

June 2009



CARRARI RANCH PROJECT

Recirculated Initial Study

Prepared for:
City of Rancho Cucamonga

Prepared by:
RBF Consulting

RECIRCULATED INITIAL STUDY/NOTICE OF PREPARATION

Carrari Ranch Specific Plan

LEAD AGENCY:

City of Rancho Cucamonga
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
Contact: Candyce Burnett, Senior Planner
(909) 477-2750

CONSULTANT:

RBF Consulting
14725 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618
Contact: Alan Ashimine
(949) 855-5710

June 2009

JN 10-104043.003



TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND	1
1. Project File	1
2. Related Files	1
3. Description of Project	1
4. Project Sponsor's Name and Address	8
5. General Plan Designation	8
6. Zoning	8
7. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting	8
8. Lead Agency Name and Address.....	8
9. Contact Person and Phone Number	8
10. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required	9
GLOSSARY	9
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	9
DETERMINATION	10
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	11
1. Aesthetics	11
2. Agricultural Resources	12
3. Air Quality	12
4. Biological Resources	14
5. Cultural Resources	15
6. Geology and Soils	17
7. Hazards and Waste Materials	19
8. Hydrology and Water Quality	21
9. Land Use and Planning	24
10. Mineral Resources	25
11. Noise	25
12. Population and Housing	26
13. Public Services	27
14. Recreation	28
15. Transportation/Traffic	29
16. Utilities and Service Systems	30
17. Mandatory Findings of Significance	32
EARLIER ANALYSES	33



LIST OF EXHIBITS

1	Regional Vicinity Map.....	2
2	Site Vicinity Map.....	3
3	Conceptual Land Use Plan.....	6

LIST OF TABLES

1	Proposed Land Use Summary	8
---	---------------------------------	---



City of Rancho Cucamonga RECIRCULATED INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

BACKGROUND

1. **Project File:** Environmental Report DRC2004-00560
2. **Related Files:** Development District Amendment DRC2005-00477; Tentative Tract Map SUBTT16925; General Plan Amendment DRC2006-00030; Development Agreement DRC2005-00629; Annexation DRC2005-00602; and Specific Plan DRC2008-00940
3. **Description of Project (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary):**

3.1 PREVIOUS DOCUMENTATION

Clearance under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the proposed project was initiated on July 22, 2005, when a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study were circulated for public review (SCH# 2005071108).

The NOP was recirculated for public review on March 2, 2006 in recognition of the need for an amendment to the *City of Rancho Cucamonga General Plan* for project implementation. The General Plan Amendment was required to allow for the proposed residential density under the City's existing *General Plan* designations for the site.

The NOP and Initial Study are once again being recirculated to account for two substantial changes to the project description: 1) the inclusion of a Specific Plan as part of project implementation; and 2) modifications to one of the emergency access roads associated with the project. Additional information regarding both the Specific Plan and emergency access road are provided below under Section 3.3, *Project Characteristics*.

3.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Project Location

The proposed project site is located in unincorporated San Bernardino County (County), approximately all of which lies within the sphere of influence (SOI) of the City of Rancho Cucamonga (City). The City is located in the southwestern portion of the County at the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains, approximately 40 miles east of downtown Los Angeles. Exhibit 1, *Regional Vicinity Map* illustrates the project site in a regional context. The City's SOI encompasses approximately 7,700 acres located between the City's northern boundary and the San Bernardino National Forest. The 670.3-acre project site is generally located north of Reales Street and La Colina Drive, east of Earl Court, and west of Archibald Avenue; refer to Exhibit 2, *Site Vicinity Map*. The County Assessor's Parcel Numbers for all of the parcels in the project area are listed below:

- 20005141 (12.63 acres)
- 20005142 (6.59 acres)
- 20103201 (159.66 acres)
- 20103202 (157.89 acres)
- 20103234 (0.65 acres)
- 20103235 (1.6 acres)
- 20103236 (19.69 acres)
- 20103238 (2.33 acres)
- 20103239 (4.48 acres)



- 20103240 (116.87 acres)
- 20103240 (14.87 acres)
- 20103241 (156.84 acres)
- 20103271 (1.12 acres)
- 20103275 (6.06 acres)
- 20103276 (0.36 acres)
- 20103277 (0.36 acres)
- 20103280 (5.2 acres)
- 20103281 (2.6 acres)
- 20104304 (0.04 acres)¹

Environmental Setting (Existing Conditions)

The project site includes hillsides, canyons, and ravines that form part of the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains. On-site elevations range from approximately 2,180 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) near the southern site boundary to approximately 4,700 feet near the northern boundary. The site drains by sheet flow generally southward, with water draining from hillsides into canyons and ravines, and off-site to the south.

Most of the property is unimproved, and no improved roads exist on the site. However, remnants of former, on-site historical uses are evident throughout the property and include picnic tables, an equipment storage area, irrigation lines, an old water fountain, drainage pipes and culverts under roads that cross drainages, and directional signs. The equipment storage area is located within the abandoned on-site Christmas tree farm, and contains old ladders, various pipes (metal, concrete, and clay), old fence posts (metal and wood), five empty 55-gallon drums, an old water tank, concrete cinder blocks, and other miscellaneous materials. Many of the on-site pine (Christmas) trees are dead or dying, and much of the former farming area is overgrown with native brush.

Although no improved roads exist on the site, several dirt roads traverse the property. Additionally, two public utility easements traverse the southern portion of the property along the current City corporate boundary: a Southern California Edison Company (SCE) easement and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) easement.

The project site contains United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) jurisdictional wetlands and Waters of the United States, and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) jurisdictional streambed and associated riparian habitat. There are two main jurisdictional drainage features located near the southwestern and eastern project boundaries, respectively, and several tributaries are associated with these drainage features. Such tributary drainages (creeks) generally flow from north to south within the project site. These creeks flow in ravines that contain coast live oak woodlands, many of the trees within which have been damaged by previous wildfires.

