

SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

322 B



FROM: TLMA - Planning Department

SUBMITTAL DATE:  
April 5, 2006

SUBJECT: Resolution No. 2006-054 Certifying Environmental Impact Report No. 469

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors adopt Resolution No. 2006-054.

BACKGROUND: Change of Zone Nos. 6885 & 6993 and Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 & 31778 were approved by the Board of Supervisors on April, 4 2006.

Departmental Concurrence

REVIEWED BY EXECUTIVE OFFICE

DATE 4-5-2006

Robert C. Johnson  
Planning Director

RCJ:aa

Policy  
 Policy

Consent  
 Consent

Dept't Recomm.:  
Per Exec. Ofc.:

5000453 -E BW 1:53  
RECEIVED RIVERSIDE COUNTY

Prev. Agn. Ref.

District: Second | Agenda Number:

3.37a

2  
3 **RESOLUTION NO. 2006-054**  
4 **CERTIFYING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 469 AND**  
5 **APPROVING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NOS. 31768 AND 31778**  
6 **(HILLCREST HOMES)**

7 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65450 et seq., a public  
8 hearing was held before the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in Riverside, California on March 21  
9 and April 4, and before the Riverside County Planning Commission in Riverside, California on January  
10 18, 2005, to consider Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778 (Hillcrest Homes); and,

11 **WHEREAS**, all the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the  
12 Riverside County CEQA implementing procedures have been met, and Environmental Impact Report  
13 (EIR) No. 469, prepared in connection with Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778 and related cases  
14 (referred to alternatively herein as "the project"), is sufficiently detailed so that all the potentially  
15 significant effects of the project on the environment and measures necessary to avoid or substantially  
16 lessen such effects have been evaluated in accordance with the above-referenced provisions and  
17 procedures; and,

18 **WHEREAS**, the matter was discussed fully with testimony and documentation presented by the  
19 public and affected government agencies; and,

20 **WHEREAS**, Public Resources Code Section 21081 requires that "no public agency shall approve  
21 or carry out a project for which an environmental impact has been certified which identifies one or more  
22 significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless  
23 both of the following occur:

24 (a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each  
25 significant effect:

- 26 (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project  
27 which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
- (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of  
another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other  
agency.

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL

APR 07 2006  
BY [Signature]

1 (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including  
2 considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained  
3 workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the  
4 environmental impact report.

5 (b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of  
6 subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social,  
7 technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the  
8 environment.

9 **BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Board of Supervisors  
10 of the County of Riverside, in regular session assembled on April 11, 2006, that:

11 A. The project site is located on approximately 102 gross acres, in the unincorporated  
12 Riverside County community of Mira Loma, California. The project site is located directly  
13 south of Cantu-Galleano Ranch Road (a.k.a Galena Street), directly east of Wineville Road  
14 and directly north of Bellegrave Avenue. The project site is also located approximately  
15 one-half mile east of Interstate 15. A proposed future Interstate 15 interchange (Galena  
16 Street) will be located in close proximity to the project site. Tentative Tract Map No.  
17 31778 (APN 160-060-035, -001) is located directly east of Wineville Road and directly  
18 north of Bellegrave Avenue. The proposed development consists of subdividing and  
19 grading 41.32 gross acres into 128 single-family residential lots. Tentative Tract Map No.  
20 31768 (APN 160-060-042) is located directly east of Tentative Tract Map No. 31778 and  
21 proposes to subdivide and grade 61 gross acres into 189 single-family residential lots, a  
22 portion of a school site, and 1.8-acres of a 5-acre neighborhood park. The school and park  
23 site will be shared with the easterly-adjacent future development.

24 B. The project is associated with Change of Zone Case Nos. 6885 and 6933. Change of Zone  
25 No. 6885 proposes to change the zoning classification of the Tentative Tract Map No.  
26 31768 property from A-2-10 (Heavy Agriculture with a 10-acre minimum lot size) to R-1  
27 (Single-Family Residential). Change of Zone No. 6933 proposes to change the zoning  
28 classification of the Tentative Tract Map No. 31778 property from A-2-20 (Heavy

1 Agriculture with a 20-acre minimum lot size) to R-1 (Single-Family Residential).

2 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental  
3 impacts associated with Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778 are potentially significant unless  
4 otherwise indicated, but each of these impacts will be avoided or substantially lessened by the identified  
5 mitigation measures, and that for each of the following impacts, the Board of Supervisors finds in  
6 accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) that “changes or alterations have been  
7 required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the  
8 environment,” as follows:

9 A. Biological Resources

10 1. Impacts:

11 No species listed as threatened or endangered under the State or Federal  
12 Endangered Species Acts are expected to occur at the project site due to  
13 absence of suitable habitat. The project site currently provides 60 acres of  
14 disked land that may be used by raptors and other birds for foraging.  
15 Ornamental trees associated with the dairy residences may be used for  
16 nesting. Implementation of the proposed project will be required to comply  
17 with the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), which prohibits the  
18 take of bird species that are considered to utilize the site.

19 The project is required to comply with the regulatory requirements of the  
20 MSHCP and Riverside County Ordinance No. 810.2 which was adopted to  
21 implement the MSHCP. The EIR also analyzed cumulative impacts  
22 associated with biological resources and determined that the project has no  
23 significant cumulative impacts with respect to biological resources  
24 requiring mitigation.

25 2. Mitigation:

26 Mitigation Measure Bio 1 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
27 project to reduce potential impacts to burrowing owls, as follows: In  
28 accordance with the CDFG Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (1995), a

1 pre-construction survey and any relocation activity for resident burrowing  
2 owls will be conducted by a qualified biologist 30 days prior to  
3 commencement of grading and construction activities. If ground disturbing  
4 activities are delayed or suspended for more than 30 days after the pre-  
5 construction survey, the site shall be resurveyed for burrowing owls.

6 If active burrowing owl nests are located they shall be avoided or the owls  
7 actively or passively relocated. To adequately avoid active nests, no grading  
8 or heavy equipment activity shall take place within at least 250 feet of an  
9 active nest during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31), and  
10 160 feet during the non-breeding season.

11 If burrowing owls occupy the site and cannot be avoided, active or passive  
12 relocation shall be used to exclude owls from their burrows, as agreed to by  
13 the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department. Relocation  
14 shall be conducted outside the breeding season or once the young are able  
15 to leave the nest and fly. Passive relocation can be used to exclude the owls  
16 from their burrows (outside the breeding season or once the young are able  
17 to leave the nest and fly) by installing one-way doors in burrow entrances.  
18 These one-way doors allow the owl to exit the burrow, but not enter it.  
19 These doors should be left in place 48 hours to ensure owls have left the  
20 burrow. Artificial burrows should be provided nearby. The project area  
21 should be monitored daily for one week to confirm owl use of burrows  
22 before excavating burrows in the impact area. Burrows should be excavated  
23 using hand tools and refilled to prevent reoccupation. Sections of flexible  
24 pipe should be inserted into the tunnels during excavation to maintain an  
25 escape route for any animals that may remain inside the burrow. The CDFG  
26 shall be consulted to determine acceptable receiving sites available where  
27 this species has a greater chance of successful long-term relocation.  
28

1 Mitigation Measure Bio 2 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
2 project, as follows: The purpose of the MSHCP is to conserve open space  
3 and habitat on a county-wide, cumulative basis. As set forth under  
4 Ordinance No. 810.2, to address the cumulative loss of habitat for special  
5 status birds by the loss of foraging habitat development in western  
6 Riverside County, including Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778,  
7 shall be conditioned to pay Riverside County MSHCP mitigation fees.

8 B. Geology

9 1. Impacts:

10 Figures in the County's General Plan and the Jurupa Area Plan both  
11 designate the project site as containing sediments very susceptible to high  
12 groundwater and liquefaction. However, according to the "Feasibility-Level  
13 Geotechnical Investigations" prepared for the project site by GeoSoils, Inc.  
14 (Sept. 2003, Aug. 2003), the general liquefaction screening process  
15 (pursuant to Special Publication 117) indicated that the potential for  
16 liquefaction and associated adverse effects within the site are low, due to  
17 the deep regional groundwater table that underlies the site. Due to design  
18 considerations involving the removal of organic soils, which can lead to  
19 liquefaction, impacts from liquefaction are considered less than significant.  
20 Currently, the onsite soils may be unstable to build on, and may pose a risk  
21 of subsidence. However, once the unstable materials are removed and  
22 replaced with "clean" soils as set forth in the design considerations, no other  
23 source of instability is expected and impacts will be less than significant.  
24 Organic materials on the project site and within soils located on the project  
25 site create the potential that methane will develop in the soils following  
26 grading of the project site. Methane represents a potential hazard on the  
27 project site. The County of Riverside Health Services Agency, Department  
28 of Environmental Health has requirements for methane mitigation protocol

1 to address new developments on former dairy sites in the Mira Loma area.  
2 The County Protocol allows proponents to choose one of two options for  
3 testing and mitigation, in order to comply with the General Requirements of  
4 the Protocol. Option 1 includes sampling and monitoring no sooner than  
5 30 days after grading for a minimum of four weeks. Mitigation measures  
6 will be needed should methane levels exceed 5,000 ppm during post-  
7 grading sampling, per Riverside County Department of Environmental  
8 Health Methane Mitigation Protocol. Option 2 allows for no sampling and  
9 automatic incorporation of mitigation measures. In order to mitigate this  
10 potentially significant impact to less than significant, development of the  
11 project site will comply with either Riverside County Department of  
12 Environmental Health Methane Mitigation Protocol Option 1 (Mitigation  
13 Measures Geo 1-5, below) or Option 2, (Mitigation Measure Geo 6). The  
14 EIR also analyzed cumulative impacts associated with geology and  
15 determined that the project has no significant cumulative impacts with  
16 respect to geology requiring mitigation.

17  
18 2. Mitigation:

19 Development of the project site will comply with either Riverside County  
20 Department of Environmental Health Methane Mitigation Protocol Option  
21 1 or Option 2, implementation of which will reduce the impact to less than  
22 significant. The mitigation measures for Riverside County Department of  
23 Environmental Health Methane Mitigation Protocol Option 1 have been  
24 adopted as mitigation and made a condition of the project, as follows:  
25 Mitigation Measure Geo 1: On lots where methane is detected above 5,000  
26 ppm, mitigation shall include installation of a minimum 60-mil high density  
27 polyethylene (HDPE) membrane barrier (or equivalent), a subslab passive  
28 venting system, sealing of utility or other penetrations through the  
membrane, seal of utility conduits where they enter the structure, and

1 construction of a utility “dam” at any point where a “dry” utility trench  
2 approaches the structure. “Liquid Boot”, applied to a minimum 60 mil dry  
3 thickness per manufacturer’s recommendations, may be substituted for the  
4 HDPE membrane.

5 Mitigation Measure Geo 2: If a post-tensioned slab is utilized, a visqueen  
6 vapor barrier may be substituted for the membrane described in Mitigation  
7 Measure Geo 1, unless the maximum methane reading is above 12,500  
8 ppm, in which case the membrane must be used, regardless of slab type.

9 Mitigation Measure Geo 3: For places within the building footprint with  
10 methane levels above 5,000 ppm, and without conditioned air, the  
11 mitigation measure shall consist of a visqueen vapor barrier, subslab passive  
12 venting system, sealing of utility conduits where they enter the structure,  
13 and construction of a utility “dam” at any point where a “dry” utility trench  
14 approaches the structure.

15 The mitigation measures for Riverside County Department of  
16 Environmental Health Methane Mitigation Protocol Option 2 have been  
17 adopted as mitigation and made a condition of the project, as follows:

18 Mitigation Measure Geo 4: On all residential lots, the following shall be  
19 installed if Option 2 is selected: A minimum 60-mil high density  
20 polyethylene (HDPE) membrane barrier (or equivalent), a subslab passive  
21 venting system, and utility conduits shall be sealed where they enter a  
22 structure, and construct a utility “dam” at the point where a “dry” utility  
23 trench approaches a structure. “Liquid Boot” applied to a minimum 60-mil  
24 dry thickness per manufacturer’s recommendations, may be substituted for  
25 the HDPE membrane.

26  
27 Regardless of which Option described above is followed by the developer,  
28 the following mitigation measure has been adopted as mitigation and made

1 a condition of the project:

2 Mitigation Measure Geo 5: Any underground utility vaults located on-site  
3 shall have air vents installed per the utility purveyor's specifications.

4 In order to address the potential for ground cracking associated with  
5 organic material remaining in the soil, the following mitigation measure has  
6 been adopted as mitigation and made a condition of the project in order to  
7 ensure impacts related to ground cracking are reduced to a level below  
8 significance:

9  
10 Mitigation Measure Geo 6: The project will be required to comply with  
11 County standards to remove manure and the majority of the organic  
12 material, thereby reducing the site's capacity to experience ground cracking  
13 from organic material.

14 C. Hydrology/Water Quality

15 1. Impacts:

16 As an active construction site of greater than 1 acre, the project would be  
17 regulated under the Clean Water Act as part of the State's General Permit  
18 for Construction Activities. The proposed project is expected to emit  
19 bacteria and viruses into its receiving waters, including Reach 3 of the  
20 Santa Ana River, which is listed as an impaired water body on the Clean  
21 Water Act's Section 303(d) list. Thus, impacts are considered significant  
22 without mitigation.

23 Development of the site would increase the amount of impervious surfaces,  
24 thereby reducing the amount of rain water that would be subject to  
25 infiltration and the amount of nitrates and other salts that would potentially  
26 migrate into ground water due to the previous use of the project site for  
27 dairy operations. The storm drain system for this project is designed to  
28 handle the increased storm water runoff. However, pollutants such as oil  
and grease, sediment, fertilizers and petroleum, and debris can be

1 expected to be present in surface water runoff once project development  
2 occurs. This would be a significant impact which can be mitigated to less  
3 than significant with mitigation. The EIR also analyzed cumulative impacts  
4 associated with hydrology/water quality and determined that the project has  
5 no significant cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology/water quality  
6 requiring mitigation.

7 2. Mitigation:

8 Mitigation Measure Hyd 1 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
9 project to reduce potential water quality impacts, as follows: In order to  
10 reduce impacts related to water quality from increased pollutants in runoff,  
11 the project proponent will construct an "in-line" filtration device located  
12 immediately up-gradient of each area drainage plan outlet structure which  
13 drains the east and west portions of the project site. The filtration device  
14 chosen to be implemented must at least treat for viruses and pathogens.

15 The filtration devices must satisfy the structural BMP requirement found in  
16 the Riverside County Stormwater Quality Best Management Practice  
17 Design Handbook, prior to obtaining any grading permits.

18 Mitigation Measure Hyd 2 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
19 project to reduce potential water quality impacts, as follows: In order to  
20 address water quality issues related to urban runoff, the project shall  
21 incorporate porous pavement as much as possible at the project access  
22 points located along Wineville Road and Bellegrave Avenue. These areas  
23 will be large enough to allow sheet flows to penetrate the pavement, thus  
24 reducing runoff and allowing for capture of pollutants that may be present.

25 Mitigation Measure Hyd 3 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
26 project to reduce potential water quality impacts, as follows: The project  
27 will utilize porous pavement surrounding each constructed catchbasin,  
28 allowing for percolation and penetration of runoff. This measure will also

1 allow for natural attenuation of pollutants that may be present in the  
2 project's runoff.

3 D. Land Use

4 1. Impacts:

5 The proposed project is consistent with the project site's "Medium Density  
6 Residential" land use designation within a Business Park Overlay under the  
7 Jurupa Area Plan (JAP) of the Riverside County General Plan. The current  
8 zoning of the project site is A-2-10 and A-2-20 (Heavy Agriculture, 10 and  
9 20-acre minimum lot sizes). However, the proposed project includes two  
10 applications (Change of Zone No. 6885 and Change of Zone No. 6933) that  
11 propose to change the zoning on the project site to R-1 (Single Family  
12 Residential). The proposed R-1 zoning is considered to be highly consistent  
13 with the "Medium Density Residential" land use designation.

14 The project is inconsistent with the agricultural zoning to the east and west  
15 and generally inconsistent with light industrial zoning designations to the  
16 north. However, because the project is developing pursuant to the land use  
17 plan shown in the County's General Plan – Jurupa Area Plan, the project  
18 does not have a significant land use impact. The EIR also analyzed  
19 cumulative impacts associated with land use and determined that the project  
20 has no significant cumulative impacts with respect to land use requiring  
21 mitigation.

22 2. Mitigation:

23 No mitigation is required.

24 E. Noise

25 1. Impacts:

26 Tentative Tract Map No. 31778 has incorporated a 50-foot setback to the  
27 project boundaries that abut Wineville Road to the west and Bellegrave  
28 Avenue to the south. Also, the locations of the house pads for the lots that

1 are adjacent to Wineville Road and Bellegrave Avenue are planned to be  
2 placed farthest from the roadways to further increase the distance of the  
3 perimeter homes from the surrounding roads. In addition, the project  
4 proposed to construct a combination wall and berm that will effectively be a  
5 13-foot barrier at street level. Finally, the project proposed to construct a  
6 combination wall and berm that will effectively be a 13-foot barrier at street  
7 level. In addition, the preliminary noise study has also concluded that a 6-  
8 foot backyard wall be constructed for the lots 1-4 and 11, to mitigate any  
9 noise impacts produced from the school and park site.

10 Construction of the proposed project will result in short-term increases in  
11 noise levels to the immediate environment related to grading operations,  
12 heavy equipment, and assembly of houses. Since the County of Riverside  
13 has no noise-related specific performance standards that apply to  
14 construction, construction noise impacts are minimized by conformance  
15 with County Ordinance No. 457, which restricts the times that construction  
16 may occur. Since construction noise impacts are temporary and will be  
17 addressed by compliance with County of Riverside regulations, impacts are  
18 considered less than significant.

19 Without mitigation, residents of the proposed project would be exposed to  
20 exterior noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL (Community Noise  
21 Equivalent Level) due to traffic-related noise from adjacent streets caused  
22 by the nearby light industrial zone and the project's proximity to those  
23 existing land uses. With implementation of the mitigation measures set  
24 forth below, the project is expected to comply with County noise standards  
25 for both exterior and interior receptors. Following implementation of  
26 design considerations which have been incorporated as mitigation  
27 measures, significant effects associated with noise impacts to and from the  
28 project will be reduced to less than significant levels.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

2. Mitigation:

Mitigation Measure Noise 1 has been adopted and made a condition to the project to reduce noise impacts to the proposed project from traffic along Bellegrave Avenue, as follows: To reduce noise impacts to the proposed project from traffic noise along Bellegrave Avenue, Wineville Road and Cantu-Galleano Ranch Road, a barrier shall be constructed to 7.5 feet for Cantu-Galleano Ranch Road, and 6.5 feet for Bellegrave Avenue/Wineville Road. This barrier may be a combination of earthen berm and wall as long as the height measured from the pad elevation is equal to that specified in the Noise Studies. Although Urban Crossroads determined that a 6.5 to 7.5 (Bellegrave/Wineville, and Cantu-Galleano Ranch Road, respectively) foot combination of wall and berm would attenuate noise, the project proposed to construct a combination wall and berm that will effectively provide a 13-foot barrier at street level. The preliminary noise study has also concluded that a 6-foot backyard wall be constructed for the lots 1-4 and 11. These lots abut "J" Street and are located across the street from the school and park site. The 6-foot backyard wall will be constructed to mitigate any noise impacts produced from the school and park site. (Urban Crossroads, 12/3/04.)

Mitigation Measure Noise 2 has been adopted and made a condition to the project to meet County interior noise standards for homes along the perimeter frontages along Bellegrave Avenue, Wineville Road, and Cantu-Galleano Ranch Road (Galena Avenue), as follows: In order to meet County interior noise standards for homes along the perimeter frontages along Bellegrave Avenue, Wineville Road, and Cantu-Galleano Ranch Road (Galena Avenue), livable upstairs space shall include structural materials to attenuate noise from exterior noise levels at least up to 30 dBA.

1 F. Fire Services

2 1. Impacts:

3 The Initial Study prepared (pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section  
4 15063) for Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778 determined that  
5 there was no substantial evidence indicating that the proposed project or  
6 any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on fire services for the  
7 proposed project or other areas within the fire service area within which the  
8 project is proposed to be constructed.

9 2. Mitigation:

10 None required.

11 G. Library Services

12 1. Impacts:

13 The Initial Study prepared for Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778  
14 determined that there was no substantial evidence indicating that the  
15 proposed project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on  
16 library services for the proposed project or other areas within the library  
17 service area within which the project is proposed to be constructed.

18 2. Mitigation:

19 None required.

20 H. Parks and Recreation

21 1. Impacts:

22 Due to the project's design, which includes construction of 1.8 acres of a 5-  
23 acre neighborhood park at the southeastern area of the project site, and  
24 through compliance with standard regulatory requirements, the proposed  
25 project's potential impacts will be below the level of significance. The EIR  
26 also analyzed cumulative impacts associated with parks and recreation and  
27 determined that the project, with design considerations, has no significant  
28 cumulative impacts with respect to parks and recreation requiring

1 mitigation.

2 2. Mitigation:

3 None required.

4 I. Schools

5 1. Impacts:

6 Development of the proposed project will generate an estimated 286 new  
7 students for the Jurupa Unified School District (JUSD). As part of the  
8 project design, a new, 10.3-acre K-6 elementary school site is proposed to  
9 serve Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778 and other proposed  
10 development projects within the boundary area located north of Bellegrave  
11 Avenue, west of Etiwanda Avenue, south of Cantu-Galleano Ranch Road  
12 and east of Wineville Road. The project proponent shall also comply with  
13 provisions of State law governing the payment of school impact fees. With  
14 these provisions, there will not be a significant impact on the JUSD. The  
15 EIR also analyzed cumulative impacts associated with schools and  
16 determined that the project has no significant cumulative impacts with  
17 respect to schools requiring mitigation.

18 2. Mitigation:

19 None required.

20 J. Sheriff's Services

21 1. Impacts:

22 The Initial Study prepared for Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778  
23 determined that there was no substantial evidence indicating that the  
24 proposed project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on  
25 sheriff's services for the proposed project or other areas within the sheriff's  
26 service area within which the project is proposed to be constructed.

27 2. Mitigation:

28 None required.

1           K.     Solid Waste

2                     1.     Impacts:

3                     The proposed project will generate approximately 128.79 tons of solid  
4                     waste annually. This amount is negligible in relation to the annual capacity  
5                     of the landfills that will serve the project. Given the limited contribution of  
6                     solid waste anticipated to be generated by the proposed project,  
7                     development of the project site will not substantially contribute to the  
8                     exceedance of the permitted capacity of the designated landfills and the  
9                     project's impacts are thus less than significant. The EIR also analyzed  
10                    cumulative impacts associated with solid waste and determined that,  
11                    although the project may have a cumulative impact in conjunction with  
12                    other developments, buildout of Riverside County, of which the proposed  
13                    project is a part, would not create a demand for waste management services  
14                    that exceed the capabilities of the County's waste management system.

15                    2.     Mitigation:

16                    Mitigation Measure Waste 1 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
17                    project to help the County of Riverside comply with state law in diverting  
18                    solid waste from landfills, as follows: The Jurupa Area Recreation and  
19                    Parks District and/or the Lighting and Maintenance District (LMD) set up  
20                    by the Riverside County Transportation Department shall establish green  
21                    waste recycling from yard maintenance. Grass recycling (where lawn  
22                    clippings from a mulching-type mower are left on the lawn) and on-site  
23                    composting shall be implemented to reduce the quantities of green waste  
24                    going to landfills. Additionally, homeowners shall be provided with  
25                    information from the Jurupa Area Recreation and Parks District or the  
26                    LMD on grass recycling and composting.

1 L. Water and Sewer

2 1. Impacts:

3 These services will be provided by the Jurupa Community Services District  
4 (JCSD). JCSD's water supply analyses determined that there will be  
5 sufficient water available to supply the project. According to JCSD's  
6 calculations in a will serve letter dated October 28, 2003, Tentative Tract  
7 Map No. 31768 would generate a peak demand of approximately 570  
8 gallons per minute (GPM) and a daily demand of 141 GPM. In a separate  
9 will serve letter dated December 23, 2003, JCSD states that Tentative Tract  
10 Map No. 31778 would generate a peak demand of approximately 308 GPM  
11 and a daily demand of 76 GPM.

12 According to JCSD's Eastvale Master Water Plan, a water pipeline will be  
13 constructed within Bellegrave Avenue from Hamner Avenue to Etiwanda  
14 Avenue in order to support all of the proposed residential developments in  
15 that area. Since the environmental impacts of building the facilities to  
16 provide water service to the project area have been analyzed and mitigated  
17 in the approved environmental document "Eastvale Area Master Water and  
18 Sewer Plans Project" (SCH No. 2003121055), impacts due to additional  
19 conveyance facilities to serve this project have already been analyzed and  
20 are part of the environmental baseline. Accordingly, these impacts are  
21 considered less than significant for purposes of this EIR.

22 According to JCSD's calculations, the estimated wastewater flow from  
23 Tentative Tract Map No. 31768 would be approximately 0.20 MGD, and  
24 Tentative Tract Map No. 31778 would generate approximately 0.09 MGD  
25 of wastewater. JCSD has stated that the existing Western Riverside County  
26 Regional Wastewater Authority's treatment facility located on River Road  
27 has adequate capacity for the proposed project development. The project  
28 applicant, however, would be required to purchase capacity rights from the

1 plant for its capacity need in the regional wastewater treatment facility.  
2 Payment of capacity fees will ensure that the proposed project will be  
3 adequately served by existing and/or future treatment facilities.  
4 Since the Santa Ana River Interceptor (SARI) pipeline within Bellegrave  
5 Avenue was designed for industrial uses, new residential sewer pipelines  
6 will have to be constructed to serve the project as well as the other proposed  
7 residential developments in the area. According to JCSD's Eastvale Master  
8 Sewer Plan Update Addendum No.1 (September 2004), a trunk sewer will  
9 have to be constructed along Bellegrave Avenue from Archibald Avenue to  
10 Day Creek Channel in order to serve the developments north of Bellegrave,  
11 between Etiwanda Avenue and Hamner Avenue. The project proponent  
12 will be conditioned by JCSD to construct the trunk sewer, or to pay its fair  
13 share for construction. With these provisions, impacts to new wastewater  
14 treatment facilities are considered less than significant.

15 The EIR concludes that, as conditioned, the proposed project will not cause  
16 significant project-specific or cumulative impacts because JCSD has  
17 confirmed that water supply and sewer services are adequate to serve  
18 projected demand caused by the proposed project and other projects  
19 impacting such services and service facilities.

20 2. Mitigation:

21 JCSD has determined that they have adequate water supply to meet  
22 population demands through 2020 by utilizing local well extraction along  
23 with desalter plants. Adequate sewage capacity has been identified by  
24 Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility for the  
25 proposed project development. The project applicant will be conditioned  
26 by JCSD to purchase capacity rights into the treatment plant. Because  
27 Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31678 and 31778 will be conditioned to either  
28 construct or pay fees, the proposed project will not result in significant

1 impacts to water supply, water supply infrastructure, or sewerage.

2 M. Transportation and Traffic

3 1. Impacts:

4 The proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 3,053 new  
5 daily trip-ends, including 240 new trip-ends during the AM peak hour and  
6 323 new trip-ends during the PM peak hour. Direct off-site impacts as a  
7 result of the project traffic would occur where the project takes access from  
8 the existing public roads resulting in levels of service (LOS) at area  
9 intersections ranging from LOS A to LOS F. This would result in direct  
10 and cumulatively significant impacts which can be mitigated to less than  
11 significant with mitigation.

12 2. Mitigation:

13 Mitigation Measures Trans 1 through 7, consisting of on-Site Improvements  
14 Opening Year (2007) with or without the Galena interchange, have been  
15 adopted and made a condition to the project to reduce traffic impacts to less  
16 than significant, as follows:

17 Mitigation Measure Trans 1: The project proponent must realign the leg of  
18 Wineville Avenue north of Bellegrave Avenue such that it is aligned with  
19 the leg south of Bellegrave.

20 Mitigation Measure Trans 2: Construct Wineville Avenue from the north  
21 project boundary to Bellegrave Avenue at its ultimate half-section width as  
22 an Arterial highway (128-foot ROW).

23 Mitigation Measure Trans 3: Construct Bellegrave Avenue from Wineville  
24 Avenue to the east project boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a  
25 Major highway (118-foot ROW).

26 Mitigation Measure Trans 4: Construct Galena Street from the west project  
27 boundary to the east project boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a  
28 Urban Arterial highway (152-foot ROW).

1 Mitigation Measure Trans 5: Sight distance at the project entrance  
2 roadways shall be reviewed by County Transportation with respect to sight  
3 distance standards at the time of preparation of final grading, landscape and  
4 street improvement plans.

5 Mitigation Measure Trans 6: Signing/stripping shall be implemented in  
6 conjunction with detailed construction plans for the project site.

7 Mitigation Measure Trans 7: Construct the Madalena Avenue (project  
8 entrance)/Galena Street to the following geometrics:  
9

10 Northbound: One shared left, through, and right-turn lane.

11 Southbound: N/A

12 Eastbound: Three through lanes.

13 Westbound: One left-turn lane. Three through lanes.  
14

15 Design and install traffic signal.

16 Mitigation Measures Trans 8 through 11, consisting of off-site  
17 improvements required at opening year (2007) with or without the Galena  
18 Interchange, have been adopted and made a condition to the project to  
19 reduce traffic impacts to less than significant, as follows:

20 Mitigation Measure Trans 8: The project will participate in the phased  
21 construction cost of local and regional off-site improvements through  
22 payment of the following "fair share" mitigation fees:

- 23 • Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF), current at time of  
24 construction.
- 25 • Road and Bridge Benefit District "Zone B" fee, current at time of  
26 construction  
27  
28

1 Mitigation Measure Trans 9: Install a traffic signal to the intersection of  
2 Wineville Avenue/Galena Street.

3 Mitigation Measure Trans 10: Construct the intersection of Jurupa  
4 Road/Bellegrave Avenue to include the following geometrics:

5 Northbound: One through lane.

6 Southbound: One through lane.

7 Eastbound: One left-turn lane. Two through lanes.

8 Westbound: One left-turn lane. One through lane.

9 Design and install traffic signal.

10  
11 Mitigation Measure Trans 11: Design and install traffic signal and  
12 construct the intersection of Wineville Avenue/Bellegrave Avenue to  
13 include the following geometrics:

14 Northbound: Two left-turn lanes. Two through lanes. One right-  
15 turn lane.

16 Southbound: Two left-turn lanes. Two through lanes. One right-  
17 turn lane.

18 Eastbound: One left-turn lane. Two through lanes. One shared  
19 right-turn and through lane.

20 Westbound: One left-turn lane. Two through lanes. One right-turn  
21 lane.

22 Mitigation Measures Trans 12 through 16, consisting of off-site  
23 improvements required for General Plan Buildout traffic conditions to be  
24 mitigated through the payment of Roadway and Bridge Benefit District and  
25 TUMF fees, have been adopted and made a condition to the project to  
26 reduce traffic impacts to less than significant, as follows:  
27  
28

1 Mitigation Measure Trans 12: Construct the intersection of Hamner  
2 Avenue/Bellegrave to include the following geometrics:

3 Northbound: One left-turn lane. Three through lanes. One shared  
4 right-turn and through lane.

5 Southbound: Two left-turn lanes. Three through lanes. One right-  
6 turn lane.

7 Eastbound: One left-turn lane. Two left-turn lanes. One right-turn  
8 lane.

9 Westbound: Two left-turn lanes. Two through lanes. One shared  
10 right-turn and through lane.

11  
12 Mitigation Measure Trans 13: Install a traffic signal and construct the  
13 intersection of Wineville Avenue/Riverside Drive to include the following  
14 geometrics:

15 Northbound: One left-turn lane. Two through lanes.

16 Southbound: One left-turn lane. Two through lanes.

17 Eastbound: One left-turn lane. Two through lanes. One shared  
18 right-turn and through lane.

19 Westbound: Two left-turn lanes. Two through lanes. One right-  
20 turn lane.

21  
22 Mitigation Measure Trans 14: Install a traffic signal and construct the  
23 intersection of Wineville Avenue/Galena Street to include the following  
24 geometrics:

25 Northbound: Three left-turn lanes. Two through lanes. One  
26 shared-right-turn and through lane.  
27  
28

1 Southbound: Two left-turn lanes. Two through lanes. One free  
2 right-turn lane.

3 Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes. Three through lanes. One free  
4 right-turn lane.

5 Westbound: Two left-turn lanes. Three through lanes. One right-  
6 turn lane.

7  
8 Mitigation Measure Trans 15: Construct the intersection of Wineville  
9 Avenue/Limonite Avenue to include the following geometrics:

10 Northbound: Two left-turn lanes. Two through lanes. One right-  
11 turn lane.

12 Southbound: Two left-turn lanes. Two through lanes. One shared  
13 right-turn and through lane.

14 Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes. Three through lanes. One right-  
15 turn lane.

16 Westbound: One left-turn lane. Three through lanes. One right-  
17 turn lane.

18  
19 Mitigation Measure Trans 16: Construct the intersection of Etiwanda  
20 Avenue/Bellegrave Avenue to include the following geometrics:

21 Northbound: One left-turn lane. Two through lanes. One right-turn  
22 lane.

23 Southbound: One left-turn lane. Two through lanes. One right-turn  
24 lane.

25 Eastbound: One left-turn lane. Two through lanes. One right-turn  
26 lane.  
27  
28

1 Westbound: One left-turn lane. Two through lanes. One right-turn  
2 lane.

3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following impacts  
4 potentially resulting from the adoption of Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778 cannot be fully  
5 mitigated and will be only partially avoided or lessened by the mitigation measures hereinafter specified,  
6 therefore the County makes the finding set forth in Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) that:  
7 specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the  
8 provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation  
9 measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report, and as required by Public  
10 Resources Code Section 21081(b), the County finds that for each of the significant impacts which are  
11 subject to a finding under Section 21081(a)(3), that specific overriding economic, legal, social,  
12 technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment, and  
13 adopts the statement of overriding considerations set forth herein:

14 A. Agriculture

15 1. Impacts:

16 Project development will convert approximately 31.5 acres of Prime  
17 Farmland and 71 acres of Farmland of Local Importance into non-  
18 agricultural use. This conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses on the  
19 project site would be considered a significant impact according to an  
20 analysis under the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment model. Although  
21 the project site is located within an area that is converting from agriculture  
22 to non-agricultural uses and has characteristics that contribute to water  
23 resource contamination, it is the existence of accessible groundwater,  
24 favorable soil types, and surrounding agriculture that makes the project site  
25 farmland conversion significant. Development of the project would locate  
26 non-agricultural land uses within 300-feet of agriculturally zoned property  
27 (areas zoned A-2-10 and R-A are located to the east and west, and south and  
28 southeast, respectively), and may have the effect of facilitating the

1 conversion of surrounding farmland to non-agricultural uses. However, the  
2 three parcels that comprise the proposed project site (160-060-042, -035 and  
3 -001) have expired contracts under the Williamson Act; therefore, the  
4 project will not result in the cancellation of any Williamson Act contracts.  
5 This project, along with other projects, is anticipated to result in  
6 cumulatively considerable impacts to the loss of designated farmland.

7 2. Mitigation:

8 The EIR evaluated several mitigation measures to address potential  
9 significant adverse impacts upon agricultural resources; however, EIR No.  
10 469 did not identify any feasible mitigation measures that could be  
11 implemented and that would reduce the impacts from loss of agricultural  
12 lands to below the level of significance. These impacts were previously  
13 considered in environmental review conducted when the County adopted  
14 the Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP) General Plan, Jurupa  
15 Community Plan, and Jurupa Area Plan (JAP). During those approvals, the  
16 County found that the loss of agricultural lands, such as the project site,  
17 would be a significant and unmitigable impact and adopted a statement of  
18 overriding considerations. The project is consistent with the land use  
19 designation placed upon the property by the RCIP General Plan, and this  
20 impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

21 B. Air Quality

22 1. Impacts:

23 Automobile traffic associated with the project is the primary source of  
24 anticipated air emissions. Potential secondary sources include temporary  
25 construction activity emissions, off-site or non-basin emission from power  
26 plants supplying electricity, natural gas combustion, or the use of gas-  
27 powered landscape utility equipment. The project site is located within a  
28 non-attainment region of the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). Essentially,

1 this means that any new contribution of emissions into the Basin would be  
2 considered significant and adverse. Additionally, the proposed project is  
3 not in compliance with the Air Quality Management Plan for the SCAB  
4 because the current land use designation (medium density residential with  
5 business park overlay) is different than the designation (industrial) in the  
6 1989 general plan on which the AQMP is based.

7 During the construction period, projected short-term ROG, NOx, CO and  
8 PM-10 emissions would exceed South Coast Air Quality Management  
9 District (SCAQMD) recommended daily thresholds. During the summer  
10 months, projected long-term operational emissions would exceed the  
11 SCAQMD recommended daily threshold for ROG. During the winter  
12 months, projected long-term operational emissions would exceed the  
13 SCAQMD recommended daily threshold for NOx.

14 The proposed project will introduce new sensitive receptors to the project  
15 site in terms of project residents. It will not add new sources of diesel  
16 pollutants to the project vicinity.

17 Short-term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions  
18 (both direct and cumulative) would be significant impacts for which  
19 mitigation measures have been identified, but mitigation to below a level of  
20 significance is not feasible and, therefore, these impacts would be  
21 considered unavoidable and adverse, even after mitigation.

22 Residents of the project site will be subject to cancer risk due to local  
23 sources of diesel pollutants from truck traffic on Interstate 15 and local  
24 roads. Based upon a 70 year, 24 hour a day, 365 days a year exposure rate,  
25 the cancer risk to project residents exceeds the 10 in one million threshold  
26 recommended by the SCAQMD and the California Air Resources Board  
27 (CARB), which is a threshold that was developed to determine impacts  
28 from new generators of diesel pollutants, not impacts on new receptors,

1 such as residents exposed to diesel pollutants. When the cancer risk is  
2 expressed in terms of the 3,900 residents estimated to occupy the project,  
3 slightly more than one person (1.02) would be predicted to experience  
4 cancer as a result of exposure due to the project's location and the existing  
5 air conditions in the South Coast Basin. Project residents will be exposed  
6 to diesel exhaust from truck traffic on Interstate 15 and from nearby  
7 industrial land uses resulting in non-cancer health risks corresponding to a  
8 hazard index 0.13 or less, which is less than 15 percent of the SCAQMD  
9 threshold.

10 The project meets the SCAQMD's land use guidelines regarding the  
11 distance between heavily traveled roadways such as the 60 and 15 freeways  
12 and the proposed residences. Project opponents proposed a 1,000 foot  
13 buffer between the proposed residences and existing warehouse center.  
14 This proposed mitigation measure will not reduce the project's significant  
15 air impacts because the residents will still be exposed to existing (baseline)  
16 air conditions in the South Coast Air Basin, which creates an estimated  
17 excess cancer risk of 1,400 in one million. All persons breathing air within  
18 the South Coast Air Basin are exposed to this air and have an estimated  
19 increased cancer risk of 1,400 in one million. Increasing the distance  
20 between the project residences and the warehouse will not improve these  
21 existing air conditions and thus will not reduce the project residents'  
22 exposure and increased risk of cancer.

23 Air impacts from the project and surrounding projects are anticipated to  
24 have cumulatively considerable environmental impacts.

25 2. Mitigation:

26 Mitigation Measure Air 1 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
27 project to reduce short-term direct and cumulative air quality impacts, as  
28 follows: Maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in

1 proper tune as per manufacturer's specifications.

2 Mitigation Measure Air 2 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
3 project to reduce short-term direct and cumulative air quality impacts, as  
4 follows: Prohibit all vehicles from idling in excess of five minutes, both  
5 on-site and off-site.

6 Mitigation Measure Air 3 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
7 project to reduce short-term direct and cumulative air quality impacts, as  
8 follows: During grading activities, any exposed soil areas shall be watered  
9 twice per day. On windy days or when fugitive dust can be observed  
10 leaving the project site, additional applications of water shall be applied to  
11 maintain a minimum of 12 percent moisture content as defined by  
12 SCAQMD Rule 403. Under windy conditions when velocities are forecast  
13 to exceed 25 miles per hour, all ground-disturbing activities shall be halted  
14 until winds abate. The contractor may install on-site wind monitoring  
15 equipment and halt grading only on actual measured wind instead of  
16 SCAQMD forecasts.

17 Mitigation Measure Air 4 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
18 project to reduce short-term direct and cumulative air quality impacts, as  
19 follows: Trucks hauling dirt, sand, gravel or soil are to be covered or  
20 should maintain at least two feet of freeboard, in accordance with Section  
21 23114 of the California Vehicle Code.

22 Mitigation Measure Air 5 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
23 project to reduce short-term direct and cumulative air quality impacts, as  
24 follows: Reduce on-site vehicle speed to less than 15 mph.

25 Mitigation Measure Air 6 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
26 project to reduce short-term direct and cumulative air quality impacts, as  
27 follows: Sweep nearby or adjacent streets at the end of the day if visible  
28 soil material is carried over from construction site.

1 Mitigation Measure Air 7 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
2 project to reduce short-term direct and cumulative air quality impacts, as  
3 follows: All material stockpiles subject to wind erosion during construction  
4 activities that will not be utilized within three days, shall be covered with  
5 plastic, an alternative cover deemed equivalent to plastic, or sprayed with a  
6 non-toxic chemical stabilizer.

7 Mitigation Measure Air 8 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
8 project to reduce short-term direct and cumulative air quality impacts, as  
9 follows: Hydroseed or apply soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas  
10 left inactive for ten days or more, or replant vegetation in disturbed areas as  
11 soon as possible.

12 Mitigation Measure Air 9 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
13 project to reduce long-term operational direct and cumulative air quality  
14 impacts, as follows: The proposed project will participate in the cost of off-  
15 site traffic signal installation and synchronization through payment of the  
16 "Traffic Signal Mitigation Fee." The funds will be collected and utilized by  
17 the County to install and synchronize traffic lights as needed to prevent  
18 congestion of traffic flow on Etiwanda Avenue, Bellegrave Avenue and  
19 Cantu Galleano Ranch Road.

20 Mitigation Measure Air 10 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
21 project to reduce long-term operational direct and cumulative air quality  
22 impacts, as follows: Local transit agencies shall be contacted to determine  
23 bus routing in the project area that can accommodate bus stops at the  
24 project access points and the project shall provide bus passenger benches  
25 and shelters at these project access points. Currently, RTA Route 29  
26 delivers transit service in the area along Bellegrave Avenue.  
27  
28

1 C. Noise: Cumulative

2 1. Impacts:

3 Cumulatively, the proposed project will incrementally add to the overall  
4 ambient noise level in the area of the proposed project. Existing noise  
5 levels in the area of the proposed project currently exceed County standards  
6 without the project or other area development. As development approved  
7 under the General Plan is implemented, the overall noise level associated  
8 with vehicle noise on roadways in the area of the proposed project will  
9 increase over time. Additionally, noise from the project will be added to the  
10 existing noise environment and contribute cumulatively to significant noise  
11 impacts associated with additional vehicular traffic on local roads. Noise  
12 impacts from the proposed project will therefore be cumulatively  
13 significant.

14 2. Mitigation:

15 Mitigation Measure Noise 1 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
16 project to reduce noise impacts to the proposed project from traffic noise  
17 along Bellegrave Avenue, Wineville Road and Cantu-Galleano Ranch  
18 Road, as follows: To reduce noise impacts to the proposed project from  
19 traffic noise along Bellegrave Avenue, Wineville Road and Cantu-Galleano  
20 Ranch Road, a barrier shall be constructed to 7.5 feet for Cantu-Galleano  
21 Ranch Road, and 6.5 feet for Bellegrave Avenue/Wineville Road. This  
22 barrier may be a combination of earthen berm and wall as long as the height  
23 measured from the pad elevation is equal to that specified in the Noise  
24 Studies Although Urban Crossroads determined that a 6.5 to 7.5  
25 (Bellegrave/Wineville, and Cantu-Galleano Ranch Road, respectively) foot  
26 combination of wall and berm would attenuate noise, the project proposed  
27 to construct a combination wall and berm that will effectively be a 13-foot  
28 barrier at street level. The preliminary noise study has also concluded that a

1 6-foot backyard wall be constructed for the lots 1-4 and 11. These lots abut  
2 "J" Street and are located across the street from the school and park site.  
3 The 6-foot backyard wall will be constructed to mitigate any noise impacts  
4 produced from the school and park site. (Urban Crossroads, 12/3/04).

5 Mitigation Measure Noise 2 has been adopted and made a condition to the  
6 project to meet County interior noise standards for homes along the  
7 perimeter frontages along Bellegrave Avenue, Wineville Road, and Cantu-  
8 Galleano Ranch Road (Galena Avenue), as follows: In order to meet  
9 County interior noise standards for homes along the perimeter frontages  
10 along Bellegrave Avenue, Wineville Road, and Cantu-Galleano Ranch  
11 Road (Galena Avenue), livable upstairs space shall include structural  
12 materials to attenuate noise from exterior noise levels at least up to 30 dBA.

13 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered the following  
14 alternatives identified in EIR No. 469 in light of the environmental impacts which cannot be avoided or  
15 substantially lessened and has rejected those alternatives as infeasible for the reasons hereinafter stated:

16 A. No Project Alternative

- 17 1. The No Project Alternative would result in the hypothetical continued use  
18 of the site for dairy and agricultural operations.
- 19 2. The No Project Alternative would maintain existing zoning classifications  
20 and environmental conditions.
- 21 3. The No Project Alternative would eliminate all agricultural resources, air  
22 quality, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology, noise, school,  
23 solid waste and transportation/traffic impacts associated with the project.  
24 However, the No Project Alternative would generate air quality impacts in  
25 the form of odors and dust from the dairy operations and would generate  
26 impacts associated with methane in the soil and water quality impacts  
27 associated with runoff from the dairy operations that affect both  
28 groundwater and surface water bodies.

- 1 4. Because the No Project Alternative would eliminate or reduce the above-  
2 referenced environmental impacts, it is considered to be “Environmentally  
3 Superior” to the project.
- 4 5. The No Project would not implement Riverside County General Plan land  
5 use designations and policies.
- 6 6. The No Project Alternative would not result in the construction of storm  
7 drain facilities and would result in continued degradation of the  
8 groundwater basin.
- 9 7. The No Project Alternative would not provide a school site and would not  
10 result in the construction of a 1.8 acre portion of a neighborhood park.
- 11 8. The No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the Project  
12 Objectives.
- 13 9. The No Project Alternative would not provide housing opportunities for  
14 households with a variety of incomes levels within close proximity of  
15 employment centers located in adjacent cities and the County of Riverside.
- 16 10. It is uneconomical to maintain the project site in agricultural use over the  
17 long-term given its location within a developing area. Therefore, the No  
18 Project Alternative may postpone rather than preclude the use of the  
19 property for more intensive land uses and may result in the ultimate, albeit  
20 later development of the property in a haphazard, piecemeal fashion.

21 B. Low-Density Residential (1/2-acre minimum lot size) Alternative

- 22 1. The Low-Density Alternative would reduce the lot size to ½-acre minimum,  
23 essentially cutting the number of dwelling units in half from the proposed  
24 317 lots.
- 25 2. The Low-Density Alternative could reduce impacts to air quality, noise, and  
26 transportation/traffic due to a reduction in project-generated traffic and  
27 solid waste due to a reduction in generated solid waste.
- 28 3. The Low-Density Alternative would reduce impacts to libraries, schools,

1 and utilities requirements due to a reduction in the population associated  
2 with the project.

- 3 4. The Low-Density Alternative would have the same or similar degree of  
4 impacts as the proposed project with respect to agriculture, biological  
5 resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous  
6 materials, hydrology/water quality, fire and sheriff services, parks and  
7 recreation, and water and sewer impacts associated with the project.
- 8 5. The Low-Density Alternative would result in the same elimination of the  
9 availability of the project site for dairy and agricultural use as the proposed  
10 project.
- 11 6. The Low-Density Alternative would have a greater positive impact upon  
12 the area's jobs/housing balance within vicinity of the project.
- 13 7. The Low-Density Alternative would not meet the basic goals and objectives  
14 of the project in that it does not provide housing opportunities for  
15 households with a variety of incomes levels within close proximity of  
16 employment centers located in adjacent cities and the County of Riverside  
17 and it would not provide for a school site or contribute to the neighborhood  
18 park.
- 19 8. The Low-Density Alternative would not be consistent with the existing  
20 Riverside County General Plan "High Density Residential" designation and  
21 would not implement the Community Center Overlay.
- 22 9. Because the Low-Density Alternative would reduce the above-referenced  
23 environmental impacts, although it would not eliminate the significant  
24 project-related and cumulative agricultural resources and air quality impacts  
25 and cumulative noise impacts associated with the project, it is considered to  
26 be "Environmentally Superior" to the project.

27 C. Business Park Alternative

- 28 1. Because the project site has a Business Park Overlay, development

1 proposals could include uses allowed under a Business Park designation.  
2 Examples of allowable uses would be research and development-type  
3 businesses, small distribution centers, printing shops, delis, cleaners and  
4 office space.

- 5 2. The Business Park Alternative would reduce noise impacts as compared to  
6 the proposed project due to the elimination of residential development on  
7 the project site. A business park would no longer be considered a sensitive  
8 receptor, thus eliminating certain noise impacts. On the other hand, AM  
9 peak hour total traffic could increase up to 5 times and PM peak hour total  
10 traffic could double. The Business Park alternative would increase the  
11 cancer risks from diesel fuel exposure to the existing sensitive receptors in  
12 Sky Country, directly south of the project site and increase cancer risks to  
13 the students at the High School.
- 14 3. The Business Park Alternative would result in the same elimination of the  
15 availability of the project site for dairy and agricultural use as the proposed  
16 project.
- 17 4. The Business Park Alternative would be inconsistent with existing  
18 Riverside County General Plan designations.
- 19 5. The Business Park Alternative would have the same or similar impacts as  
20 the proposed project with respect to impacts on agriculture, biological  
21 resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous  
22 materials, hydrology/water quality, fire and sheriff services, library  
23 services, parks and recreation services, and water and sewer.
- 24 6. The Business Park Alternative would have greater air quality (including the  
25 generation of diesel emissions) and solid waste impacts than the project,  
26 due to development of the project site with warehouse/distribution uses in  
27 lieu of the proposed project.
- 28 7. The Business Park Alternative would not meet the basic goals and

1 objectives of the project.

2 8. The Business Park Alternative would generate more jobs than the proposed  
3 project and therefore would have a greater positive impact upon  
4 jobs/housing balance within vicinity of the project.

5 9. The Business Park Alternative would not provide a school site or contribute  
6 to a neighborhood park.

7 10. Overall, the Business Park Alternative is not environmentally superior to  
8 the proposed project.

9 D. Alternate Location Alternative

10 One potential alternative site was found within the Cumulative Impact  
11 Study Area. However, that site is designated for industrial land use, not  
12 residential. No other undeveloped areas within the Study Area had  
13 adequate acreage to support the proposed project. Moreover, the applicant  
14 does not have ownership interests in any other properties within the County  
15 that are suitable to meet the project objectives. Therefore, there is no  
16 feasible alternative site to the proposed project.

17 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has balanced the benefits of  
18 Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778 against the unavoidable adverse environmental effects  
19 thereof, and has determined that the following benefits outweigh and render acceptable those  
20 environmental effects in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081(b):

21 A. The project will implement the Riverside County General Plan land use designations and  
22 policies.

23 B. The project will provide housing opportunities for households with a variety of income  
24 levels within close proximity to employment centers.

25 C. The project will provide a variety of housing types within walking distances of community  
26 services.

27 D. The project will set aside a site for a new elementary (K-6) school and contribute 1.8 acres  
28 of a 5-acre neighborhood park.

- 1 E. The project will improve water quality by removing manure and manure-rich soil from the  
2 project site, thereby substantially reducing the risk that rain water will carry nitrates into  
3 the underlying groundwater. The project will also improve water quality through the  
4 provision of drainage facilities that will better contain and direct stormwater flows.
- 5 F. The project will provide traffic mitigation measures to address local and regional  
6 cumulative circulation impacts, thereby contributing to improvements at critical  
7 intersections and roadways.
- 8 G. The project will provide funding for various elements of regional infrastructure through the  
9 County's mitigation fee programs.

10 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the State CEQA Guidelines  
11 (14 Cal. Code of Regs. Section 15126(d)) require an EIR to discuss how a proposed project could directly  
12 or indirectly lead to economic, population, or housing growth. A project may be growth-inducing if it  
13 removes obstacles to growth, taxes community service facilities or encourages other activities which  
14 cause significant environmental effects. The discussion is as follows:

15 A. Economic, Population or Housing Growth

16 Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778 propose a total of 317 dwelling units on the  
17 project site. The project is estimated to generate a total of approximately 960 persons,  
18 based upon an estimate of 3.0 persons per house. The project EIR has evaluated the  
19 employment/housing balance. The proposed project is consistent with regional growth  
20 forecasts and regional jobs/housing balance projections.

21 B. Removal of an Impediment to Growth

22 The proposed project could potentially influence continued development within adjacent  
23 properties by providing or extending roadways, water and sewer service, utility and energy  
24 services to the immediate area. However, the project site is already served by or in close  
25 proximity to existing paved roads, potable water and storm drain facilities. Although  
26 additional improvements are required to extend these services through the project site and  
27 to provide sewer service, these facilities have been included and evaluated as part of local  
28 agency service plans. Although the project could influence growth in the immediate area,

1 growth is already occurring or planned for within the area. Therefore, the Project will not  
2 induce growth through the removal of impediments to growth.

3 C. Precedent-Setting Effects

4 There are no precedent-setting effects of the proposed project in that the project site has  
5 been planned for high density residential development with a Community Center Overlay  
6 and development of the surrounding area is reflected in adopted general plans and master  
7 plans.

8 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that Tentative Tract Map Nos.  
9 31768 and 31778 will implement applicable elements of the Riverside County General Plan as follows:

10 A. Land Use Element

11 The proposed project is consistent with the Riverside County General Plan, Jurupa Area  
12 Plan, which designates the site for high density residential with a Business Park Overlay;  
13 this designation is consistent with the proposed project. Factors pertaining to circulation,  
14 hazards, nuisances, aesthetics, design, sewer and water availability and utilities have been  
15 addressed pursuant to Riverside County General Plan Policies through project design,  
16 mitigation measures and/or the conditions of approval. The project is participating in  
17 regional transportation improvements and other major circulation improvements in the area  
18 pursuant to the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element.

19 B. Regional Element

20 The Regional Element requires major land use projects to be consistent with SCAG  
21 Subregional population forecasts or to provide mitigation of regional public services and  
22 facilities impacts. The project population of approximately 960 persons comprises 0.06%  
23 of the forecasted population for the Subregion in 2010 and 0.04% in 2030. For the  
24 unincorporated areas of Western Riverside County, the project will constitute 0.22% of the  
25 forecasted population in 2010 and 0.11% in 2030. The proposed project falls within 14  
26 miles of areas projected to be jobs-rich and very-jobs-rich. The proposed project will  
27 contribute to the overall jobs/housing balance.  
28

1 C. Public Facilities and Services Element

2 The project through its design, mitigation measures and/or conditions of approval will  
3 provide adequate circulation, water, sewer, fire protection, school and other services to  
4 comply with public facilities and services element requirements.

5 D. Housing Element

6 The project promotes the Housing Element goal of providing a selection of housing that is  
7 decent, safe, and sound, in close proximity to jobs and daily activities, and which varies by  
8 location, type, design and price.

9 E. Environmental Hazards and Resources Element

10 EIR No. 469 assessed the full range of concerns associated with the project and proposed  
11 mitigation for each of the potentially significant impacts. Overriding findings are required  
12 for agricultural resources, air quality impacts and cumulative noise impacts.

13 F. Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP)

14 EIR No. 469 and Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778 are consistent with the  
15 MSHCP as follows:

- 16 1. The parcels that comprise Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778 are not  
17 located within a criteria cell of the MSHCP.
- 18 2. In compliance with the Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools requirements of  
19 the MSHCP, the proposed project site does not include any natural riparian/riverine  
20 and/or vernal pool habitat.
- 21 3. In compliance with the Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface, the  
22 proposed development is not within the proximity of an MSHCP Conservation  
23 Area, including cores and linkages.
- 24 4. The project is consistent with the Narrow Endemic Plant Species requirements of  
25 the MSHCP. Pursuant to Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP, habitat assessments and/or  
26 focused surveys for certain Narrow Endemic Plant Species were conducted for  
27 properties within mapped survey areas, and no such habitat was found.
- 28 5. The project is consistent with the Database Updated/Additional Surveys

1 requirements of the MSHCP. Pursuant to Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP, habitat  
2 assessments and/or focused surveys for certain additional plant and animal species  
3 are required for properties within mapped survey areas. Although the project site  
4 does not contain habitat for the burrowing owl, focused surveys were conducted  
5 during both nesting and wintering seasons, and no burrowing owls or occupied  
6 burrows were present at the site.

7 Accordingly, no further surveys or conservation measures are required at this time.  
8 However, prior to issuance of any grading permit for the project, a 30-day preconstruction  
9 survey for the Burrowing Owl is required by the MSHCP. If it is determined that the Owl  
10 continues to occupy this site, then relocation will be allowed at that time as indicated in the  
11 MSHCP. A condition for this pre-construction survey has been imposed on the project  
12 site.

13 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that Tentative Tract Map Nos.  
14 31768 and 31778 are consistent with the General Plan.

15 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and considered  
16 EIR No. 469 in evaluating Tentative Tract Map Nos. 31768 and 31778, that EIR No. 469 is an accurate  
17 and objective statement that complies with the California Environmental Quality Act and reflects the  
18 County's independent judgment, and that EIR No. 469 is incorporated therein by this reference.

19 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **CERTIFIES** EIR No. 469,  
20 **ADOPTS** the Mitigation Monitoring Plan specified herein, **ADOPTS** the Statement of Overriding  
21 Considerations as set forth above and **APPROVES** the project.

22 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the custodian of the documents  
23 upon which this decision is based are the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and the County Planning  
24 Department and that such documents are located at 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, California.