall incorporate design measures to ensure that interior noise levels for residential development do not exceed 45 A-weighted decibels (dBA) in accordance with Title 25 (California Noise Insulation Standards) and the City's Municipal Code (Title 7).

- During the preparation of construction drawings for Project-specific development, the exact acoustical specifications for window glass in buildings with unshielded first- and second-floor windows shall be determined pursuant to an acoustical study and the requirements of the City's General Plan and Municipal Code.

Mineral Resources

- There are no applicable PDFs related to Mineral Resources.

Public Services and Utilities

- In addition to paying City Fire Facility Impact Fees, the Project proposes to reserve and/or dedicate a site for the construction of a new fire station within the Project site (identified in the Specific Plan in the mixed-use area of Central Village), which is subject to change based on the Fire Department's preference. Reservation of the fire station site would aid toward substantially improving fire services within and beyond the Project site and place additional resources in closer proximity to residential and open space areas, helping to reduce the risk associated with wildfire for the entire community.
- The Specific Plan would include the construction of three aboveground potable water storage tanks with a total storage capacity of approximately 14 million gallons and the installation of water mains, laterals, and hydrants sufficient to provide minimum fire flow at required pressure to all portions of the Project, as well as operational and emergency flows.
- All homes within the proposed Specific Plan would include in-house fire protection sprinkler systems per State regulations, which the City would enforce through its building and occupancy permit process.
- The Specific Plan would be developed in phases over a period of up to approximately 30 years, which would allow the City Fire and Police Departments time to respond to any need for additional facilities, equipment, and/or officers and other personnel that might be required to serve the Project area as funding becomes available. The Specific Plan includes a fire station site in the mixed-use area of Central Village. The Project would pay Police Impact Fees and Fire Impact Fees in addition to all other fees assessed and Project contributions toward General Fund revenue through property tax and sales tax.
- The majority of the residential development within the proposed Specific Plan consists of single-family homes having frontage on public local streets. This type of development provides "eyes on the street," which is the essence of defensible space design.
- In addition to paying prevailing school impact fees at the time of building permit issuance, the Specific Plan addresses the need for additional school facilities created by its development by setting aside sites for three elementary schools and one middle school (totaling approximately 70 ac) to increase available school facilities.
- The Specific Plan development would extend power from the existing substation near Avenue 52. The substation facilitates interconnection with IID's transmission lines and provides for the distribution of electricity to the Project and other sites in the City's northern area.
- As part of the City's standard plan check review and tract map development process, the applicant would make appropriate provision for telecommunication services.

- The Specific Plan intends to use recycled water from the City's plant should recycled water be available from the existing plant in the future.
- All construction on the Project site would comply with the solid waste diversion mandate contained in the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code).
- The Specific Plan includes provisions requiring the diversion of a minimum of 75 percent solid waste.

Recreation

- The Specific Plan includes park, open space, and recreational uses that total approximately 901.6 ac, or approximately 41 percent of the Project footprint. Developed park facilities may be credited toward part, or all, of the Project's required park facilities fees, which are estimated to be in excess of \$56 million.
- The Specific Plan would offer three elementary school sites and one middle school site for dedication to CVUSD. These sites, totaling 69.8 ac, would be located in Planning Areas C14, C25, H13, and H26. If constructed, all sites could potentially provide joint use of playground/field facilities for neighborhood recreational uses pursuant to school district policies.
- The Specific Plan includes community parks in Planning Areas G18, G14, C6, C8, C22, and H21 with combinations of play equipment, play areas, sport courts, shade structures, picnic areas, passive turf play areas, benches, and basic related amenities. The parks would be located along a pedestrian system of walkways and paths in the 27.8 ac Village Paseo.
- The Specific Plan includes neighborhood recreation parks in Planning Areas C17 and H16, ranging in size from 5 ac to 9 ac, to serve the active and passive recreational needs of residents.
- The Specific Plan provides 176.6 ac of larger regional-scale, special-use parks with sports facilities within portions of the Project's fault setback zone, specifically in Planning Areas G2, G1, and G4. These large parks are intended to be used for fields and sports courts, playgrounds, trails, and off-street parking, and can be accessed via pedestrian walkways, the 27.8 ac Village Paseo, or public streets.
- The Specific Plan would include the construction and/or extension of trails adjacent to backbone roads as part of a 27.8 ac Village Paseo that connects the Project's parks and schools, and as part of 81.8 ac of linear parks on the upper edges of the Project drainage ways that connect to natural open space areas located on the northeastern portion of the Project site. These trails would provide connections between the residential communities and the natural open space areas within and adjacent to the Project site.
- The Specific Plan's private parks, trails, and open space areas would be maintained by an LLMD or other similar entity for use by the Project residents and would not impact the City's General Fund.

Traffic and Transportation

- The Specific Plan proposes non-vehicular circulation facilities that would include bicycle lanes, trails, pathways, and sidewalks that promote alternative non-vehicular modes of transportation.
- The Specific Plan proposes mixed-use commercial, recreational, and school facilities that would reduce vehicle trips to the adjacent City and regional street system.
- The Specific Plan incorporates substantial circulation system improvements, including the extensions of Avenues 50 and 52.
- The Specific Plan provides for secondary and emergency access, at the request of City staff, through the extension of Avenue 52.
- The Specific Plan allows and provides for the use of electric low-speed vehicles (LSVs) or NEVs on all internal Project streets. The Specific Plan proposes paseo cross-sections that provide striped dual NEV and bike lanes.
- Sunline Transit District would be consulted, in conjunction with Project development, to coordinate the potential for expanded transit/bus service and vanpools and to discuss and implement potential transit turnout locations within the Project area.

Water Supply

- The Specific Plan includes various water conservation features as set forth in Specific Plan Section 2.3, *Sustainable Community Design Features*, including use of native plants.

3.0 FINDINGS CONCERNING IMPACTS FOUND NOT SIGNIFICANT OR LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

In evaluating the potential impacts associated with the Project, the Final EIR identified potential impacts that would be not significant. This Section of the Statement of Facts and Findings identifies those impacts that may occur with Project implementation, but were found to be below the threshold of significance. CEQA does not require findings for impacts that are found to be less than significant, and therefore do not require mitigation. Nevertheless, the following information is provided in order to summarize the bases for determinations of non-significance for the potential impacts as presented in the Chapter 4.0, *Existing Environmental Setting, Environmental Analysis, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures*, and Chapter 6.0, *Long-Term Implications of the Project*, in the Final EIR.