Currently, runoff from the project site drains via sheet flow off hillsides into ravines and canyons, which then convey flows to off-site drainage facilities to the south and southeast. According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood hazard maps, the main drainage courses in the southwest corner and eastern portion of the project site are located within a Zone A floodplain, which indicates that it is within a 100-year flood zone. These areas are also identified in the General Plans of the County of San Bernardino and City of Rancho Cucamonga as being located within 100-year flood zones. The remainder of the property is located within an area

¹ Acreages are based on the County Assessor's Parcel Number data and may vary from the acreages identified in the project description.



designated as Zone X, which indicates that this area is not within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone.

Surrounding Land Uses

Land uses surrounding the project site are a mixture of open space (San Bernardino National Forest), vacant, and residential uses. These uses, and their respective land use designations in the *City of Rancho Cucamonga General Plan*, if applicable, are described as follows:

- North: Open space within the San Bernardino National Forest is located to the north, and privately owned vacant land (designated as Open Space [0 to 0.1 dwelling units per acre]) is located to the northeast.
- South: Single-family residential uses (designated Residential Very Low [0.1 to 2.0 dwelling units per acre]) are located to the south, southeast, and southwest.
- East: Privately owned vacant land (designated as Open Space) and several single-family homes are located to the east.
- West: Privately owned, primarily vacant land (designated Open Space and Hillside Residential) is located to the west.

3.3 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The project proposes to annex the entirety of the 670.3-acre project site into the City of Rancho Cucamonga's incorporated area. The project site is composed of two primary components: 1) the 342.3-acre Carrari Ranch Specific Plan area, where the development of 110 single-family residential dwelling units is proposed; and 2) 328 acres east of the Specific Plan area which would be annexed into the City, but where no development is currently proposed. These components are described in detail below.

Carrari Ranch Specific Plan

As stated above, this Initial Study is being recirculated to account for two substantial changes to the project description: 1) the inclusion of Specific Plan as part of project implementation; and 2) modifications to one of the emergency access roads associated with the project.

The Carrari Ranch Specific Plan provides a detailed description of the proposed residential development and infrastructure requirements for the Carrari Ranch Project. Generally, a specific plan is intended to assist in the systematic implementation of the City's General Plan. It also links implementing policies of the General Plan to specific development proposals in a defined area. All specific plans must be prepared in accordance with California Government Code Sections 65450 – 65457. The Carrari Ranch Specific Plan would be subject to adoption by the City of Rancho Cucamonga as part of the project approval process.

The Carrari Ranch Specific Plan proposes a master planned, gated community consisting of 110 executive-level single-family homes on lots ranging from a minimum of 10,200 square feet up to more than one acre within the southwestern portion of the Specific Plan area (refer to Exhibit 3, *Conceptual Land Use Plan*).

Primary components of the proposed Carrari Ranch Specific Plan include the following:



- **Residential Development:** As stated above, the Specific Plan would include 110 executive-level dwelling units. The average residential lot size would exceed one-half acre, with a net density of 1.9 dwelling units per acre. Each lot would consist of a graded pad with a minimum size of 7,500 square feet and a maximum size of 32,500 square feet. Larger lots are situated on the exterior of the proposed community, with smaller lots concentrated internally to the project.
- **Private Roadways:** Residential units on-site would front a network of private streets and cul-de-sacs. Site access would be provided by a gated street originating from the northern terminus of the existing Delphin Place (along the southern boundary of the Specific Plan area).

In addition, two emergency access roadways would be constructed as part of the project: 1) an on-site roadway connecting the western portion of the residential development to the eastern portion; and 2) a modified roadway originating in the southeastern portion of the Specific Plan area, that proceeds in a southeasterly direction off-site and ultimately ties in to Almond Street, approximately 0.25-mile southeast of the Specific Plan boundary. It should be noted that the alignment for the southeasterly off-site emergency access roadway has been modified and further defined since the July 22, 2005 and March 2, 2006 NOPs were distributed for public review.

- **Fuel Modification:** Due to wildland fire hazards associated with development in the San Gabriel Mountain foothills, permanent fuel modification areas would be required around all areas that are located adjacent to or exposed to hazardous fire areas. Approximately 41.6 acres of fuel modification would be required as part of the project.
- **Water Reservoir:** The proposed development would require the construction of an aboveground water reservoir. The reservoir would be constructed as part of the project, but would be owned and maintained by the Cucamonga Valley Water District (CVWD). The proposed reservoir site would be approximately one acre in size and would be located within the northwestern portion of the Specific Plan area. In addition, a reservoir access road (occupying approximately 0.7-acre) would be required for maintenance and inspection purposes.
- **Permanent Natural Open Space:** Approximately 203.8 acres within the Specific Plan area would be undisturbed by project activities. These areas would be preserved as permanent natural open space.

Annexation Area

In addition to the Carrari Ranch Specific Plan area described above, the proposed project includes approximately 328 acres that would also be annexed into the City of Rancho Cucamonga. This area is situated directly east of the Specific Plan area. Although no development is currently proposed within this area, this “annexation area” would be rezoned Hillside Residential and Open Space consistent with the City of Rancho Cucamonga’s underlying General Plan Designation. Any development within the annexation area, once annexed into the City and pre-zoned, would occur as part of a separate project, and would be subject to further environmental review once a development application is submitted.

An acreage summary for the various project components is provided in Table 1, *Proposed Land Use Summary*.

Phasing

Annexation and pre-zoning of the project site would occur upon project approval (by affected agencies, including the City of Rancho Cucamonga and San Bernardino County Local Agency



Formation Commission [LAFCO]). Development associated with the Carrari Ranch Specific Plan is anticipated to occur in two phases, with build-out of the project occurring approximately five years after the start of construction.

**Table 1
Proposed Land Use Summary**

PROJECT COMPONENT	ACREAGE
Residential Development	58.0
Private Roadways	37.2
Fuel Modification	41.6
Reservoir and Associated Access Roadway	1.7
Permanent Natural Open Space	203.8
<i>Total Carrari Ranch Specific Plan Area</i>	<i>342.3</i>
Annexation Area ¹	328
TOTAL PROJECT AREA	670.3

¹ No development is proposed within the Annexation Area at this time.

4. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Mr. Gary Miller
721 South Brea Canyon Road, Suite 7
Walnut, CA 91789

5. General Plan Designation:

Hillside Residential and Open Space

6. Zoning:

The project site is within the City's SOI; it is not currently within the boundaries of a Development District.

7. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

The project site is located north of the City limits in an area that serves as an urban-wildland interface. The surrounding area has open space and vacant lands to the north, northeast, and west, and single-family residential uses to the south and east.

8. Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of Rancho Cucamonga
Planning Division
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

9. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Candyce Burnett
Senior Planner
909.477.2750



10. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

California Department of Fish and Game
County of San Bernardino
Local Agency Formation Commission
Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

GLOSSARY – The following abbreviations are used in this report:

ACOE – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
AMSL – above mean sea level
CARB – California Air Resources Board
CDFG – California Department of Fish and Game
CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act
CVWD – Cucamonga Valley Water District
EIR – environmental impact report
FEIR – final environmental impact report
FEMA – Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM – Flood Insurance Rate Map
LADWP – Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
LAFCO – Local Agency Formation Commission
MWD – Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
NOP – Notice of Preparation
NPDES – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
RWQCB – Regional Water Quality Control Board
SCAQMD – South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCE – Southern California Edison
SOI – sphere of influence

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," "Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated," or "Less Than Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

✓	Aesthetics		Agricultural Resources	✓	Air Quality
✓	Biological Resources	✓	Cultural Resources	✓	Geology and Soils
✓	Hazards and Waste Materials	✓	Hydrology and Water Quality	✓	Land Use and Planning
	Mineral Resources	✓	Noise	✓	Population and Housing
✓	Public Services	✓	Recreation	✓	Transportation and Traffic
✓	Utilities and Service Systems	✓	Mandatory Findings of Significance		



DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- () I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- () I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by, or agreed to, by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- (✓) I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- () I find that the proposed project MAY have a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standard and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- () I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Prepared By: Alan Ashimine, RBF Consulting Date: June 2009

Reviewed By: Candyce Burnett, City of Rancho Cucamonga Date: June 2009



EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Have a substantial affect a scenic vista?	✓			
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway?	✓			
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	✓			
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	✓			

Comments:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is not within a view corridor, according to Exhibit III-15 of the *General Plan* (Major Community Design Features). However, scenic resources are present on the project site, including hillsides, canyons, and ravines that form part of the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains. The area to the north and beyond the project site includes the San Bernardino National Forest and Mountains. Land uses located south of the project site and motorists along Beryl Street currently experience views, to varying degrees, of the existing scenic resources. The Specific Plan proposes approximately 1.77 million cubic yards of cut and approximately 1.77 million cubic yards of fill to accommodate the proposed Specific Plan.¹ The EIR will evaluate the potential for project implementation to substantially affect the existing scenic vistas.
- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** There are no State Scenic Highways within the project site or within the City of Rancho Cucamonga, and there are no historic buildings on the project site. However, the project site contains hillsides, canyons, ravines, trees, and rock outcroppings that contribute to the scenic quality of the project site. The EIR will evaluate the potential for project implementation to substantially damage these existing scenic resources.
- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The site is located north of Reales Street and La Colina Drive, east of Earl Court, and west of Archibald Avenue (refer to Exhibit 2 [Site Vicinity Map]). Land uses surrounding the project site include a mixture of open space, vacant lands, and single-family detached residential uses.

With project implementation, undeveloped open space and vacant land in the southwestern portion of the project site would be replaced with the proposed residential uses and associated roadway improvements. Implementation of the proposed project would increase urban characteristics associated with structures and paved surfaces. The nature and scope of existing conditions would be altered, thereby permanently altering views across the site and the character of the existing environment. The EIR will evaluate the potential for project implementation to substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings.

¹ KTGy, *Carrari Ranch Specific Plan Screencheck Draft No. 2*, April 30, 2009.



- d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed residential and roadway improvements would require lighting of building interior and exterior spaces (e.g., entryways, signs, streetlights, and security lighting). Light and glare caused by car headlights associated with the proposed roadways would further influence lighting in the project area. The EIR will evaluate the potential for project implementation to adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area from new sources of light or glare.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				✓
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				✓
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			✓	

Comments:

- a) **No Impact.** The site is not designated as Prime Farmlands, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance.
- b) **No Impact.** There is no agriculturally zoned land within the City of Rancho Cucamonga or the project site. There are also no Williamson Act contracts within the City or the project boundaries.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Portions of the property were historically used as a Christmas tree farm; however, operations ceased years ago and the tree farm is now abandoned. Many of the pine trees on the farm are dead or dying, and much of the former farming area is overgrown with native brush. A brush fire that occurred in 2003 killed many of the Christmas trees. The project site is designated Hillside Residential and Open Space; therefore, the site is not intended for farmland use according to the *General Plan Land Use Plan*. Additionally, there are no agricultural uses located in the vicinity of the project site. Project implementation would not result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	✓			



Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	✓			
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	✓			
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	✓			
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				✓

Comments:

a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), an area monitored by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Basin is in attainment for carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) for both State and Federal standards. The Basin is in nonattainment for ozone (O₃), coarse particulate matter (PM₁₀), and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) under both Federal and State standards. Further review will be conducted within the EIR to confirm the project's status in terms of compliance with current SCAQMD guidelines.

b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Construction and buildout of the project would emit air pollutants from three different sources: (1) short-term emissions during construction activities, (2) long-term mobile emissions from vehicles traveling to and from the site once the project is operational, and (3) long-term stationary emissions from power and gas consumption by machinery and equipment on-site.

The greatest potential for air quality impacts from the project would be attributed to mobile-source emissions. The project's potential air quality impacts on a local and regional level requires an evaluation pursuant to the SCAQMD and the California Air Resource Board (CARB) requirements and methodology. Additional analysis is necessary to quantify potential project-related air quality impacts (both short-term and long-term) and to identify appropriate mitigation that would be effective in avoiding or reducing pollutant emissions.

c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could potentially result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard. Also, refer to Responses 3(a) and 3(b).

