

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: Demolition No. 357
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
City of Redlands
Development Services Department
35 Cajon Street, Suite 20
Redlands, CA 92373 Mailing Address:
City of Redlands
Development Services Dept. – Planning
P.O. Box 3005
Redlands, CA 92373
3. Contact Person & Telephone: Sean Reilly, Principal Planner, (909) 798-7555 option 2.
4. Project Location: 130 Sierra Vista, Redlands, CA (Assessor Parcel Number: 0176-173-09-0000)
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:
Bryan and Celina McKernan
130 Sierra Vista Drive
Redlands, Ca 92373
6. General Plan Designation: Very Low Density Residential
7. Zoning Designation: Residential Estate (R-A)
8. Description of Project:

The applicant, Bryan and Celina McKernan, proposes to demolish an existing single-family residence that is approximately 2,712 square feet. As a part of the project all the structures would be removed from the property. The structure is over 50 years of age and is located at 130 Sierra Vista within the Residential Estate (R-A) District.
9. Existing On-site Land Use and Setting: The property is located at the intersection of Escondido Road and Sierra Vista Drive. The property has been improved with a single family residence, and attached garage.
10. Surrounding General Plan and Land Uses:

	General Plan	Zoning	Land Use
North:	Very Low Density Residential	Residential Estate (R-A)	Single Family Residence
South:	Very Low Density Residential	Residential Estate (R-A)	Single Family Residence
West:	Very Low Density Residential	Residential Estate (R-A)	Single Family Residence
East:	Very Low Density Residential	Residential Estate (R-A)	Single Family Residence
11. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): None

12. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Not Applicable. This Preliminary Environmental Checklist is being prepared to augment a potential finding of Exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), in accordance with Section(s) 15301 (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines.

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" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- (✓) I find that the Proposed Project could not have a potentially significant effect on the environment, and the Proposed Project qualifies for an EXEMPTION from further environmental review.
- () I find that the Proposed Project could not have a potentially 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 not 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. No further review is required.

Sean Reilly, Principal Planner
City of Redlands
January 17, 2023

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all determinations, except "No Impact" determinations that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" determination is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" determination should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All determinations and discussion must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be potentially significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries in any section of this Initial Study, then an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared to fully analyze the identified issue(s).
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In such cases, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For any effects that are determined to be "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist any and all references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., General Plan maps or exhibits, zoning ordinances, specific plans, etc.). Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion. In this Initial Study, a References section is provided at the end of the document.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats. However, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and,
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		With Mitigation Incorporated		
I. AESTHETICS.				
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Aesthetics – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway. The proposed project is the demolition of a single-family residence which is not located within a scenic vista or along a scenic highway. The removal of the structure would reduce impacts in regard to this issue.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition of a single-family residence will not damage scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway. The property is not located along a state scenic highway and the building itself is not historic or located within a historic or scenic district. There are no known rock outcroppings on-site.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not degrade the existing visual character or affect the quality of the site and its surroundings. The demolition of the single-family residence would not create a change in the appearance of the surroundings. The project is a demolition which will remove a structure from a property which is not particularly visible from the adjacent surroundings. Overall, the demolition of the single-family residence would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the area.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project is a demolition, and it will not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Lighting and glare will be reduced because of the demolition and removal of the structure onsite.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES.				
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Agriculture & Forest Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The project includes the demolition of a single-family residence. The property does not include Prime Farmland and the demolition of the single-family residence will not convert Prime Farmland or Unique Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use.

- b) *No Impact.* The demolition will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. The property is within a developed residential area in a residential zoning district. The demolition does not include any proposal to change the zoning district nor is the property under a Williamson Act contract.
- c) *No Impact.* This demolition is located in an area that is zoned for residential development. The property does not contain any forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production. As such, removal of the structures on the property will not create an impact on forest land or timberland.
- d) *No Impact.* The demolition will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, as the property does not contain any forest land or propose the conversion of any forest land to non-forest use.
- e) *No Impact.* This demolition is located in an area surrounded by a single-family residences and the demolition of the home on the property would not result in the conversion of any farmland or forest area. Therefore, no impacts will occur related to agriculture or forest resources.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Air Quality – Discussion

- a, b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. The proposed project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not 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.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures.
- e) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The project is limited in size and scope to only include the structures on a single-family residential property. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	With Mitigation Incorporated			

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service?
- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife or U.S. 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?