AESTHETICS, LIGHT, AND GLARE

Finding

Threshold 4.1.1. *Project construction and implementation would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.*

Facts in Support of Finding

No City-designated scenic vistas are identified in the City of Coachella General Plan. No designated scenic corridors occur within the vicinity of the Project site. However, the Santa

Rosa Mountains and Mecca Hills are considered visual resources in the vicinity of the City of Coachella and are visible from all areas on the Project site and from offsite lands in the surrounding area.

Project construction would result in temporary visual changes due to grading and other construction activities, including the presence of construction equipment and materials onsite. With completion of each phase, temporary views of construction activities, materials, or equipment in those areas would cease, and Project Design Features (e.g. revegetating mass graded areas upon completion of grading) would be implemented to further reduce potential effects of such temporary disturbance. The activities associated with short-term construction would therefore not obstruct or significantly affect a scenic vista, and impacts would be less than significant.

As designed, the Project would not create a skyline development silhouette that would be visible from offsite public vantage points. Further, the Project design includes approximately 900 acres of open space and park/recreation uses that would preserve scenic views from the subject site. The EIR analysis of public area vantage points determined that Project development would partially encroach or not encroach into or obstruct existing views to resources off of the Project site, and would therefore not have a significant effect on any designated scenic vistas from such viewpoints. Therefore, no substantial adverse effects to scenic vistas within the existing viewshed would occur, and Project impacts on scenic views would be less than significant.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.1-11-4.1-16.

Finding

Threshold 4.1.2. Project construction and implementation would not damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway.

Facts in Support of Finding

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. No City-designated scenic corridors occur within the Project area, and no scenic rock formations are identified in the General Plan as occurring on the Project site. The Project site is currently undeveloped, and no historic buildings or other aesthetic structures are present onsite. The City's General Plan identifies only mature date palms as scenic plant resources. However, no mature date palms are present on the Project site. Therefore, Project impacts on this type of scenic resource are considered to be less than significant.

Significant visual resources are visible from the Project site and surrounding areas. However, views of these resources do not occur from a designated State Scenic Highway, and the Project would not obstruct any such views. As identified in the General Plan and the adopted McNaughton Specific Plan, the Project site is designated for a mixture of land uses, thereby indicating that the site could be developed in the future and is therefore not considered an aesthetic resource intended for preservation in its current undeveloped state. Any future development would be required to comply with applicable General Plan and Specific Plan policies regulating the design of new structures and protecting the existing visual quality of the City. Therefore, although the Project would convert vacant land to urban uses, it would not substantially degrade scenic resources in the area. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.1-16 – 4.1-17.

AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Finding

Threshold 4.2.2. *Project construction and implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site is not covered under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any Williamson Act contract. The areas affected by the proposed extension 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 extension of Avenues 50 and 52 would be considered as the provision of new major streets so that orderly development (e.g., La Entrada Specific Plan) may result. Therefore, the extensions of Avenues 50 and 52 would be consistent with the A-T zoning designation. The Project would not conflict with or result in impacts associated with existing zoning for agricultural uses. No impacts would occur in this regard, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.2-10 – 4.2-11.

Finding

Threshold 4.2.3. *Project construction and implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The portion of the Project site that is located within the City is currently zoned as C-G (General Commercial), R-M (Residential Multiple Family), R-S (Residential Single Family), O-S (Open Space), and A-T (Agricultural Transitional); the portion of the Project site that is located in the County is zoned O-S (Open Space). Therefore, no portions of the Project site are zoned for timberland or timberland development. As development of the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland, no impacts to forest land or timberland resources would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.2-11.

Finding

Threshold 4.2.4. *Project construction and implementation would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection maintains Forest and Range Assessments under the Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP). FRAP mapping does not indicate any forest resources within the City. In addition, the City's General Plan does not identify any lands that contain forest or forestry resources within the City limits or its Sphere of Influence. The Project site does not support wilderness, timberlands, or forest land. Therefore,

development of the Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. No impacts would occur in this regard, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.2-11.

Finding

Threshold 4.2.5. Project construction and implementation would not involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Facts in Support of Finding

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 Project impact on agricultural resources. The type of soils located onsite, combined with the location of the site relative to the amount and quality of agricultural operations within the Zone of Influence (ZOI) for the site and the absence of Protected Resource Land, resulted in low LE and SA subscores. As established by the LESA Model for the proposed Project development area, no significant agricultural resource impacts would result from conversion of the site to non-agricultural uses.

Whether adjacent agricultural land is developed depends on several factors, including market demand, availability of property, profitability of the agricultural use, and the landowner's interest in continuing farming. One factor considered in the LESA Model is the land uses located within each site's ZOI. The amount of agricultural land within the ZOI for the Project site is approximately 17 percent of the land in that ZOI. The condition and use of land adjacent to the Project site was assessed in the LESA Model prepared for the Project. The results of the LESA Model concluded that the conversion of the site to non-agricultural uses would not result in a significant agricultural resource impact. Impacts would therefore be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Also refer to Response to Comment No. 11, and discussion below for Threshold 4.2.1, regarding Avenue 50 extension impacts on existing agricultural lands.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.2-12 – 4.2-13.

AIR QUALITY

Finding

Threshold 4.3.4. Project construction and implementation would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site is located in Riverside County, which is not among counties found to have serpentine and ultramafic rock in their soils. Therefore, the potential risk for naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) to be present during Project construction is limited. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Vehicle trips generated by the anticipated 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 Project would

therefore contribute to increased carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations at intersections in the Project vicinity. However, all intersections analyzed for potential CO impacts were determined to experience 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations below the federal and State standards, both without and with the Project. The Project would therefore result in a less than significant impact on local air quality for CO, and no mitigation is required.

Three existing residences are located in the Project vicinity that could potentially be exposed to Project construction-related emissions. 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 areas affected by Project construction, the majority of construction activities would be distanced far away from these sensitive receptors. Therefore, measurable pollutant concentration increases are considered unlikely. Project impacts on sensitive receptors would be below a level of significance, and no mitigation is required.