Additionally, the proposed project has the potential to result in emissions of greenhouse gases. Assembly Bill (AB) 32 requires that CARB determine what the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level was in 1990, and approve a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit that is equivalent to that level, to be achieved by 2020. CARB has approved a 2020 emissions limit of 427 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent. California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger issued Executive Order S-3-05 in June 2005, which also established greenhouse gas emission reduction targets. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed in more detail in the EIR to determine the significance of potential impacts.



- d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Sensitive receptors are defined as populations that are more susceptible to the effects of pollution than the population at large. The SCAQMD identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. According to the SCAQMD, projects have the potential to create significant impacts if they are located within 0.25 mile of sensitive receptors. The sensitive receptors located in proximity to the project site are the existing residences to the south. Construction and operation of project-related residential uses would increase vehicle trips on area roadways and resultant air pollutants. Grading and excavation operations may also have air quality impacts in the absence of mitigation. These impacts require additional analysis to assess their level of significance.
- e) **No Impact.** The proposed residential uses would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	✓			
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	✓			
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	✓			
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	✓			
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	✓			
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				✓

Comments:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** On-site vegetation includes chamise chaparral, northern mixed chaparral, scrub oak chaparral, coast live oak woodland, Riversidean sage scrub (alluvial fan sage



scrub), herbaceous riparian, deerweed series, and toyon.² Additionally, portions of the project site have been characterized as ruderal and disturbed. Future development could change the diversity of on-site plant species. The number of native species and their cover in the project area could be lowered through the loss of habitat. The areas of habitat supporting these species could be replaced by land development, paved surfaces, and ornamental plantings. Future development could also decrease the diversity and number of wildlife species on-site and in the immediate vicinity through the loss of vegetation that provides shelter, nesting, and foraging habitat. Development could also impose a barrier to travel between the project area and adjacent lands. Further analysis is required to assess potential impacts on candidate, sensitive, and special-status species located on-site or in the project vicinity.

- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** An investigation of the western portion of the project site (i.e., the Specific Plan area) was conducted by PCR Services Corporation to determine the extent of jurisdictional wetlands, waters of the U.S., and waters of the State (*Investigation of Jurisdictional Wetlands and Water of the U.S., Carrari Ranch Tentative Tract 16925, San Bernardino, California*, PCR Services Corporation, May 2008). The investigation concluded that the study area contains one main jurisdictional drainage, 20 associated tributaries, and numerous subtributaries. According to PCR, the total jurisdiction within the study area includes approximately 7.22 acres that are either “waters of the U.S.” or “waters of the State,” including 0.87 acre of jurisdictional wetlands. Jurisdictional streambeds and associated riparian habitats also occur throughout the study area. Further analysis is required to assess potential impacts on riparian habitats, wetlands, and other sensitive natural communities; refer also to Response 4(a).
- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses 4(a) and 4(b).
- d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 4(a).
- e) **Potentially Significant Impact.** On-site vegetation includes coast live oak woodland. Removal of these trees may be required to accommodate the proposed Specific Plan. Further analysis is required to determine the potential conflicts associated with removal of these trees. Refer also to Response 4(a).
- f) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within an existing or proposed conservation area, according to Exhibit IV-3 of the *General Plan* (Sensitive Biological Resources). Project 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.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	✓			
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	✓			

² PCR Services Corporation, *Investigation of Jurisdictional Wetlands and Water of the U.S., Carrari Ranch Tentative Tract 16925, San Bernardino, California*, May 2008, Page 5.



Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	✓			
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			✓	

Comments:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Review of the records on file at the Archaeological Information Center by CRM Tech found that a historic-period transmission line has been recorded as an archaeological site across the southern portion of the project area in an east-west direction. This site was constructed during the early part of the 20th century and was determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places in 1998. Construction activity associated with the proposed Specific Plan, particularly grading, soil excavation, and compaction, could adversely affect or eliminate existing cultural resources. A cultural resources assessment will be included in the EIR to confirm the presence or absence of such resources and assess potential impacts.

Chapter 2.24 of the Municipal Code (Historic Preservation Commission) was adopted to “designate, preserve, protect, enhance, and perpetuate those historic structures and sites which contribute to the cultural and aesthetic benefit of Rancho Cucamonga.” Project implementation would be subject to compliance with the requirements of Chapter 2.24.

- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 5(a).
- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The General Plan FEIR (Section 5.11) indicates that the Rancho Cucamonga area is on an alluvial fan. According to the San Bernardino County database, no paleontological sites or resources have been recorded within the City of Rancho Cucamonga or the SOI, including the project site; however, the area has a high sensitivity rating for paleontological resources. Further analysis is required to assess whether project implementation would adversely affect a unique paleontological resource/site or unique geologic feature. A cultural resources assessment will be conducted to confirm the presence or absence of such resources and assess potential impacts.
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** No known religious or sacred sites exist within the project area and there is no evidence that suggests that the project site has been used for human burials. However, portions of the project site have not been disrupted by historical uses of the property. Human remains in a previously unknown burial site could be encountered during construction activities associated with the proposed Specific Plan. In the event human remains are encountered during earth removal or disturbance, all activity shall cease immediately and a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor shall be immediately contacted, pursuant to the California Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5). The County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to Section 5097.98 and 5097.99 of the Public Resources Code relative to Native American remains. Should the Coroner determine the human remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted. With adherence to State regulations, a less than significant impact would occur regarding potential disturbance of human remains.



Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	✓			
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	✓			
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	✓			
iv) Landslides?	✓			
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	✓			
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	✓			
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	✓			
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				✓

Comments:

a) An analysis was conducted to identify and evaluate major geotechnical and geologic constraints affecting the portion of the Specific Plan area (i.e., *Review of Major Geotechnical and Geologic Constraints, 396-Acre Residential Section 15, T1N, R7W N/O Beryl Avenue & Almond Street, Rancho Cucamonga Area of San Bernardino County, CA*, RMA Group, revised March 2, 2007). The analysis concluded the following regarding potential seismic hazards:

i) **Fault Rupture**

Potentially Significant Impact. Two faults pass through the project site: The Cucamonga fault passes through the southern portion of the site and the Demens Canyon fault passes diagonally through the western part of the site.³ According to the RMA report, regional geologic maps show other apparently discontinuous faults within or near the site and aerial photographs show two lineaments possibly suggestive of faulting.