Biological Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The property is located within an urbanized area and the project scope is limited to the demolition of the existing residential structure. This demolition will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications. All work completed will be required to adhere to all local, State, and Federal laws.
- b) *No Impact.* There are no riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities within the project area and no disturbance beyond the limits of the subject property is proposed.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. No protected wetlands exist within the subject property.

- d) *No Impact.* The project includes the demolition of an existing single-family residence, and related improvements that have been previously developed and will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native residential 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) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
- f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a single-family home, and it will 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant		
		With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Cultural Resources – Discussion

- a) *Less than Significant Impact.* The historical significance of the project has been reviewed pursuant to the findings of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) which are as follow.

The analysis in this section is based upon the research and analysis contained with the Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) prepared by Historic Resources Group dated January 2023, which is included as an attachment to the Demolition No. 357 Staff Report. The HRE was prepared using primary and secondary sources related to the history and development of the property, including reference materials available at the A.K. Smiley Public Library in Redlands and field inspection of the property. Identification of physical features and historic integrity were ascertained during the site visit and through review of available building plans and other archival materials.

A. Associated with events have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California History and cultural heritage.

Permits were issued for construction of the home in 1958 and aerial images verify that the structure was constructed as of 1959. The home is a modest example of the post-World War II housing boom in the city, when large swaths of Redlands were developed as housing tracts and developments. It is one of over 3,700 residences built during this decade and was not associated with an early or notable tract development. As such, the building does not have significant interest as part of the development of Redlands. A comprehensive newspaper search and research conducted at the A.K. Smiley Library's

Heritage Room by City staff did not reveal any evidence that this structure makes a significant contribution to the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, State, or Country.

B. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

Staff conducted research at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room and through newspaper.com. The table (as shown below) lists the residents associated to the subject property based on the information provided by the City Directories located at the A.K. Smiley Library's Heritage Room and Newspapers.com.

Year	Name(s)	Occupation
1959-1971	Robert Baker	Interior Designer
1975 - 1998	Paul R. Ennis	Doctor
2003 - 2008	Rick Pence	Construction Contractor
2008 - 2018	Gregory Misbach	Doctor
2018 - Present	Celina and Bryan McKernan	Construction Contractor

The newspaper research that was conducted for each of these individuals revealed no significant information. The individuals listed above had professional occupations and are not known to have significantly contributed to the culture, history or development of the city and further, the information found related to these individuals was not closely tied to this specific home.

As previously stated, the home was designed by notable Redlands architect Clare Day. Clare Day is known for his Mid-Century Modern style of design for residential, commercial and institutional buildings. Some of his contributions to the local area include Clement Middle school, Redlands Paint on Redlands Blvd., Cram Elementary School in Highland, and several homes within the south hills of Redlands. While the home was designed by Clare Day, it is not one of his more notable works. In addition, while Clare Day is a notable local architect, he would not be someone who is considered to have significantly contributed to the culture, history or development of the City.

C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.

Please refer to the response provided under Section 2.62.170(D), above.

D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information in prehistory or history.

There are several homes with Mid-Century Modern architecture in the City of Redlands. Although this home may not be one of the few remaining homes in the City of this architectural type, it is one of approximately 13 homes in Redlands designed by Clare Day. At the time of its initial construction, the residence exhibited significant character-

defining features of the Mid-Century Modern style and reflected Day's work as an important local architect. However, the building has undergone substantial alterations since its original construction, including relocation of the primary entrance, replacement of most windows and doors, enclosure of the original carport, replacement of some original siding, and re-cladding of the prominent exterior fireplace. Because of these alterations the property is no longer an excellent example of the Mid-Century Modern style nor an important example of Clare Henry Day's work. Day was extremely active in Redlands in the 1950s and 1960s, and there are many houses still extant with higher integrity in the City that better reflect his significance as a local architect. The home does not retain sufficient integrity to convey any potential significance under this criterion.

Based on the review of the criteria above as it relates to the demolition of the structure, it is not historically significant and approval of the proposed project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5 further, there is no evidence that the site is likely to yield valuable information regarding pre-history.