The Health Risk Assessment (HRA) performed for the Project 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.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.3-22 – 4.3-27.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Finding

Threshold 4.4.4. Project construction and implementation would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

Facts in Support of Finding

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). All three Conservation Areas contain biological corridors and linkages between the San Jacinto/Santa Rosa Mountains and the San Bernardino Mountains. Implementation of the Project as designed would not interfere with or disturb these conservation areas. Therefore, the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines established in Section 4.5 of the CVMSHCP would not be applicable to the proposed Project. Project effects related to wildlife movement and habitat fragmentation would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.4-15 - 4.4-18.

Finding

Threshold 4.4.5. Project construction and implementation would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Facts in Support of Finding

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 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, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.4-18 – 4.4-19.

Finding

Threshold 4.4.6. Project construction and implementation would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site is within the planning boundary of the CVMSHCP, but is not within a designated Conservation Area. The Project site is located in proximity to three CVMSHCP Conservation Areas. However, the Project as designed 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, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.4-19.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Finding

Threshold 4.6.5. The Project would not result in adverse impacts as a result of soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

Facts in Support of Finding

The 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 would not result in impacts related to alternative wastewater disposal systems, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.6-19.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Finding

Threshold 4.8.4. Project construction and implementation would not result in impacts related to the Project being located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site is not included on any hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962. Therefore, the 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 impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.8-10.

Finding

Threshold 4.8.5. The Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site is located approximately four miles northeast of the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport, formally known as the Thermal Airport. Therefore, the site is not located within two miles of a public airport. The Project site is not located within an airport land use plan and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working onsite. Based on review of the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport "Airspace Plan" and Airport Master Plan, which shows FAA FAR Part 77 notification surfaces, the Project is not within any applicable FAA airspace notification surface. The nearest site boundary is approximately 19,500 feet from the nearest runway terminus, although the site is northeast of the north-south runway and not in a flight path. The runway approach pattern is at 866 feet above mean sea level (msl), which is well above the site's maximum elevation of 700 feet, which occurs in the distant eastern portions more than 4 miles from the nearest runway terminus. Therefore, the Project would not result in adverse impacts associated with aviation safety and airports, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.8-10.

Finding

Threshold 4.8.6. The Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working onsite. Therefore, the Project would not result in adverse impacts associated with aviation safety and airports, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.8-10.

Finding

Threshold 4.8.3. Project construction and implementation would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Facts in Support of Finding

The 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. In addition, the

Project site and immediate properties do not contain any existing school facilities. Therefore, the Project would not result in adverse impacts associated with hazardous emissions or materials or substances within proximity of an existing or proposed school, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.8-10.

Finding

Threshold 4.8.7. Project construction and implementation would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Riverside County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) and the Riverside County Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) are applicable to the Project site. The Project would include multiple direct emergency vehicle access routes to and from the site. Project implementation would result in increased traffic on area roadways that could potentially result in substantial delays to the movement of emergency vehicles. However, the Project would accommodate future development of police and fire stations on the Project site and secondary emergency access as part of the Project design that would require review and approval by the City Fire Department. Therefore, Project impacts related to potential delays to emergency vehicles would be reduced to a less than significant level, based on such Project features.

Further, the 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, Project effects related to consistency with the General Plan would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.8-10 – 4.8-11.

Finding

Threshold 4.8.8. Project construction and implementation would not 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.

Facts in Support of Finding

According to the County of Riverside Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan, the Project site is located in an area that has a Low to Moderate wildfire hazard potential. The Project would be required to demonstrate compliance with the City's Fire Code for future land uses in 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 Project would not increase the potential for wildland fires to occur. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant adverse risk of loss, injury, or death related to wildland fires. Impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.8-11 – 4.8-12.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Finding

Threshold 4.9.9. Project construction and implementation 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.

Facts in Support of Finding

No portions of the Project site are located within a 100-year flood hazard area. The Project site is not located within the potential flood zone of a dam, as no dams or reservoirs are located upslope of the Project site.

The Coachella Canal levee, located approximately 750 feet from the Project site, may be subject to failure during a seismic event. However, the majority of the Project site is higher in elevation than the Canal. Any flooding resulting in the event of failure of the levee would not adversely affect the Project site. Any flooding from failure of the levee would occur downslope of the Project site within offsite designated open space areas. Therefore, construction and/or operation of the 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 impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.9-21.

Finding

Threshold 4.9.2. Project construction and implementation would not 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.

Facts in Support of Finding

Construction

Groundwater at the site is greater than 50 feet below ground surface. Therefore, 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 could decrease infiltration during construction. However, Project 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.

Operation

The Coachella Water Authority (CWA) would provide water service to the Project. The main source of supply for the proposed Project is the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin. In accordance with SB 610 and CEQA, the CWA Water Supply Assessment prepared for the Project concluded that the total projected water supplies available to the CWA during normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year periods over a 20-year projection period and beyond would be sufficient to meet the projected demands associated with the Project, in addition to existing and planned future uses in the CWA service area (including agricultural and manufacturing uses). Further, the demands associated with the Project have been specifically accounted for as part of the Coachella Valley Water District's (CVWD's) regional water supply

planning efforts and conclusions of water supply sufficiency. Long-term operational impacts would therefore be less than significant.

Construction and operation of the 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. In fact, the Project design features would facilitate groundwater recharge through Sustainable Community Design Features (Specific Plan Section 2.3) such as water quality basins and natural drainage channels which allow for Project storm flows and irrigation flows to recharge. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.9-16. Also refer to Draft EIR Section 4.17, *Water Supply*; Draft EIR Appendix M, *La Entrada Water Supply Assessment, Memorandum of Understanding 2009, and Memorandum of Understanding 2013*; and *Water Supply Assessment* (Appendix B and C).

Finding

Threshold 4.9.7. Project construction and implementation would not 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.

Facts in Support of Finding

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 within a 100-year flood hazard area. The Sustainable Community Design Strategies include implementation of an integrated stormwater collection and a conveyance system designed to provide 100-year flood protection to flood-prone areas, prohibition of development within onsite 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 housing would be protected from the 100-year flood. Impacts related to placement of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.9-20 – 4.9-21.

Finding

Threshold 4.9.8. Project construction and implementation would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.