³ RMA Group, *Review of Major Geotechnical and Geologic Constraints, 396-Acre Residential Section 15, T1N, R7W N/O Beryl Avenue & Almond Street, Rancho Cucamonga Area of San Bernardino County, CA*, revised March 2, 2007, Page 4.



ii) **Strong Seismic Ground Shaking**

Potentially Significant Impact. The site is located in a seismically active area, as is the case throughout southern California. There are a number of faults in the region that could generate earthquake-induced ground shaking that could be felt at the site. Notable faults located nearest to the project site are the Cucamonga and Demens Creek (traverse the site), San Jose (6 miles), San Jacinto (7 miles), Sierra Madre (9 miles), and Chino–Central Avenue (12 miles) faults. Several other discontinuous faults pass through the subject site.

iii) **Seismic-Related Ground Failure**

Potentially Significant Impact. Potential secondary seismic hazards are soil liquefaction, tsunamis, seiches, seismically induced ground settlement, lurching, seismically induced flooding, and seismically induced landsliding. The RMA analysis concluded the following regarding these potential seismic hazards:

Liquefaction. The project site involves hillside areas underlain by metamorphic bedrock; therefore, liquefaction is not expected to be a hazard at the site. However, this requires further evaluation, with particular attention directed to ravine areas.

Tsunamis and Seiches. Because of the inland location and high elevation of the site, and lack of nearby bodies of standing water, tsunamis and seiches do not pose hazards to the site.

Seismically Induced Settlement and Lurching. Development is anticipated to occur in areas underlain by surface or shallow bedrock; therefore, seismically induced settlement is not expected at the site, provided that any man-made materials are properly placed and compacted. Further evaluation is required to determine fill and compaction requirements.

The Cucamonga fault, the Demens Creek fault, and other apparently discontinuous faults pass through the site; therefore, the potential exists for lurching near these faults. Further evaluation of the potential for lurching is required.

Seismically Induced Flooding. There are no reservoirs or dams within or upslope of the project site; therefore, no potential for seismically induced flooding exists. However, the Specific Plan proposes development of a 1.0-acre reservoir in the northwestern portion of the site. Further analysis is required to determine the potential for seismically induced flooding associated with the proposed reservoir.

iv) **Seismically-Induced Landslides**

Potentially Significant Impact. The surficial soils and weathered bedrock that exist on steep natural slopes found on the project site are potentially prone to seismically induced landsliding. In addition, the potential exists for seismically induced landsliding related to the possible landslide features noted on the aerial photographs reviewed by RMA. Further evaluation of these potential hazards is required.

Overall, further review is necessary to evaluate the potential exposure of people or structures to adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, and secondary seismic hazards. The RMA analysis further concluded that additional geologic and geotechnical studies are required to verify the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of its report (revised March 2, 2007), and to develop specific design parameters.



- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Alluvial soils, metamorphic bedrock, surficial soils, and a few localized areas of fill underlie the project site.⁴ Grading and excavation during construction of the Specific Plan component would involve stockpiling and movement of on-site soils, thereby increasing the potential for erosion. Additionally, the Rancho Cucamonga area is subject to strong Santa Ana wind conditions between September and April, which generate blow sand and dust, and create erosion problems. Construction activities may temporarily exacerbate the impacts of windblown sand, resulting in temporary problems associated with dust control. Implementation of erosion control measures as required by the City, and adherence to all requirements set forth in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit required for construction activities, would lessen potential impacts in this regard. Further analysis is necessary to determine whether project implementation would result in substantial soil erosion.
- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The regional geologic maps reviewed by RMA do not show landslides within the site, and the *San Bernardino County General Plan Map* (FH20D) indicates a low to high landslide susceptibility at the site. However, the review of aerial photographs conducted by RMA revealed some landforms suggestive of possible landslides.⁵ Additionally, most steep hillsides within the site have debris flow or mudflow scars from past surficial slope failures. Further review of these existing features is necessary to evaluate their stability, particularly in relation to the proposed development areas of the Specific Plan. The potential for debris and mudflows also requires consideration of locating buildings downslope of steep slope areas.
- d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** RMA staff concluded, based on observation of surface soils and bedrock, the material types shown on regional geologic maps, and their experience in the area, that soil and bedrock materials on-site are expected to have a very low expansion potential. However, these conditions require verification during future geotechnical studies and during rough grading of the site.
- e) **No Impact.** A sewer infrastructure system would be constructed to serve residential development associated with the project. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed. No impacts would occur in this regard.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. HAZARDS AND WASTE MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			✓	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	✓			
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?				✓

⁴ Ibid., Page 5.

⁵ Ibid., Page 4.



Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				✓
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	✓			
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	✓			

Comments:

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Specific Plan would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; therefore, project implementation would not create a significant hazard to future residents, the public, or the environment in this regard. Typical of residential developments, secondary activities that would occur on-site (e.g., building and landscape maintenance) would use nominal amounts of hazardous materials. The City participates in a Countywide interagency coalition that is considered a full-service hazardous materials division that is more comprehensive than any other in the State. The City has adopted a Standardized Emergency Management System Multi-Hazard Functional Plan to respond to chemical emergencies. The project-related development would be subject to compliance with Federal, State, and local regulations concerning the storage and handling of hazardous materials and/or waste, which would further minimize potential impacts in this regard.
- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Portions of the project site were historically used as a Christmas tree farm, which ceased operations years ago and is now abandoned. Remnants of the tree farm are evident throughout the property and include: an equipment storage area, irrigation lines in areas planted with pine (Christmas) trees, an old water fountain, drainage pipes under roads that cross drainages, and directional signs. The equipment storage area is located within the abandoned tree farm; it contains old ladders, pipe (metal, concrete, and clay), old fence posts (metal and wood), five empty 55-gallon drums, an old water tank, concrete cinder blocks, and other miscellaneous materials. Additionally, pesticides and herbicides may have been used previously in conjunction with operation of the tree farm. Further analysis is required to confirm the presence or absence of hazardous materials on the project site.
- c) **No Impact.** The proposed residential uses would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste.