- b) *No Impact.* The building and site have not yielded any information regarding prehistory or history. The building will not likely yield information about the past. Therefore, approval of the proposed project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature as significant ground disturbance is not proposed.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

VI. **ENERGY.**

Would the project:

- a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?
- b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Energy – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The project is the demolition of a single-family residence. The demolition and removal of the structure of the residential structure would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy. The Project would therefore not cause or result in the need for additional energy producing or transmission facilities. The Project would not engage in wasteful or inefficient uses of energy and aims to achieve energy conservations goals within the State of California. Therefore, no impact would occur in relation to this issue.
- b) *No Impact.* Redlands Municipal Code Chapter 15.18 requires that all new development projects (e.g., commercial, industrial, residential, etc.) comply with the California Green Building Standards, Title 24, Part 11 (known as CalGreen). However, the proposed project does not include the construction. The demolition of on single-family residence will not conflict with or obstruct any State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. There will be no impact.

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

Geology & Soils – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project is a demolition and will remove a structure from the site. It will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault; Strong seismic ground shaking; Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; and landslides.
- b) *No Impact.* Disturbance within the project site will be limited to the immediate location surrounding the home and the site is not being cleared or graded as a result of this project. The proposed project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

- d) *No Impact.* Adoption of the proposed project is not 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) *No Impact.* The proposed project does not 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 waste water. The project is a demolition of a single-family home, which is not currently utilizing sewer service and septic is in place on-site.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not generate gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.				
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Hazards & Hazardous Materials – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, a demolition application shall be submitted to the City of

Redlands Building and Safety Division for approval per the regulations set forth in the California Building Code. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures and the abatement of hazardous materials.

- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not 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. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures and the abatement of hazardous materials.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest public school is Mariposa Elementary School, which is approximately one mile from the proposed project. The demolition process will be required to comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures and the abatement of hazardous materials.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. This was verified by the Envirostor and GeoTracker database, as a result, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- e - f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a single-family residence which is not located within the immediate vicinity of a public or private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The project is not located in an airport land use plan.
- g) *No Impact.* The project is the demolition of a single-family residence on an existing lot adjacent to established roadways. The proposed project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- h) *No Impact.* The proposed project is a demolition which will remove a structure from the property. Any new construction will be required to obtain permits and will be reviewed for consistency with existing Building, Fire and Municipal Codes. The proposed project will 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.

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

Hydrology & Water Quality – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a single-family residence. No discharge will be created due to the removal of the structures onsite. The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- b) *No Impact.* The project consists of demolishing a single-family residence and is not expected to utilize groundwater supplies. The proposed 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.
- c) *No Impact.* The project is the demolition of a single-family residence. The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project is a demolition and will remove impervious surface area from the site. This should result in a reduction in the amount of runoff from the site. The proposed project will not create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
- g) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a single-family residence and does not propose any new housing. The proposed project will 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. The proposed project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.
- h) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the removal of a structure, and it will 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.
- e) *No Impact.* The project is not located in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No impact will occur.

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

Land Use & Planning – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will remove an existing structure from the site but will not change the property boundaries.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not conflict with the zoning ordinance or general plan or other applicable land use plan as it only consists of the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition of the single-family residence does not conflict with any conservation or natural community plan as it located in an urban area.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant		
		With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- 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?

Mineral Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The removal of the structures on-site will not change the availability of mineral resources and the project is not located near a mineral resource recovery area. No impact will occur related to these issues.
- b) *No Impact.* The removal of the structures will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral source as delineated on a local general plan, or specific plan.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE. Would the project:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Noise – Discussion

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project will not result in 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. The demolition of a single-family residence will require the use of small, powered equipment that may generate low levels of noise for short periods of time. The proposed project will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project will not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Project will be required to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance.
- c) *No Impact.* The project is located approximately 4.00 south of the Redlands Municipal Airport. The proposed project is a demolition of a single family residence. This demolition would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels within the vicinity of an airport.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The proposed project is the demolition of a small building structure. This demolition would not expose people

residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

XIV. POPULATION & HOUSING.

Would the project:

- 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 road or other infrastructure)?
- 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?

Population & Housing – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a single-family residence. No extension of infrastructure is proposed by this project and no population growth is anticipated.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of one single-family residence. The demolition would not result in the displacement of substantial existing housing that would require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not result in the displacement of a substantial number of people that would require the construction of a replacement housing.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.