Facts in Support of Finding

As indicated above, the majority of the Project site is in Zone D, and there is a potential for the proposed Project to place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. The Sustainable Community Design Strategies include implementation of an integrated stormwater collection and a conveyance system designed to provide 100-year flood protection to flood-prone areas, prohibition of development within onsite 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 would be protected from the 100-year flood. Impacts related to placement of structures within a 100-year flood hazard area would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.9-20 – 4.9-21.

Finding

Threshold 4.9.10. *Project construction and implementation would not result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.*

Facts in Support of Finding

No water retention facilities are located within proximity to the Project site. The proposed onsite retention basins would only temporarily detain runoff and therefore do not constitute a body of water. The risk associated with seiche waves is not considered a potential constraint or a potentially significant impact of the Project. Further, the Project site is not located in a designated tsunami inundation zone, and therefore, no impacts related to exposure of people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of inundation by tsunami would occur.

Geologic mapping of the Project site identified minor onsite debris/mudflows. Due to the minor nature of those debris/mudflows, the risk associated with possible mudflows and mudslides is not considered a potential constraint or a potentially significant impact of the Project. Therefore, the 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. No mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.9-21 – 4.9-22.

LAND USE AND RELEVANT PLANNING

Finding

Threshold 4.10.1. *The Project would not divide any established communities.*

Facts in Support of Finding

Development of the Project as designed would occur on approximately 1,600 acres of the site.

The Project site is currently undeveloped Open Space. Implementation of the Project would include Residential, School, Parks/ Recreational, Open Space, and Mixed Uses. Although implementation of the Project would extend Avenues 50 and 52 to connect to the Project site, the proposed Project would not divide established communities in the Project vicinity. Therefore, no impacts to existing development would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.10-5.

Finding

Threshold 4.10.3. *The Project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site is located within the boundaries of the CVMSHCP, which encompasses over 1,000,000 acres in the Coachella Valley. Although the Project site is in the planning area of the CVMSHCP, it 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 resulting with implementation of the Project on those adjacent Conservation Areas would be addressed based on compliance with the CVMSHCP Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the CVMSHCP. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.10-13.

Finding

Threshold 4.10.2. The Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project would result in modification of the General Plan existing land use designations on the Project site and would change the designation of the General Plan Land Use Map from the McNaughton Specific Plan to the La Entrada Specific Plan. The Project would extend the Specific Plan boundaries to include an additional 588 acres within the City boundary that are currently located in unincorporated Riverside County. Further, the Project would require a General Plan Amendment (GPA) and Zone Change in support of the proposed Specific Plan land uses. If the Project is approved subsequent to the General Plan update currently underway, the Project would already be incorporated into the General Plan and Zoning Code and would not require a GPA or Zone Change.

The proposed Project would be consistent with the applicable policies in the General Plan Land Use Element. 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 Project would be consistent with the City's General Plan.

The Project would also 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 Project to change the existing zoning on site, with an overall zoning designation of "Specific Plan" for the entire site. Approval of a Zone Change to reflect the specific zoning designations in the La Entrada Specific Plan would ensure that the Project as proposed would be consistent with the City's Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed extension of Avenues 50 and 52 across the Project site would connect to a future proposed interchange at I-10. 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 Project as proposed includes future development of multi-purpose trails, neighborhood electric vehicles (NEVs), Class 1 and 2 bike lanes, pedestrian/hiking trails, and equestrian trails. Therefore, the 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. SCAG, in their August 26, 2013 DEIR comment letter (Comment No. 8), affirmed the Project's overall consistency with SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Community Strategies (also refer to Response No. 8c).

The Project would be consistent with the majority of goals and policies established by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for annexation. The Project would be inconsistent with LAFCO's policy of encouraging development to be consistent with its surrounding area and

encouraging development in areas of annexation to occur within 10 years. The 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 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-acre parcel to the City by LAFCO would ultimately override and/or mitigate any inconsistencies between the Project and applicable LAFCO policies.

Impacts with regard to conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.10-5 – 4.10-13.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Finding

Threshold 4.11.2. Project construction and implementation would not 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.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site is located within Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 3 and contains aggregate mineral deposits, such as sand and gravel. During the construction phase, a substantial amount of sand and gravel that may be suitable for aggregate would be reused onsite and would not be available for other future reuse. During Project operation, access to any sand or gravel resources on the Project site would not be available, as the site would be in a developed state and would not be available for future use. The known sand and gravel materials do not represent unique resources that would qualify them as significantly important. Other known and existing commercial aggregate sources and undeveloped local and regional sources would otherwise adequately meet existing and future needs in the City and the Coachella Valley. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.11-3 – 4.11-4.

Finding

Threshold 4.11.1. Project construction and implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

Facts in Support of Finding

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, the Project would not have the potential to result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated in an applicable General Plan, Specific Plan, or any other land use plan. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.11-4.

NOISE

Finding

Threshold 4.12.2. *The Project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.*

Facts in Support of Finding

Construction

Ground-borne noise and vibration generated by Project construction activities would be largely low to moderate, unless pavement breaking and/or sheet pile vibration are used onsite, or when bulldozers or other heavy-tracked equipment are used. Such activities would temporarily impact receptors during the site preparation phase. However, any ground-borne noise and vibration would not be excessive and would not cause any damage to the buildings or impact outdoor activities. No impacts would occur in this regard, and no mitigation is required.

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 impacts would occur in this regard, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.12-20 – 4.12-21.

Finding

Threshold 4.12.5. *The Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels due to public airports.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site is not located within the boundaries of an airport land use plan. The closest airport is Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport (formerly known as Thermal Airport), located approximately four miles southwest of the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels from a public airport. No impacts would occur in this regard, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.12-22.

Finding

Threshold 4.12.6. *The Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels due to private airstrips.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site is not located within the boundaries of an airport land use plan. The closest airport is Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport (formerly known as Thermal Airport), located approximately four miles southwest of the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not expose

people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels from a private airport. No impacts would occur in this regard, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.12-22.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Finding

Threshold 4.13.1. *The Project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly.*

Facts in Support of Finding

Development of the Project as proposed would result in construction of 7,800 dwelling units, which would result in an estimated 35,958 future residents. The approved McNaughton Specific Plan proposed 8,000 dwelling units on 1,877 acres in the City of Coachella, and the City General Plan and zoning designations were amended to reflect that approved development on that parcel. The 35,958 future residents forecast 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) and included future population growth forecasts. As a result, because the La Entrada Specific Plan proposes fewer dwelling units, implementation of the Project would have a less than significant impact related to population growth.