- d) **No Impact.** The project site is not included on a governmental list of hazardous materials sites.
- e) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of an airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Project implementation would not result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area.
- f) **No Impact.** Refer to Response 7(e).
- g) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The City adopted a Standardized Emergency Management System Multi-Hazard Functional Plan in 1997, which identifies the roles, responsibilities, and procedures for those who respond to natural or man-made emergencies. Because of the nature and location of the proposed uses, project implementation would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the City's adopted Plan.

Access to the project site is proposed via a private, gated street that would connect to the northern terminus of Delphin Place. A network of privately owned and maintained streets and cul-de-sac streets would provide interior access to the proposed residential uses.

Two emergency access roadways would be constructed as part of the project: 1) an on-site roadway connecting the western portion of the residential development to the eastern portion; and 2) a modified roadway originating in the southeastern portion of the Specific Plan area, that proceeds in a southeasterly direction off-site and ultimately ties in to Almond Street, approximately 0.25-mile southeast of the Specific Plan boundary. The access roads would have restricted access for fire equipment and other emergency vehicles. The emergency access roads are proposed to provide alternative access routes during fire and emergency conditions. Also, an easement road is planned to provide access to the proposed reservoir. Further review of the proposed access routes is necessary to determine their consistency with all applicable City codes, including local fire ordinances regarding site access. As such, further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

- h) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The City conducted an analysis to categorize structural and wildland fire threat based upon probability of occurrence and consequences. Exhibit V-7 of the *General Plan* (Fire Risk Assessment) presents the results of the analysis and indicates that the project area is placed in a High-Probability, High-Consequence category of fire risks. Also, according to the *Conceptual Fire Protection and Vegetation Management Plan*⁶, Rancho Cucamonga's greatest ongoing threat from a wind-driven fire is in the Urban Wildland Interface area found in the northern part of the City and in the SOI, which includes the project site. A Wildland Fire Model, Urban Response Fire Model, and Fuel Modification Analysis will be prepared to determine the potential exposure of people or structures to risks involving wildland fires. Further analysis in an EIR is therefore warranted.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	✓			

⁶ Hunt Research Corporation, Fire Protection Plan/Vegetation Management Plan for the Carrari Ranch Development, Rancho Cucamonga, California, April 2008.



Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	✓			
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	✓			
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	✓			
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	✓			
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	✓			
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	✓			
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	✓			
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	✓			
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	✓			

Comments:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Impacts related to water quality would range over three different periods: (1) during the earthwork and construction phase, when the potential for erosion, siltation, and sedimentation would be the greatest; (2) following construction, prior to the establishment of ground cover, when the erosion potential may remain relatively high; and (3) following completion of the proposed residential uses, when impacts related to sedimentation would decrease markedly, but those associated with urban runoff would increase.

Construction of the proposed Specific Plan would disturb on-site soils. During a storm event, particulate matter would run off the site. Urban runoff is expected to increase as a result of developing the proposed residential uses. The concentration of chemical constituents dissolved or suspended in runoff waters leaving the site would vary with the distribution pattern of rainfall events. Similarly, the characteristics of rain events affect the concentration of pollutants.



The State of California is authorized to administer various aspects of the NPDES permit under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The General Construction Permit treats any construction activity over 1.0 acre as an industrial activity, requiring a permit under the State's General NPDES permit. Further review is necessary regarding compliance requirements with the Statewide NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity, which would prevent stormwater pollution from impacting waters of the U.S. in the vicinity of the project site. Further analysis is required to determine whether project implementation would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Exhibit IV-2 of the *General Plan (Water Resources)* illustrates the locations of the City's groundwater recharge basins and spreading grounds. As indicated in Exhibit IV-2, the project site is not located within an area designated as a recharge basin or spreading ground, although some such areas exist in proximity to (downstream of) the project site. The project does not propose to extract groundwater to meet the water demand created by the proposed residential uses. However, the geotechnical and geologic constraints analysis conducted by RMA noted that the U.S. Geological Survey Map of the Cucamonga Peak Quadrangle shows two springs in the southern portion of the site. The analysis also noted that perched groundwater can sometimes occur in canyon areas at or near the contact between alluvium and bedrock. The locations of the springs and the potential for bedrock seepage and perched groundwater require further evaluation to determine whether project implementation would affect groundwater supplies.
- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Development of the Specific Plan area would involve the construction of impervious surfaces, which would decrease ground absorption on-site, increase the quantity of surface water, and change existing drainage patterns. The changes in drainage patterns, altered absorption rates, and the manner in which runoff from the site would be accommodated by existing or future flood control infrastructure improvements require further analysis. A drainage technical assessment would be conducted to determine potential impacts in this regard.
- d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 8(c).
- e) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses 8(a) and 8(c).
- f) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 8(a).
- g) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Exhibit V-5 of the *General Plan (Flood Hazards)* identifies the flood areas referred to as "Special Flood Hazard Areas inundated by 100-Year flood" on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As illustrated on Exhibit V-5, the southwestern and southeastern portions of the project site are within the boundaries of a Special Flood Hazard Area. Further analysis is required to determine potential impacts in this regard.
- h) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 8(g).
- i) **Potentially Significant Impact.** There are no reservoirs or dams within or upslope of the project site; therefore, no flooding as a result of an existing reservoir or dam is anticipated. However, the project proposes development of a 1.0-acre reservoir on-site. Further analysis is required to determine the potential for flooding associated with the proposed reservoir. Refer also to Response 8(c).
- j) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Because of the inland location, elevation of the site, and lack of nearby bodies of standing water, inundation by tsunamis or seiches does not pose a hazard to the site. However, the RMA analysis concluded that most steep hillsides within the site have debris flow or mudflow scars from past surficial slope failures. Further review of these existing features is necessary to evaluate their stability, particularly in relation to the proposed Specific Plan area. The



potential for debris and mudflows also requires consideration for building locations downslope of steep slope areas.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Physically divide an established community?				✓
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	✓			
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓

Comments:

- a) **No Impact.** The project site is located in the western portion of the City’s SOI, north of the Reales Street and La Colina Drive, east of Earl Court, and west of Archibald Avenue. The project site is located in an area that includes the northern portion of the City and the SOI, and which serves as an urban–wildland interface. The surrounding area is characterized by open space and vacant lands to the north, east, and west. Based on the location of the project site and the character of the surrounding area, project implementation would not physically divide an established community.
- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Land Use Plan for Rancho Cucamonga and its SOI area is shown on Exhibit III-1 of the General Plan (Land Use Plan). According to Exhibit III-1, the project site is designated Hillside Residential and Open Space. Further analysis is required to determine the project’s consistency with the Land Use Plan and policies of the *Rancho Cucamonga General Plan*.