Would the project:

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

i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Public Services – Discussion

- a) i) and ii) *No Impact*. Police and fire protection for the project site are provided by the City of Redlands. Calls for service are not expected to result from the demolition of the home. The proposed project will not result in the need for new or additional public facilities such as Police or Fire stations, vehicles, or additional staff as it is the removal of a structure and does not include the addition construction any new facility that could contribute to a significant increase in police or fire calls for service. No impact is anticipated in relation to this issue.
- iii), iv), and v) *No Impacts*. The proposed project is not expected to impact or result in a need for new or altered general governmental services provided by the City of Redlands, the Redlands Unified School District, or other government agencies. The proposed project is a demolition and will result in the removal of a single-family residence from the property. It will not result in the need for new or additional public facilities such as public libraries, parks, or meeting facilities. The project does not induce significant residential growth requiring additional school facilities, nor will it directly generate the need for new additional park land. In terms of cumulative effects, the proposed project would not create any public services or facilities issues beyond that anticipated in the *General Plan EIR*. Therefore, no impacts will occur related to these issues.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

XVI. RECREATION.

Would the project:

- a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Recreation – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a single-family residence. The removal of the structure on this site will not contribute to an increased demand for recreational facilities.
- b) *No Impact.* The project will not affect existing or planned recreational facilities, nor create a significant new demand for additional recreational facilities.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

XVII. TRANSPORTATION.

Would the project:

- a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?
- b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result 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) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Transportation – Discussion

- a-f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a single-family residence. The removal of these structures would not create additional vehicle trips, or result in changes to vehicle circulation patterns, emergency access, and transit facilities. The demolition of the single-family residence and accessory structures will not conflict with congestion on any major roads or highways or conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of circulation systems.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

- a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
- i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or,
 - ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Tribal Cultural Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The subject site was initially developed as a single-family residence, which is proposed for demolition. No subsurface activities will occur as a result of the demolition of the structures on-site, beyond the removal of slabs and foundations. Grading of the site is not proposed in the scope of this demolition.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS.				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Utilities & Service Systems – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The demolition of the single-family residence will not result in an increase in wastewater treatment because no new building is proposed as a part of this project that would require waste water treatment.
- b, c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not require the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facility which could cause significant environmental effects. The proposed project is the demolition and removal of an existing single-family home and it will not require the construction of storm water drainage facilities which could cause significant environmental effects.
- d) *No Impact.* The demolition of the existing single-family residence will not result in the need for additional water supplies.
- e) *No Impact.* The demolition of the existing single-family residence will not result in an additional demand for wastewater treatment by its provider.

- f) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition of one single-family residence will not generate waste that will exceed the capacity of the landfill.
- g) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will require the issuance of building permit, issued by the Development Services Department. As a part of permit issuance, compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste is required.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		With Mitigation Incorporated		
XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Wildfire – Discussion

- a, b, c, d) *No Impact.* The proposed project is a demolition, which will remove a structure from the project location. Any future construction on the site would be required to comply with the California Building Code and the Redlands Municipal Code. Therefore, there will be no impacts.

Issues:

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				

Mandatory Findings of Significance – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not 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) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

REFERENCES

California Department of Conservation. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Available online at: <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html>

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection (2016). *San Bernardino County Williamson Act FW 2015/2016 Sheet 2 of 2*.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. *EnviroStor Database*. Available online at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>

California Department of Transportation. *California Scenic Highway Mapping System*. Available online at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/

CalRecycle. Facility/Site Summary Details: San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill (36-AA-0087). Available online at: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/36-AA-0087/Detail/>

City of Redlands (2017, December 5). *City of Redlands Climate Action Plan*. Available online at: <https://www.cityofredlands.org/post/planning-division-general-plan>

City of Redlands (2017, December 5). *City of Redlands 2035 General Plan*. Available online at: <https://www.cityofredlands.org/post/planning-division-general-plan>

City of Redlands (2017, July 21). *City of Redlands General Plan Update and Climate Action Plan Environmental Impact Report* (SCH No. 2016081041). Available online at: <https://www.cityofredlands.org/post/planning-division-general-plan>

City of Redlands (1989, January 3). *East Valley Corridor Specific Plan (January 3, 1989, and as amended)*. Available online at: <https://www.cityofredlands.org/post/specific-plans-and-community-plans>

California State Geoportal. “California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer.” 2020. <https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414>

Department of Toxic Substances Control. “Envirostor.” <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Redlands>

Historic Resources Group. *Historical Resource Evaluation Report Baker Residence, 130 Sierra Vista Drive, Redlands* (January 2023)

State Water Resources Control Board. “Geotracker.” Accessed 24 August 2021. https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0607100096

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. “National Wetlands Inventory.” 8 March 2021. <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>