The 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 substantial permanent increase in population within the Project area.

The Project proposes approximately 1.5 million square feet of non-residential uses that would generate up to an estimated 3,355 new jobs. While the place of residence of the persons accepting employment generated by the Project is unknown, due to the City's projected jobs-to-housing ratio, it is reasonable that the majority of these jobs would be filled by persons already living in the City or surrounding areas. Therefore, a significant increase in population in the City or surrounding areas is not anticipated to result from operation of the proposed onsite uses.

Population growth anticipated under the Specific Plan would not induce growth beyond that which 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 Project would result in less than significant growth-inducing impacts, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.13-7 - 4.13-11, and Final EIR Section 6.2, *Growth-inducing Impacts*.

Finding

Threshold 4.13.2 and 4.13.3. *The Project will not displace a substantial number of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site is currently undeveloped and has not historically been used for residential use. Future construction and operation of the 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 impact is anticipated, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.13-11 – 4.13-12.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Finding

Threshold 4.14.3. Project construction and implementation of the Project would not result in the need for additional schools.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project as designed includes four proposed school sites, resulting in future generation of an estimated 5,837 new students. Although the Project would not specifically develop the proposed school facilities, it would accommodate future development by reserving sites for the schools. The Project would include a Project Design Feature requiring the Project to pay school fees at the time of 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 middle schools that serve the Project area are currently over capacity, 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 to a level of less than significant.

Additionally, the Project would generate approximately 1,575 high school level students that would attend the existing Coachella Valley Union High School. That high school is currently operating above capacity, and therefore, the increased demand at that high school would be an adverse effect of the 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 to a level of less than significant.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.14-17 – 4.14-19.

Finding

Threshold 4.14.5. Project construction and implementation of the Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public transportation.

Facts in Support of Finding

Each phase of the Project would accommodate existing Sunline Transit Agency Lines 90 and 91, extending those bus routes into the Project site to loop through "Street A." The Project would also accommodate neighborhood electric vehicles (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. Therefore, Project impacts on public transportation would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.14-20 – 4.14-21.

Finding

***Threshold 4.14.6.** Project construction and implementation of the Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for **other public utilities**.*

Facts in Support of Finding

Verizon Wireless and Time Warner Cable would extend their existing facilities to the Project site to meet new demands for telephone, internet, and cable services associated with the Project. The Project would ensure 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 Project, no adverse impact would occur to these services. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.14-21.

Finding

***Threshold 4.14.7.** Project construction and implementation of the Project would not exceed **wastewater treatment requirements** of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.*

Facts in Support of Finding

Wastewater generated by the Project would be regulated under the Colorado River Basin RWQCB Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) Order No. R7-2005-0083. Therefore, Project compliance with the WDR Order permit requirements would ensure that wastewater discharges from the Project and treated by the WWTP would not exceed applicable Colorado River Basin RWQCB wastewater treatment discharge requirements. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.14-21 – 4.14-22.

Finding

***Threshold 4.14.8.** Project construction and implementation of the Project would not 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.*

Facts in Support of Finding

Stormwater on the Project site would require the construction of new stormwater collection and drainage facilities and the expansion of existing facilities. Regional flows from north of the Project site flow through seven alluvial drainages onsite 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) onsite retention basins where it would be held until it percolates the soil if the onsite 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 Project includes channelizing these drainages in a soft-bottom condition with side walls. Stormwater on the Project site would flow through backbone streets to a network of storm drains and then onsite drainage channels. All stormwater on the Project site would be accommodated by the stormwater drainage facilities included in the Project.

If the onsite retention basins are constructed with the Project, the Project would retain stormwater runoff onsite and would therefore not contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of the downstream storm drain facilities. If the onsite retention basins are determined to not be required, the onsite channels would convey storm water flows to the East Side Dike. As such, 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 Project without the onsite retention basins would not exceed the capacity of the downstream storm drain system.

CVWD's letter dated August 22, 2013 indicates CVWD's conceptual and conditional approval of the concept of the existing-condition hydrology and Project-related impacts to the existing CVWD facilities. This conceptual and conditional approval is based on RBF Consulting's report entitled "*La Entrada Specific Plan Development: Drainage Master Plan, City of Coachella and County of Riverside, California, Final Report, June 2013*" (refer to Draft EIR Appendix I).

Project-related impacts to stormwater drainage facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.14-22 – 4.14-23.

Finding

***Threshold 4.14.9.** Project construction and implementation of the Project would not result in impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered **energy transmission facilities** in order to maintain acceptable levels of service.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project would generate a total estimated 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 to extend the existing 92-kilovolt (kV) transmission lines from the existing substation near Avenue 52 across the canal to the Project site. Further, the IID would be required to relocate and/or rearrange certain segments of the existing 92 kV overhead transmission lines and some existing 13 kV lines to integrate these facilities with the new onsite electric distribution facilities. Installation of two new substations and the expansion of existing transmission lines would ensure that electricity demands associated with each Project phase would be met.

The Draft EIR addresses potential impacts of new energy transmission facilities. The EIR addresses potential electrical substations and transmission lines, which may be slightly modified to reflect transmission line easements requested by IID and Glorious Land Company (refer to Response No. 5b). As shown in Exhibit 4.14.2, the substations are conceptually planned within the Specific Plan area, in areas permitted for utility facilities, including development areas and open space. Utility facility siting, construction and operation will comply with applicable EIR mitigation measures, as well as other applicable standard design and construction practices and regulations of IID and other agencies such as the California Public Utilities Commission. These

substations and/or electrical transmission lines would be constructed by IID, within parcels to be improved by the developer as part of final engineering and design. Substation construction would be subject to CPUC and IID review and approval, which is anticipated to rely upon this EIR for CEQA clearance (at least at a programmatic level).

The Project would also include energy conservation measures detailed in the Specific Plan. With the proposed improvements, the Project would have a less than significant impact on electricity generation and transmission facilities, and no mitigation is required.

The Project would also generate a monthly demand of 24,512,076 cubic feet of natural gas and would require the Southern California Gas Company to construct a gas regulator station to provide an additional natural gas source to serve the site. With such infrastructure improvements, the Project would receive acceptable levels of service related to natural gas during each Project phase. Therefore, the Project would result in less than significant impacts related to natural gas transmission facilities, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.14-23 – 4.14-26, Response to Comment No. 5b.

Finding

***Threshold 4.14.12.** Project construction and implementation of the Project would not result in impacts due to conflict with any federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to **solid waste**.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project would comply with all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, including solid waste diversion requirements established by the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code) and the California Integrated Water Management Act of 1989. The 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, Project impacts with regard to solid waste would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.14-30 – 4.14-31.

RECREATION

Finding

***Threshold 4.15.1.** Project construction and implementation of the Project would not result in impacts due to an increase in 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.*

Facts in Support of Finding

Development of the Project would increase the City's population by up to an estimated 35,958 people. These residents would generate an increased demand for parks and recreational facilities. The Project would be required to provide approximately 107.9 acres of parkland to meet City requirements of 3.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. The Project design includes approximately 344.7 acres of parkland, 381.1 acres of open space, and 175.8 acres of

drainage/wash area. The Project also includes a network of multi-purpose trails and bicycle trails throughout the Project site.

The City currently has a deficit of approximately 36.2 acres of parkland. Although the Project would increase the City's overall population, it would provide sufficient parkland to offset the existing deficit of parkland in the City. Because the Project would result in an overall surplus of nearly 200 acres of parkland in the City, the Project would not adversely affect existing parks or other recreational facilities. Each of the three villages in the Specific Plan includes parks/recreation and open space uses that would be developed as the residential uses in the villages are developed so that residents in each village would have parks/recreation and open space uses available. As no deficiency in parkland with Project implementation 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 Project would not result in the physical deterioration of existing recreational facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.15-8 – 4.15-12.

Finding

Threshold 4.15.2. Project construction and implementation of the Project would not result in impacts due to the construction of or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Facts in Support of Finding

Buildout of the Project as designed would result in the provision of approximately 381.1 acres of open space, 175.8 acres of drainage/wash areas, and 344.7 acres of active parkland. The Project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond those already included in the Project as proposed. The Project would therefore 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. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.15-12.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

Finding

Threshold 4.16.3. The Project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

Facts in Support of Finding

Two general aviation airports in the vicinity of the Project site provide limited commercial service: Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport (4.25 miles southwest of the Project site) and Bermuda Dunes Airport (8.5 miles 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 feet, 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 anticipated land uses may result in some demand for travel at those airports by residents or employees. However, any such demand would not be substantial and would not be expected to adversely affect traffic levels at those airports. The Project would therefore not result in an

increase in traffic levels or air traffic patterns or any substantial aviation-related safety risks. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.16-18.

Finding

Threshold 4.16.4. The Project will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

Facts in Support of Finding

Construction

Construction of the Project may result in the need to temporarily restrict or detour vehicular traffic or cause temporary hazards. Project construction activities 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. Therefore, Project construction would result in a less than significant impact related to road or design hazards, and no mitigation is required.

Operation

Planned roadway improvements with the Project would be designed and constructed consistent with applicable City and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) design requirements, which would result in safe and efficient traffic flows. Project adherence to the Specific Plan general street alignments, street cross-sections, and other applicable City requirements for the design of streets would ensure the Project does not result in sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or other design hazards. Therefore, the Project would not increase hazards due to design features. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.16-18 – 4.16-19.

Finding

Threshold 4.16.5. The Project will not result in inadequate emergency access.

Facts in Support of Finding

Construction

Construction activities may temporarily restrict or delay emergency vehicles on and around the Project site. Project construction activities 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, 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 Project streets would ensure the Project does not result in conditions that would impede emergency response vehicles. The Project provides for

important regional access improvements by connecting Avenues 50 and 52 to Interstate 10 (including new access crossings over the Coachella Canal), by providing a new I-10 interchange at Avenue 50, and by making provision for access to land-locked parcels east of the Project. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.16-19.

Finding

Threshold 4.16.6. The Project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Facts in Support of Finding

The 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 also 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 Project would not conflict with the policies and goals in the Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG) Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. Therefore, Project impacts regarding conflicts with plans for alternative transportation modes would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.16-19 – 4.16-20.

WATER SUPPLY

Finding

Threshold 4.17.1. The Project will not result in impacts due to the lack of sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or new or expanded entitlements.

Facts in Support of Finding

Construction

Short-term demand for water may occur during demolition, excavation, grading, and construction of the proposed Project. It is estimated that a total of approximately 1,628 acre-feet (af)¹ would be used for construction purposes over buildout of the Project. The 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 Coachella Valley Groundwater Basin, specifically the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin, would serve as the main water source for the Project. 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

¹ One acre-foot is approximately 325,851 gallons (the amount of water represented by one acre of land covered one foot deep in water).

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 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). Impacts on water supplies associated with construction activities are therefore considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Operation

The CWA would provide water service to the Project. In accordance with SB 610 and CEQA, the CWA Water Supply Assessment prepared for the Project concluded that 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 Project, in addition to existing and planned future uses in the CWA service area, including agricultural and manufacturing uses.

As indicated above, CVWD has concluded that the total projected water supplies available to the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin area 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. Water demands for the Project have been accounted for as part of the CVWD's regional water supply planning efforts and conclusions of water supply sufficiency.

CVWD's supplemental water supplies and entitlements are specifically available to the CWA to serve the Project, 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. Project impacts related to sufficient water supplies and entitlements would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.17-44 – 4.17-50, and Final EIR Appendix M, *La Entrada Water Supply Assessment* (and related MOUs).

Finding

Threshold 4.17.2. The Project will not result in impacts due to requirements for or construction of new water or wastewater treatment or collection facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Facts in Support of Finding

The 2010 annual production from the City's eight wells was approximately 2,700 million gallons. The 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 within the production capacity of the City's existing wells (approximately 18 million gallons per day, or 6,570 million gallons annually).

In addition to onsite infrastructure within the Specific Plan boundaries, the Project would supplement City water facilities with two offsite 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 north of 48th Avenue and east of Tyler Street, approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile from the closest proposed well. The Specific Plan indicates that well and booster sites would be located at an off-site location to maintain water quality. Two separate pipelines would be routed from these wells and boosters across the Coachella Canal along Avenue 50 and Avenue 52 to a common booster station on the Project site to serve all three pressure zones. The Conceptual Water Plan (La Entrada Specific Plan Exhibit 2-10 and Figure 4.17.1) indicates two 24-inch water mains would be extended from the City's 150 Zone system to serve the Project site. The 24-inch water main would be extended from Polk Street into the Project area and would be transferred into a booster station for the 450 Zone system.

The Project water infrastructure would be integrated into the City's existing water facilities system. The physical disturbance of undeveloped land associated with the Project has been evaluated in the DEIR. Project impacts with regard to requirements for or construction of new water or wastewater treatment or collection facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.17-50 - 4.17-52.

Finding

***Threshold 4.17.3.** The Project will not 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.*

Facts in Support of Finding

Construction

Groundwater at the Project site is greater than 50 feet below ground surface, and therefore, it is not anticipated that the groundwater table would be encountered, and dewatering is not anticipated to be required during construction. Project grading and construction would compact soil, which may decrease infiltration during construction. However, 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. Therefore, Project construction impacts on groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Operation

The CWA would provide water service to the 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.

Water demands associated with the 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 on the Project site. However, the site is not used to support regional recharge programs identified in the 2010 CVWMP Update that recharge the Lower Whitewater River Subbasin. The 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. The Project will provide for groundwater recharge through onsite water quality basins and natural drainage channels. Therefore, Project operational impacts related to groundwater levels would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.17-44 - 4.17-50.

4.0 FINDINGS CONCERNING IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION

In evaluating the potential impacts associated with the Project, the Final EIR identified potential impacts that would be less than significant with mitigation. This Section of the Statement of Facts and Findings identifies those impacts that may occur with Project implementation but were found to be below the threshold of significance with implementation of recommended mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment B, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program). Impacts noted below are also offset through existing regulatory programs and Project conditions of approval, as well as Project Design Features listed in the Final EIR Section 3.9 (pages 3-19 to 3-25).

AESTHETICS/LIGHT AND GLARE

Finding

Threshold 4.1.4. Construction and implementation of the Project would not result in impacts to surrounding uses due to light and glare, or expose residential property to unacceptable light levels during construction, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B," Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).

- (1) *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which substantially lessens the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.*

Facts in Support of Finding

During construction, travelers within the Project area will experience views of the site that may include construction fencing, equipment, grading areas, building pads, partially constructed structures, and other related facilities and activities. Such views would be temporary and would not represent a permanent change in views of construction equipment and activities from outside the Project site. Construction activities would not occur during the evening or nighttime hours, and therefore, no night lighting for construction would be required. Limited security lighting will be provided at the Site Manager's trailer and at other locations during construction. However, such lighting would comply with City Municipal Code Requirements. Further, construction activities and/or equipment would not generate substantial potential sources of glare. As a result, Project construction activities and/or equipment would result in less than significant temporary impacts related to aesthetics and light and glare.

The Project would result in the introduction of new 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 such sources of light would contribute to the overall light visible in the night sky and the surrounding area, the Project site is in an undeveloped desert area, and no nearby sensitive receptors occur that would be adversely impacted by such lighting. Agricultural uses in the Project vicinity operate during daylight hours and would therefore not be impacted by Project lighting and glare effects, as such uses are not typically sensitive to light and glare. While the 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 areas are relatively undeveloped with limited or no existing light sources, the Project would introduce a substantial amount of light and glare sources where none previously existed, resulting in a potentially significant impact.

All structural and landscape lighting would be consistent with the design guidelines in the Specific Plan and all applicable City regulations and ordinances pertaining to specific plan developments. Onsite landscaping would be used to screen lighting sources to reduce potential visual impacts from lighting used for buildings and parking lots. Further, Project adherence to the City's Zoning Code would ensure that any building or parking lighting installed would not significantly impact adjacent uses. Mitigation Measure 4.1.1 would be implemented to further reduce potential light-related impacts of the Project, beyond the requirements of the City's Municipal Code. With adherence to applicable regulations and implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.1.1, Project light and glare impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level.

All Project lighting (other than street lighting) would be shielded to minimize illumination of adjacent properties and to reduce the potential for glare. Lighting for the ball field would be in the form of tall fixtures placed to illuminate the field and would incorporate low-glare, shielded lighting to minimize glare impacts on surrounding areas. Mitigation Measure 4.1.1 would be implemented to further reduce potential ball field light-related impacts or beyond the requirements of the City's Municipal Code.

New traffic signals are proposed for internal roads on the Project site. Any Project-related traffic signals would be shielded to direct light toward a specific lane, while blocking 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, potential light impacts of traffic signals installed with the Project 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. With implementation of such measures, and with consideration for the nature of the type of uses proposed, the Project is not anticipated to contribute to a substantial increase the amount of daytime glare in the area.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.1-19 – 4.1-23.

AIR QUALITY

Finding

Threshold 4.3.5. *Project construction and implementation would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.*

Facts in Supporting Finding

The operation of heavy-duty equipment on the Project site during the construction phase 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 anticipated during Project construction. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

The anticipated residential, commercial, and/or 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 on 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. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.9.2 would require preparation and adherence to a maintenance plan for these water features to minimize potential odors caused by standing or retained water. Therefore, potential impacts resulting with Project operations would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.3-27.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Finding

Threshold 4.4.1. *The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly 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 with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B," Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

- (1) *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The impact of the Project on biological resources would be less than significant due to compliance with existing laws, regulatory programs, and General Plan policies currently in place. Further, implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4-1 to 4.4-5 would reduce impacts on special-interest plant communities; non-listed special-interest species; threatened and endangered species; and, burrowing owl and migratory birds to a less than significant level. Any future development within the Project site would be subject to the requirements of the EIR and applicable regulatory programs, and would require site-specific CEQA analysis to ensure that all impacts on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species would be reduced to less than significant. The Project also includes design features to minimize impacts to biological resources, including setting aside natural open space areas, and maintaining portions of the existing desert wash in its natural condition (DEIR, pages 4.4-10 and 4.4-11). These include the following:

- The Specific Plan development is proposed to be phased, with the initial Phase 1 grading limited to the area necessary to achieve mass balancing and proper drainage of the overall property, leaving the balance of the site in its current condition until such time the remaining phases begin to develop. This phased development would minimize impacts to biological resources.
- The proposed Specific Plan includes approximately 557 ac of open space, including 175.8 ac of soft-bottomed drainage areas available for mitigation and approximately 344.7 ac of passive and active recreation. Retention basins for drainage and water quality, if required by the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD), would be vegetated, and the landscaping of active recreational areas would increase plant cover and trees on site, providing habitat for birds and forage for birds of prey.¹ The northern portion of the regional Special Use Park is proposed as natural open space to avoid impacts to a jurisdictional drainage in that location.
- The Specific Plan's Conceptual Drainage Plan (provided in Appendix I and shown on Figure 3.10 in the Project Description) incorporates drainage and water quality features that would maintain water quality within the on-site drainages and preserve/enhance downstream water quality, indirectly protecting the biological resources and functions of the drainage.
- Specific Plan implementation would result in increased desert vegetative cover on site, including trees and shrubs that could enhance the availability of nesting sites for migratory birds in the Project area.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.4-11– 4.4-14.

Finding

Threshold 4.4.2. The Project would not 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 with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B," Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).

- (1) *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The impact of the Project on biological resources would be less than significant due to compliance with existing laws, regulatory programs, and General Plan policies currently in place, in addition to implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-5. Of the approximately 218.13 acres of CDFW jurisdiction on the Project site, approximately 10.0 acres are considered CDFW vegetated streambed, and 6.6 acres of desert dry wash woodland are considered CDFW jurisdictional vegetation. The Project is anticipated to impact approximately 191.60 acres of CDFW jurisdictional area (123.49 acres permanent, 68.11 acres temporary). As a result, a CDFW 1602 Agreement would be required prior to any construction in jurisdictional areas. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4.5 would ensure that Project impacts related to CDFW jurisdictional waters are reduced to a less than significant level.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.4-14.

Finding

Threshold 4.4.3. *The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B," Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

- (1) *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.*

Facts in Support of Finding

Based on an analysis of onsite hydrologic conditions, the relevant reaches were determined to have insubstantial or speculative effect on the chemical, physical, or biological significant nexus to the Whitewater River and Salton Sea. No United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) jurisdictional waters/wetlands have been identified on the Project site, and ACOE jurisdiction is therefore absent because the onsite 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. However, 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. Compliance with existing laws, regulatory programs, and General Plan policies currently in place, in addition to Mitigation Measure 4.4-6, would reduce Project impacts to a level of less than significant.

Reference: Final EIR, page 4.4-14 – 4.4-15.

CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Finding

Threshold 4.5.1. *Project construction and implementation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.*

- (1) *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site has been the subject of several past cultural resource assessments, which have only identified the Coachella Canal as a historic resource (see Draft EIR Table 4.5.A, page 4.5-2). 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 as part of Phase 1 development 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 during Phase 1 construction, these changes would not impact the historical significance of the Coachella Canal. Therefore, impacts to historical resources are considered less than significant.

Phases 2 through 5 of the Project are not expected to adversely impact historic resources. However, a site-specific field survey of the parts of the Specific Plan site outside the Phase 1 area was not conducted as part of the current cultural resources evaluation, which covered only the Phase 1 area on the Specific Plan site. Mitigation Measure 4.5.5, prescribed in Section 4.5.11, of the Program EIR requires the Project applicant to conduct site surveys and records searches and prepare Cultural Resources Survey Reports for areas on the Specific Plan site outside the Phase 1 area, prior to the submittal of Tentative Tract Maps for those areas. Those reports will describe whether there are any historic resources on the portions of the Specific Plan site outside the Phase 1 area and, if so, if the proposed development in a Tentative Tract Map would affect those resources and the measures required to address those effects. As a result, it is expected that the impacts of the Specific Plan related to historic resources would be less than significant after mitigation.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.5-20 – 4.6-21.

Finding

Threshold 4.5.2. *Construction of the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B," Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

- (1) *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project as designed could facilitate future development that has the potential to disturb or destroy archaeological resources, and therefore, the Project could indirectly result in impacts to these resources. Two historic trail segments and one historic prospecting locale occur on the Project site. In previous recommendations at the trail sites, they were not recommended as significant archeological resources under CEQA because the segments are highly-fragmented, non-contiguous, disjointed foot paths. Further, 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 would be implemented to protect archaeological resources in the event of discovery during ground-disturbing construction activities. The City of Coachella complies with procedures and regulations codified in the State CEQA Guidelines and the Traditional Tribal Cultural Places Law ("Senate Bill 18") as defined in California Government Code 65352 governing the

identification and treatment of archaeological resources. Mitigation Measures 4.5.1 to 4.5.2 and 4.5.4 to 4.5.5 provide protection to these resources. With the mitigation listed above, the City's development review process, mandatory CEQA statutes, compliance with "Senate Bill 18", and other regulation identified above, future implementing projects allowed pursuant to the Project are anticipated to result in less than significant impacts.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.5-21 -- 4.5-22.

Finding

***Threshold 4.5.3.** Construction of the Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B," Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

- (1) *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which substantially lessens the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.*

Facts in Support of Finding

Portions 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. However, 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. Further, the Project would be required to comply with existing policies and regulations intended to protect the integrity of paleontological resources. These policies and regulations correspond to policies contained in the City's General Plan and would be applied to all future development occurring with the Project. Additionally, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.3 would ensure impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

Reference: Final EIR, pages 4.5-22 -- 4.5-23.

Finding

***Threshold 4.5.4.** Construction of the Project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "B," Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

- (1) *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which substantially lessens the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.*

Facts in Support of Finding

Although no human remains are known to be on site or are anticipated to be discovered, precautionary mitigation is required. Ground-disturbing activities in the Project area such as grading or excavation would have the potential to disturb as yet unidentified human remains. If human remains are found, those remains would require proper treatment in accordance with applicable laws. State of California Public Resources Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5-7055 describes the general provisions for treatment of human remains. Specifically, HSC Section 7050.5 prescribes the requirements for the treatment of any human remains that are accidentally discovered during excavation of a site. As required by State law, the procedures set forth in PRC Section 5087.98 would be implemented, including evaluation by the County Coroner and notification of the Native American Heritage Commission. Compliance with State regulations would ensure that impacts in this regard would be less than significant. Additionally,