The project site is located in the western portion of the City’s SOI and not within the City limits; thus, the property is not currently within the boundaries of a Development District. The proposed project includes the annexation of the site into the City of Rancho Cucamonga, as well as pre-zoning of the site under the City’s Development Code. Should the City approve the proposed project, a request would be submitted to the LAFCO to annex the project site to the City of Rancho Cucamonga.

The City has determined that the 110 residential units proposed as part of the Carrari Ranch Specific Plan would exceed residential densities allowable under the Hillside Residential and Open Space *General Plan* designations for the site. As such, approval of a General Plan Amendment would be required as part of the proposed project. In addition, the topography of the project site includes slopes ranging from 10.0 to 30.0 percent or more. The City has adopted a Hillside Development Ordinance, which is applicable to all proposed residential development on natural slopes of 8.0 percent grade or greater (with some exceptions). Accordingly, due to the steep topography on-site, further analysis is required to determine consistency between the proposed Specific Plan and the Hillside Development Ordinance.



The Carrari Ranch Specific Plan provides a detailed description of the proposed residential development and infrastructure requirements for the Carrari Ranch Project. Generally, a specific plan is intended to assist in the systematic implementation of the City's General Plan. It also links implementing policies of the General Plan to specific development proposals in a defined area. All specific plans must be prepared in accordance with California Government Code Sections 65450 – 65457. The Carrari Ranch Specific Plan would be subject to adoption by the City of Rancho Cucamonga as part of the project approval process.

c) **No Impact.** Refer to Response 4(f).

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?				✓
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				✓

Comments:

a) **No Impact.** The site is not designated as a State Aggregate Resources Area or valuable mineral resource recovery site, according to Figure IV-1 of the *General Plan* (Regionally Significant Aggregate Resources) and Table IV-1 (Areas of Designated Regionally Significant Aggregate Resources).

b) **No Impact.** Refer to Response 10(a).

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	✓			
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	✓			
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	✓			
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	✓			



Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓

Comments:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Exhibit V-13 of the *General Plan* (Future Noise Contours) illustrates the exposure to noise from vehicular traffic on local streets, arterials, and highways under year 2020 conditions. The project site would not be exposed to vehicular noise levels exceeding City standards under buildout conditions, according to Exhibit V-13. However, project-related construction activities and operation of proposed residential uses on-site would result in both short-term and long-term impacts. Short-term impacts would occur during grading and construction operation and could expose nearby receptors to noise levels of between 70 and 90 decibels at 50 feet from the noise source. Long-term noise impacts would be associated with vehicular traffic to and from the site, outdoor activities, and stationary mechanical equipment on-site. Both short- and long-term noise impacts require further evaluation.
- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The project would include extensive earthwork and grading to prepare the site for installation of infrastructure and for site development. Further review is required to determine the significance of impacts.
- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 11(a).
- d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 11(a).
- e) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of an airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Project implementation would not expose people residing in the project area to excessive noise levels.
- f) **No Impact.** Refer to Response 11(e).

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	✓			



Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

Comments:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** A project could induce population growth in an area either directly or indirectly. The development of new homes or businesses could induce population growth directly, whereas the annexation of property, and extension of roads or other infrastructure could induce population growth indirectly. The Specific Plan proposes development of 110 single-family residential lots, thereby, inducing direct population growth in the City. Based on an estimate of 3.222 persons per household⁷ (State of California Department of Finance, 2009), the increase of 110 housing units resulting from project implementation could potentially increase the City's population by approximately 354 persons. Additional analysis is required to determine the growth inducing potential of the project.
- b) **No Impact.** The project site contains no existing housing units. Project implementation would not displace existing housing or persons, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- c) **No Impact.** Refer to Response 12(b).

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i>				
a) Fire protection?	✓			
b) Police protection?	✓			
c) Schools?	✓			
d) Parks?	✓			
e) Other public facilities?	✓			

⁷ State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2009, with 2000 Benchmark.* Sacramento, California, May 2009.



Comments:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Rancho Cucamonga Fire District serves the City and SOI area combined. Because of the location and nature of the proposed Specific Plan, project implementation would increase service demand on existing fire protection resources in the general area. Additional analysis in an EIR and consultation with the Fire Department are required. Refer also to Response 7(h) for a discussion of potential wildland fire hazards.
 - b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The City contracts with the San Bernardino Sheriff's Department for police protection services. Because of the location and nature of the proposed Specific Plan, project implementation would increase service demands on existing police protection resources in the general area. Additional analysis in an EIR and consultation with the Sheriff's Department are required.
 - c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Exhibit III-11 of the *General Plan* (Schools and School Districts) illustrates the boundaries of the school districts that serve the City. According to Exhibit III-11, the project site is located north of the Alta Loma School District, within the Alta Loma Extension Area. Also, the project site is located within the Chaffey Joint Union High School District. The Specific Plan involves development of 110 single-family residential lots, thereby inducing direct student population growth in these Districts. The potential impact of student population increases requires additional analysis in an EIR.
 - d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Exhibit III-10 of the *General Plan* (Parks and Recreation Plan) identifies the locations of existing parks and recreational use facilities; no park or use facility is identified within the project boundaries or in the immediate vicinity. The Specific Plan involves development of 110 single-family residential lots, thereby directly creating a demand for parkland and recreational use facilities. The potential impact associated with increased recreational demands requires additional analysis in an EIR.
- Exhibit III-13 of the *General Plan* (Hiking and Riding Trails Master Plan) illustrates the City's planned system of regional and community trails. As indicated in Exhibit III-13, the project site is within an Equestrian/Rural Overlay District. All new developments within this District are required to provide community and local trails for equestrian use in accordance with the Hiking and Riding Trails Plan of the *General Plan*; a Regional Multi-Purpose Trail is planned across the portion of the project site proposed for development (refer to Exhibit III-13). The potential physical impacts associated with the provision of hiking and riding trails requires additional analysis in an EIR.
- e) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Specific Plan involves development of 110 single-family residential lots, which may create a demand for other public facilities. Further analysis in an EIR is required to determine the potential impacts in this regard.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. RECREATION. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	✓			
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	✓			



Comments:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Specific Plan involves development of 110 single-family residential lots, which may increase the use of existing neighborhood, regional, or other recreational facilities. The potential impact associated with increased use of existing recreational facilities requires additional analysis in an EIR.
- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses 13(d) and 14(a).

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	✓			
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	✓			
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				✓
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	✓			
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	✓			
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			✓	
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				✓

Comments:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Project implementation would increase traffic volumes in the project vicinity during both construction and long-term operation of the proposed residential uses. Further analysis in an EIR is required to determine whether the projected traffic volumes would be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., City and County).
- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 15(a).
- c) **No Impact.** Because of the nature and scope of the proposed Specific Plan, project implementation would not change air traffic patterns.
- d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 7(g) for a discussion of the proposed roadways and access routes.



- e) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses 7(f), 7(g), 13(a), and 13(b).
- f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Through the project application process, the proposed Specific Plan would be reviewed by the City of Rancho Cucamonga to determine consistency with the City's Development Code regarding the provision of parking. With the City's discretionary review and approval of Specific Plan through the established procedures, project implementation would not result in inadequate parking capacity.
- g) **No Impact.** Because of the nature and scope of the proposed Specific Plan, project implementation would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	✓			
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	✓			
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	✓			
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	✓			
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	✓			
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	✓			
g) Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			✓	

Comments:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would be served by the Cucamonga Valley Water District sewer system, which has waste treated by the Inland Empire Utilities Agency at the RP-4 treatment plant located within Rancho Cucamonga. Operation of proposed residential uses would generate additional wastewater beyond current conditions. Further analysis is necessary to evaluate the treatment requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).



- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Project implementation would generate additional wastewater beyond current conditions and may require an incremental expansion of the existing sewerage system and expansion of the wastewater treatment facility. Further analysis is required to determine the extent of modifications, upsizing, and realignments of wastewater facilities, and the resultant physical impacts. Refer also to Response 15(a).

The Cucamonga Valley Water District (CVWD) is the sole water provider of the City's water supply. Project implementation would increase the demand for water and would require an incremental expansion of the existing water distribution system to serve proposed residential uses; modifications, upsizing, and/or realignments may be required. Also, the project proposes development of a 1.0-acre reservoir on-site. Further analysis is required to determine the potential environmental effects associated with the water distribution system and the proposed reservoir.

- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 8(c).
- d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The CVWD draws its supply from local canyon runoff, groundwater, and imported surface water delivered through the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). The EIR will evaluate whether sufficient water supplies are available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or whether new or expanded entitlements would be needed. Refer also to Response 16b.

Senate Bills 221 and 610 took effect January 1, 2002. These two bills amended State law to better link information on water supply availability to certain land use decisions by cities and counties. The two companion bills provide a regulatory forum that requires more collaborative planning between local water suppliers and cities and counties. All SB 610 and 221 reports are generated and adopted by the public water supplier.

Senate Bill (SB) 610 requires a detailed report regarding water availability and planning for additional water supplies that is included with the environmental document for specified projects. Residential developments that propose more than 500 dwelling units require an assessment. The Specific Plan proposes 110 dwelling units; therefore, a detailed report is not required pursuant to the provisions of SB 610. Under SB 221, approval by a city or county of certain residential subdivisions requires a written verification of sufficient water supply. The proposed residential subdivision does not satisfy SB 221 criteria (residential development of more than 500 dwelling units); therefore, the project would not be subject to compliance with SB 221.

- e) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses 8(a) and 8(b).
- f) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Private contractors who transport solid waste out of the City provide solid waste service. Within the SOI, solid waste is transported to the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill operated by the County of San Bernardino. The proposed project would generate solid waste beyond existing conditions. The project's effect upon the landfill capacity and the City's waste recycling programs require further evaluation.
- g) **Less Than Significant Impact.** This project would be subject to compliance with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste. The City of Rancho Cucamonga continues to implement waste reduction procedures consistent with AB 939.



Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	✓			
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	✓			
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	✓			

Comments:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** As stated in Responses 4(a) through 4(e) (Biological Resources) and Responses 5(a) through 5(d) (Cultural Resources), further study is required.
- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** A review of cumulative impacts for each issue area that has been identified as potentially significant is required pursuant to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines.
- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could potentially cause adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly; further study is required.



EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration per Section 15063(c)(3)(D). The effects identified above for this project were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in the following earlier document(s) pursuant to applicable legal standards, and such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis. The following earlier analyses were utilized in completing this Initial Study and are available for review in the City of Rancho Cucamonga, Planning Division offices, 10500 Civic Center Drive (check all that apply):

- General Plan FEIR*
(SCH#2000061027, Certified October 17, 2001)
- Master Environmental Assessment for the 1989 General Plan Update*
(SCH #88020115, certified January 4, 1989)
- Industrial Area Specific Plan EIR*
(Certified September 19, 1981)
- Industrial Area Specific Plan, Subarea 18, EIR*
(SCH #93102055, certified June 15, 1994)
- Victoria Planned Community EIR*
(Certified May 20, 1981)
- Terra Vista Planned Community EIR*
(SCH #81082808, certified February 16, 1983)
- Foothill Boulevard Specific Plan EIR*
(SCH #87021615, certified September 16, 1987)
- Etiwanda Specific Plan EIR*
(SCH #82061801, certified July 6, 1983)
- Etiwanda North Specific Plan EIR*
(SCH #89012314, certified April 1, 1992)
- Other:
- Other: