

2
3 **RESOLUTION NO. 2006-074**
4 **CERTIFYING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 457 AND**
5 **APPROVING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 30433**

6 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65450 et.seq., a public
7 hearing was held before the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in Riverside, California on November
8 15, 2005 and before the Riverside County Planning Commission in Riverside, California on August 31,
9 2005 to consider Tentative Tract Map 30433; and

10 **WHEREAS**, all the procedures of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the
11 Riverside County CEQA Implementing Procedures have been met, and the Environmental Impact Report
12 (EIR) No. 457, prepared in connection with Tentative Tract Map No. 30433 and related cases (referred to
13 alternatively herein as "the project"), is sufficiently detailed so that all the potentially significant effects of
14 the project on the environment and measures necessary to avoid or substantially lessen such effects have
15 been evaluated in accordance with the above-referenced provisions and procedures; and,

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

18 **BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Board of Supervisors
19 of the County of Riverside, in regular session assembled on April 18, 2006, that:

- 20 A. The proposed project would result in a tentative tract map that subdivides 188.1 acres into a
21 maximum of 503 single-family residential lots with minimum lot sizes of 6,000 s.f. and
22 7,200 s.f., an activity park, neighborhood park, mini-park, linear park/greenbelt system,
23 detention basins, and associated infrastructure and utilities.
24 B. Tentative Tract Map No. 30433 is associated with a Change of Zone (CZ Case No. 06656)
25 which was considered concurrently at the public hearings before the Planning Commission
26 and Board of Supervisors. Change of Zone Case No. 6656 proposes to change the
27 property's zoning classification from "Heavy Agriculture (10-acre minimum lot sizes)" and

5000 W. K. ...
RECEIVED RIVERSIDE COUNTY

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
APR 17 2006
BY [Signature]

2
3 **RESOLUTION NO. 2006-074**
4 **CERTIFYING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 457 AND**
5 **APPROVING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 30433**
6 **AND CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 6656**

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 November
9 15, 2005 and before the Riverside County Planning Commission in Riverside, California on August 31,
10 2005 to consider Tentative Tract Map 30433 and Change of Zone No. 6656.

11 **WHEREAS**, all the procedures of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the
12 Riverside County CEQA Implementing Procedures have been met, and the Environmental Impact Report
13 (EIR) No. 457, prepared in connection with Tentative Tract Map No. 30433 and Change of Zone No.
14 6656 and related cases (referred to alternatively herein as "the project"), is sufficiently detailed so that all
15 the potentially significant effects of the project on the environment and measures necessary to avoid or
16 substantially lessen such effects have been evaluated in accordance with the above-referenced provisions
17 and procedures; and,

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

20 **BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Board of Supervisors
21 of the County of Riverside, in regular session assembled on April 18, 2006, that:

- 22 A. The proposed project would result in a tentative tract map that subdivides 188.1 acres into a
23 maximum of 503 single-family residential lots with minimum lot sizes of 6,000 s.f. and
24 7,200 s.f., an activity park, neighborhood park, mini-park, linear park/greenbelt system,
25 detention basins, and associated infrastructure and utilities.
- 26 B. Tentative Tract Map No. 30433 is associated with a Change of Zone (CZ Case No. 06656)
27 which was considered concurrently at the public hearings before the Planning Commission
28 and Board of Supervisors. Change of Zone Case No. 6656 proposes to change the
property's zoning classification from "Heavy Agriculture (10-acre minimum lot sizes)" and

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL

APR 1 2 2006

BY

1 "Rural Residential (R-R)" to "Planned Residential (R-4)," One Family Dwellings (R-1),"
2 and "Open Space Area Combined Development (R-5),"to be consistent with the land use
3 designations applied to the site by the County's Southwest Area Plan.

4 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and considered
5 the EIR No. 457 in evaluating Tentative Tract Map No. 30433 and related cases, that the EIR is an
6 accurate and objective statement that complies with the California Environmental Quality Act and reflects
7 the County's independent judgment, and that the EIR is incorporated by reference in it entirety.

8 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental
9 impacts associated with Tentative Tract Map No. 30433 and related cases are potentially significant
10 unless otherwise indicated, but each of these impacts will be avoided or substantially lessened by the
11 identified mitigation measures:

12 A. Land Use

13 1. Impacts:

14 The project site is located in the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) of the
15 County's General Plan. Tentative Tract Map No. 30433 would be
16 developed pursuant to the land use designation of the SWAP Land Use Plan
17 ["Medium Density Residential (2-5 du/ac)"]. The project site is outside the
18 French Valley Airport Influenced Area. However, because Tentative Tract
19 Map No. 30433 proposes the off-site construction of Briggs Road that
20 would extend into the influenced area, approval by the Riverside County
21 Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is required. On September 17,
22 2004, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) recommended a finding
23 of consistency provided the project complies with all conditions of approval
24 imposed by the ALUC. As disclosed in the EIR, the proposed project
25 would be consistent all applicable policies contained in the SWAP.

26 2. Mitigation:

27 Prior to the sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision
28 Map Act, recordation of any map, or insurance of any permit, the applicant

1 must provide Avigation Easements to the French Valley Airport for any
2 portion of the project within the Influence Area. All prospective buyers or
3 tenants must be provided the standard notice alerting them of potential
4 airport impacts [per Business & Profession Code 11010 12(A)]. The
5 proposed development will not be permitted to obstruct the "FAR Part 77
6 Conical Surface." Hooded or shielded outdoor lighting shall be installed to
7 prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
8 Additionally, all lights must be downward facing.

9 The following shall be prohibited:

- 10 • Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of
11 red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport
12 operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight
13 climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a
14 straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other
15 than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual
16 approach slope indicator.
- 17 • Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards
18 an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following
19 takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final
20 approach towards a landing at an airport.
- 21 • Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or
22 which would attract a large concentration of birds, or which
23 may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
- 24 • Any use which would generate electrical interference that
25 may be detrimental to any operation of aircraft and/or
26 aircraft instrumentation.

1 B. Aesthetics, Visual Quality and Light & Glare

2 1. Impacts:

3 Implementation of the proposed project would result in the introduction of
4 new sources of lighting, including lights for residences, the park, and
5 streets. The introduction of new lighting sources is regarded as a
6 potentially significant impact both because it could potentially conflict with
7 the Mt. Palomar Observatory Special Lighting Area and because it could
8 adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

9 2. Mitigation:

10 The project shall comply with the requirements of Riverside County
11 Ordinance No. 655 for Zone A, which specifies standards for outdoor
12 lighting and requires the submission of plans and evidence of compliance
13 with Ordinance No. 655.

14 As a condition of project approval, the County shall require that prior to the
15 issuance of building permits, the County Planning Department shall verify
16 that the proposed architecture and landscape architecture shown on
17 construction drawings substantially conforms with the project-specific
18 Hidden Meadow Design Guidelines.

19 C. Biological Resources

20 1. Impacts:

21 Implementation of the proposed project would result in on-site impacts to a
22 few disturbed clusters of Riversidean Sage Scrub (RSS), totaling
23 approximately 0.15 acres. The loss of RSS is considered significant due to
24 the extent that RSS supports sensitive plant and wildlife species. Within the
25 off-site improvement areas, impacts would occur to approximately 0.19-
26 acre of willow woodland. The loss of willow woodland is considered
27 significant. Although quality natural habitats do not occur on the proposed
28 project site, burrowing owl (BUOW), a California Species of Concern, may

1 utilize the site and the off-site improvement areas in nesting, perching,
2 and/or foraging. Thus, the potential impacts shall be avoided with
3 mitigation. Project implementation has the potential to directly affect
4 suitable nesting habitat for the Cooper's hawk, a California Species of
5 Concern. Although impacts to nesting habitat are not regarded as
6 significant by itself, there is a potential for the disruption of nesting
7 activities if construction activities occur on the site and in the off-site
8 improvement areas between February 1 and August 31. This is regarded as
9 a significant impact. The Stephens kangaroo rat is a listed endangered or
10 threatened species and has a low-moderate probability of occurring on the
11 project site. Impacts to Stephens' kangaroo rat on-site and in the off-site
12 alignments of Baxter and Briggs Roads are regarded as potentially
13 significant.

14 Implementation of Tentative Tract Map No. 30433 would result in impacts
15 to 0.15 acres of state streambeds and waters of the U.S. Temporary
16 construction-related impacts to waters of the U.S. also would occur,
17 consisting of 0.13-acre for the Baxter Road crossing and 0.02-acre and
18 0.27-acre for the two Briggs Road crossings. Impacts to waters of the U.S.
19 are considered significant.

20 The project site is located within a MSHCP Criteria Area. As a result of the
21 HANS and JPR review by County staff, it was determined that the project
22 will contribute to the establishment of Proposed Core 2 by conserving
23 approxi-mately 19.5 acres of the site on the west side of Briggs Road as
24 open space to be part of the MSHCP conservation area. A portion of this
25 area will consist of a revegetated manufactured slope. The provision of the
26 revegetated on-site open space achieves the goals of the applicable Cell
27 Groups, thus, no adverse impacts to the MSHCP would occur from project
28 implementation.

1 To comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, any vegetative or tree
2 removal activities or grading occurring between February 1 to August 15
3 shall require a qualified biologist to conduct a nesting bird survey no more
4 than one week prior to grading. All trees on the project site, whether or not
5 they will be removed, shall be surveyed for nesting birds. The results shall
6 be documented in a report submitted to the Riverside County Planning
7 Department. If no nests are present, no further mitigation will be required.
8 If any active nests are detected, exclusionary fencing shall be placed 200
9 feet around the tree for non-raptors and 500-feet for raptors, until the birds
10 have permanently left the nest.

11 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall comply
12 with Riverside County Ordinance No. 4.62.070 which requires payment of a
13 MSHCP mitigation fee order to assist in providing revenue to acquire and
14 conserve lands necessary to implement the MSHCP.

15 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall submit
16 documentation to the County of Riverside verifying that the necessary
17 permits required by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), California
18 Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and Regional Water Quality Control
19 Board (RWQCB) have been obtained. The ACOE has a no net loss policy
20 which requires that any unavoidable impacts to wetland values and
21 functions be replaced. In addition, the RWQCB will add restrictions to
22 control runoff from the site, require on the site treatment of runoff to
23 improve water quality, and impose Best Management Practices on the
24 construction. It is anticipated that the following measures or similar
25 measures as approved by the ACOE, CDFG, and RWQCB would reduce
26 impacts to ACOE and CDFG jurisdictional areas to a level less than
27 significant:
28

- 1 • On or off-site replacement of ACOE jurisdictional waters
- 2 and wetlands at a ratio no less than 1:1;
- 3 • On or off-site replacement of CDFG jurisdictional streambed
- 4 and associated riparian habitat at a ratio no less than 1:1;
- 5 and/or
- 6 • Incorporation of design features into the proposed project
- 7 that will avoid biological impacts to blue-line streams.

8 Prior to the approval of building permits and prior to approval of
9 construction permits for Briggs Road, the County shall review project
10 landscaping and lighting plans to ensure that all project lighting is
11 selectively placed, directed, and shielded away from preserved habitats.
12 The County also shall verify that the project's CC&R's include lighting
13 restrictions on private residential properties adjacent to Briggs Road and the
14 prohibition of large spotlight-type backyard lighting directed into conserved
15 habitat. The reason for the lighting restriction shall be stated in the
16 CC&R's.

17 Prior to the approval of landscaping plans, the County shall verify that no
18 plants included on the California Exotic Pest Plant Council's list of invasive
19 species or in Table 6-2 of the MSHCP will be used anywhere on the site,
20 and only native species will be planted adjacent to open space area west of
21 Briggs Road. The County also shall verify that the project's CC&R's
22 include a list of prohibited species and the reason for the prohibition.

23 Signs shall be posted at potential access points into the Preserve containing
24 information regarding the wildlife habitat value of the open space to minimize
25 human intrusions.

1 D. Archaeological and Paleontological Resources

2 1. Impacts:

3 Although the cultural resources survey did not uncover the presence of
4 archaeologically significant resources, it is possible that previously
5 undiscovered, buried prehistoric or historic resources may be encountered
6 during grading activities on- and off-site resulting in potentially significant
7 impacts to historic resources, including resources that may be important to
8 the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians.

9 Ground disturbance in the form of clearing, excavation, and/or installation
10 of underground facilities required for the project could result in the loss of
11 paleontologic resources, including scientifically important fossil remains,
12 associated geologic data, fossil sites, and fossiliferous rocks, by disturbing
13 fossil-bearing and potentially fossiliferous rocks. This is regarded as a
14 potentially significant impact.

15 2. Mitigation:

16 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall enter
17 into a pre-excavation agreement with the Pechanga Band of Luiseno
18 Indians. The agreement shall document archeological monitoring
19 requirements and specify the disposition of any significant resources
20 discovered during monitoring.

21 Prior to issuance of grading permits, a qualified archaeologist shall develop
22 a mitigation plan and a discovery clause/treatment plan, which will include
23 mitigation monitoring to be implemented during earthmoving activities on
24 the project site. The treatment plan shall allow for the recovery and
25 subsequent treatment of any archaeological remains and associated data
26 uncovered by brushing, grubbing, or earthmoving.

27 Prior to issuance of grading permits, a qualified archaeologist shall develop
28 a mitigation plan and a discovery clause/treatment plan, which will include

1 mitigation monitoring to be implemented during earthmoving activities on
2 the project site. The treatment plan shall be developed in consultation with
3 the Pechanga Tribe and in accordance with the pre-excavation agreement
4 and shall account for treatment of any archaeological remains and
5 associated data uncovered by brushing, grubbing, or earthmoving.

6 Archaeological and Tribal monitoring shall be conducted on a full-time
7 basis for all grading and ground-disturbing activities including
8 archaeological testing until the project archaeologist, in consultation with
9 the Pechanga Tribe, determines that resources are not likely to be
10 encountered.

11 If archaeological remains are found by the archaeological monitor, the
12 archaeological monitor in consultation with the Native American observer
13 shall have the authority to require that earthmoving shall be temporarily
14 diverted away from the deposits until they have been evaluated, recorded,
15 excavated, and/or recovered as necessary. Earthmoving shall not be
16 allowed to proceed through the deposit site until the archaeological
17 supervisor, in consultation with the Pechanga Tribe and the County,
18 determines that the artifacts are recovered and/or the site mitigated to the
19 extent necessary.

20 If possible human remains are encountered during any earthmoving
21 activities, all work shall stop in the area in which the find(s) are present, and
22 the Riverside County Coroner shall be immediately notified. In accordance
23 with State law, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall
24 be notified in the event that remains are determined to be, in fact, human
25 and of Native American decent. In some instances, grave remains may also
26 include artifacts found in association with a burial.

27 Any recovered archaeological resources shall be identified, recorded,
28 mapped, and artifacts catalogued in accordance with County of Riverside

1 requirements. Examination by an archaeological specialist shall be
2 conducted where necessary, dependent on the artifacts, features, or sites that
3 are encountered. The specialist shall identify, date, and/or determine
4 significance potential.

5 A final report of findings shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist for
6 submission to the Eastern Information Center and the County of Riverside.
7 The report shall describe parcel history, summarize field and laboratory
8 methods used, if applicable, and include any testing or special analysis
9 information conducted to support the findings.

10 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, and again if necessary during the
11 development of the final project mitigation monitoring report, the project
12 developer shall inquire if the Pechanga Tribe has developed a standard
13 retrievable archival system for cultural materials. If such system is in place
14 the Pechanga Tribe shall be given preference in housing any collection.

15 Prior to any grading activities, a qualified vertebrate paleontologist shall
16 develop a storage agreement with the LACM Vertebrate Paleontology
17 Section, San Bernardino County Museum, or another acceptable museum
18 repository to allow for the permanent storage and maintenance of any fossil
19 remains recovered in the project area as a result of the monitoring program,
20 and for the archiving of associated specimen data and corresponding
21 geologic and geographic site data at the museum repository.

22 The qualified paleontologist shall develop a mitigation plan and a discover
23 clause/treatment plan that, when implemented during earthmoving
24 activities, will allow for the recovery and subsequent treatment of any fossil
25 remains and associated specimen and site data uncovered by these activities.

26 Prior to the commencement of grading activities, the qualified
27 paleontologist and a paleontologic construction monitor shall attend a pre-
28 grading meeting to explain the monitoring program to grading contractor

1 staff and shall develop procedures and lines of communication to be
2 implemented if fossil remains are uncovered by earthmoving activities,
3 particularly when a monitor may not be available on-site.

4 Paleontologic monitoring of earthmoving activities shall be conducted on a
5 full-time basis by the monitor during all earthmoving activities that exceed
6 a depth of three feet, in accordance with the exposure of sensitive strata.
7 Earthmoving activities in areas of the project area where previously
8 undisturbed strata will be buried but not otherwise disturbed shall not
9 require the presence of a full-time monitor. The supervising paleontologist
10 shall have the authority to reduce monitoring once it is determined that the
11 probability of encountering fossils is low.

12 If the paleontological monitor finds fossil remains, earthmoving activities
13 shall be diverted temporarily around the fossil site until the remains have
14 been recovered and the monitor determines that earthmoving activities may
15 resume.

16 If fossil remains are encountered during earthmoving activities when the
17 monitor is not on-site, earthmoving activities shall be diverted around the
18 fossil site and the monitor shall be contacted to immediately recover the
19 remains from the site.

20 If fossil remains are found, an appropriate amount of fossiliferous rock shall
21 be recovered from the fossil site and processed to allow for the recovery of
22 smaller fossil remains. Test samples may be recovered from other sampling
23 sites in the rock unit.

24 Any recovered fossil remains shall be prepared to the point of identification
25 and identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible by knowledgeable
26 paleontologists. The remains then shall be curated (i.e. assigned and
27 labeled with museum repository fossil specimen numbers and
28 corresponding fossil site numbers as appropriate; placed in specimen trays

1 and, if necessary, vials with completed specimen data cards) and
2 catalogued, and associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and
3 geographic site data shall be archived (i.e. specimen and site numbers and
4 corresponding data entered into appropriate museum repository catalogs
5 and computerized data bases) at the museum repository by a laboratory
6 technician. The remains then shall be accessioned into the museum
7 repository fossil collection, where they shall be permanently stored,
8 maintained, and, along with associated specimen and site data, made
9 available for future study by qualified scientific investigators.

10 A final report of result and findings shall be prepared by the paleontologist
11 for submission to the County of Riverside and the museum repository
12 following accessioning fossil collection (if any) into the museum repository
13 fossil collection. The report shall describe the geology and stratigraphy
14 parcel, summarize field and laboratory methods used, include a faunal list
15 and an inventory of catalogued fossil specimens, evaluate the scientific
16 importance of the specimens, and discuss the relationship of any newly
17 recorded fossil site in the parcel to relevant fossil sites previously recorded
18 from the fossil-bearing rock unit in the parcel vicinity and from correlative
19 rock units in other regions.

20 E. Hydrology, Flooding, and Drainage

21 1. Impacts:

22 The increase in the amount of runoff associated with eight drainage areas is
23 regarded as a potentially significant impact due to the potentially adverse
24 downstream effects. The increased runoff could also potentially reduce the
25 amount of recharge within the groundwater basin. Mitigation, in addition to
26 the following standard conditions of approval, will be required:
27
28

- Drainage and flood control facilities and improvements shall be provided in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District requirements.
- Proposed grading and drainage improvements shall conform to Section 2907 and 7012 of the Uniform Building Code (UBC).
- The project shall be in compliance with the basin plan of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region.

2. Mitigation:

Detention/water quality detention basins shall be provided in Drainage Areas A, B, E, F, G, and I to mitigate the multiple-year different duration peak flow increases. (Existing Drainage Areas C and D shall drain to the detention/water quality basin in Drainage Area E). The Detention/Water Quality Detention Basins shall be designed in accordance with the suggested basin sizes provided in a site-specific hydrology report approved by the County (refer to Appendix F in the EIR).

F. Water Quality

1. Impacts:

Implementation of the proposed project including on-site improvements and off-site roadway construction would include grading operations that would result in potential short-term erosion and sedimentation impacts.

Implementation of the proposed project would permanently alter the composition of the surface runoff by grading the site surfaces, by construction of impervious streets and roofs, and by irrigation of landscaped areas. This would be regarded as a potentially significant cumulative water quality impact.

In addition to the detention/water quality basins required as mitigation (see E.2 above), additional mitigation measures would be required to reduce water quality impacts to below a level of significance.

1 could cause moderate to severe ground shaking at the site. Construction of
2 proposed structures in accordance with the Uniform Building Code (UBC)
3 will ensure that potential ground shaking impacts will not result in a
4 significant impact.

5 2. Mitigation:

6 All grading shall be performed in accordance with Riverside County
7 requirements and with the Recommended Grading Specifications included
8 in the site specific geotechnical reports (attached as *Appendices J* and *J1* to
9 the EIR). The measures recommended by the site-specific geotechnical
10 report shall be identified on applicable grading plans and shall be
11 implemented to the satisfaction of the County Geologist.

12 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the County of Riverside shall
13 verify that all structures are designed in accordance with the Uniform
14 Building Code (UBC).

15 Surficial, compressible soils shall be overexcavated and compacted to the
16 satisfaction of Riverside County prior to the placement of foundations,
17 engineered fill, or associated improvements. Prior to the issuance of grading
18 permits, the County Geologist shall review and approve all grading plans to
19 ensure adherence to this requirement.

20 Slopes steeper than 2:1 or higher than ten feet shall be clearly indicated on
21 all grading plans. Such slopes must be determined to be safe in the slope
22 stability report prepared by the soils engineer or engineering geologist. The
23 slope stability report shall also contain recommendations for landscaping
24 and erosion control. The Uniform Building Code, County Ordinance No.
25 457, and all other relevant laws, rules and regulations governing grading in
26 Riverside County shall be observed.

1 H. Soils, Slopes and Erosion Potential

2 1. Impacts:

3 While not observed during the field reconnaissance, it is possible for
4 undocumented fills or other materials with an expansion potential greater
5 than low to be encountered during construction. If present, these materials
6 would not be suitable for structural development, and is regarded as a
7 potentially significant impact requiring remedial grading as mitigation.

8 Soils that have high erosion susceptibility, along with fill materials used for
9 development areas, would be subject to potentially significant project-
10 related erosion during construction activities because of the removal of
11 stabilizing vegetation and exposure of these erodible materials to wind and
12 water.

13 2. Mitigation:

14 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit within the proposed project site, an
15 overall Conceptual Grading Plan shall be submitted for Planning
16 Department approval. The Grading Plan shall include: 1) techniques
17 employed to prevent erosion and sedimentation during and after the grading
18 process; 2) approximate time frames for grading; 3) identification of areas
19 which may be graded during high probability rain months (January through
20 March); and 4) preliminary pad and roadway elevations.

21 All grading procedures shall be in compliance with the Riverside County
22 Grading Standards including requirements for erosion control during rainy
23 months. The requirements for compliance with Riverside County Grading
24 Standards shall be noted on all grading plans.

25 Prior to any grading activities, a soils report and geotechnical study shall be
26 performed to further analyze on-site soil conditions and slope stability and
27 shall include the appropriate measures to control erosion.
28

1 Potential brow ditches, terrace drains, or other minor swales, determined
2 necessary by the County of Riverside at future stages of project review,
3 shall be lined with natural erosion control materials or concrete.

4 Graded, but undeveloped land shall be maintained weed-free and planted
5 with interim landscaping within 90 days of completion of grading, unless
6 building permits are obtained.

7 Planting of developed land shall comply with the National Pollutant
8 Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Best Management Practices
9 Construction Handbook Section 6.2.

10 The locations of potentially compressible soils shall be identified on all
11 Grading Plans. Where development is proposed in areas of compressible
12 soils, deep foundation systems shall be used, or compressible soils shall be
13 completely overexcavated and compacted.

14 I. Agricultural Resources

15 1. Impacts:

16 Because the Tentative Tract Map No. 30433 project site is located within
17 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property, a potentially significant impact to
18 agricultural lands may occur, requiring mitigation in the form of compliance
19 with County Ordinance No. 625.

20 2. Mitigation:

21 The project shall comply with Riverside County's "Right to Farm"
22 Ordinance (Ordinance No. 625). The ordinance is intended to provide for a
23 means of giving notice to prospective buyers of homes in newly built
24 subdivisions and recently subdivided parcels that they are moving into an
25 agricultural area and that a farm has been in operation legally for at least
26 three years shall not be or become a nuisance simply because residential
27 uses have entered the area and are offended by the odors, dust, etc.
28

1 J. Mineral Resources

2 1. Impacts:

3 Because the Tentative Tract Map No. 30433 project site is not designated by
4 the State of California as a known mineral resource area, no known mineral
5 resources are present on the site, and no mining of the site has occurred in
6 the past, significant impacts to mineral resources would not occur.

7 2. Mitigation:

8 None required.

9 K. Hazardous Materials

10 1. Impacts:

11 During grading and construction, there is a low potential for the discovery
12 of hazardous materials; however, this possibility for discovery of hazardous
13 materials is regarded as a potentially significant impact.

14 2. Mitigation:

15 Although determined not to be hazardous, all buried septic systems on the
16 project site shall be properly removed or abandoned pursuant to Riverside
17 County Health Department Guidelines.

18 Users of household hazardous materials such as paints, roofing materials
19 and solvents during construction shall comply with applicable federal, state,
20 and local regulation requiring elimination and reduction of waste at the
21 source by prevention of leakage, by segregation of hazardous waste, and by
22 process of materials change.

23 All site improvements not removed from the property by the current owner
24 shall be disposed of off-site, in accordance with current local, state, and
25 federal disposal regulations. Any petroleum contaminated materials and/or
26 buried trash/debris encountered during removal and/or grading shall be
27 evaluated by an experienced environmental consultant prior to removal. If
28 asbestos, mercury and/or lead based paint is discovered during the

1 demolition of onsite structures, surveys shall be conducted for the purpose
2 of ensuring proper disposal of building materials and the protection of the
3 workers involved with demolition activities.

4 In the event that any subsurface hazardous materials are found during
5 grading or construction, including soil and/or groundwater contamination,
6 all activity in the area of discovery and/or in an appropriate radius of the
7 area of discovery shall temporarily cease and the County of Riverside
8 Environmental Health Department shall be notified. Prior to the resumption
9 of any construction activity in the area of discovery, the site shall be
10 deemed safe by the appropriate entity prior to the resumption of grading
11 and/or constructions activities.

12 If soil is to be imported or exported to or from the site during proposed
13 grading and other construction activities, the transported soil shall be
14 sampled for contaminants prior to use or disposal. Imported soil shall be
15 free from contamination. Exported soil, if contaminated, shall be handled
16 in accordance with prevailing environmental laws and regulations.

17 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, soil sampling shall occur to
18 identify levels of pesticides, herbicides, fertilizer, and other agricultural
19 chemicals. Chemical levels shall be verified to be within allowable limits
20 as regulated by prevailing environmental laws and regulations prior to the
21 issuance of building permits.

22 L. Noise

23 1. Impacts:

24 Time restrictions on construction involving the operation of powered
25 equipment are recommended to extend from 7 p.m. to 7 a.m. the following
26 morning, and all day on Sundays and holidays. Compliance with these
27 limits would mitigate temporary noise impacts associated with construction
28 activities.

1 Residences located on the perimeter of the proposed development may be
2 exposed to exterior noise volumes in excess of 65 dBA CNEL, which
3 represents a violation of the County's exterior noise standards. This is
4 regarded as a significant impact, and noise attenuation, in the form of
5 physical barriers (e.g., landscaped berms, solid block walls, etc), will be
6 required. Interior noise levels are expected to exceed the County's
7 thresholds also. The required interior noise level reduction can be
8 accomplished with a "window closed" condition, requiring a means of
9 mechanical ventilation (e.g. air conditioning) for all homes facing Briggs
10 Road, Baxter Road, and Pat Road, and upgraded dual pane windows with a
11 minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 31 for all homes
12 facing Briggs Road. A final noise study will be required prior to the
13 issuance of building permits in order to accurately evaluate the mitigation
14 requirements for individual homes.

15 2. Mitigation:

16 Construction activities shall comply with Riverside County noise Ordinance
17 No. 457, relating to construction noise.

18 During construction, all vehicles or equipment shall be equipped with
19 properly operating and maintained mufflers.

20 All construction operations shall be limited to the construction hours
21 allowed by the County of Riverside (7AM -5 PM weekdays and Saturdays).

22 Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be located as far as practical
23 from existing residential dwellings. The intent is to locate construction
24 noise activity in areas that will impact the fewest homes.

25 Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall construct a 7.5-foot
26 high sound wall for lots 264 to 269 facing Briggs Road.

27 Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall construct a 7.0-foot
28 high sound wall for lots 287 to 295, 341, and 342 facing Briggs Road.

1 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall construct a 6.5-
2 foot high sound wall for lots 337 to 340, and 270 to 277 facing Briggs
3 Road.

4 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall construct a 6.0-
5 foot high sound wall for lots 278 to 283, 322 to 324, 335, 336, and 263
6 facing Briggs Road.

7 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall construct a 4.5-
8 foot high sound wall for lots 314 and 315 facing Baxter Road.

9 Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall construct a 4.0-foot
10 high sound wall for lots 17, 54 to 59, 401, 403 and 404 facing Baxter Road
11 or Pat Road.

12 All lots facing Pat Road, Briggs Road, and Baxter Road shall be provided
13 with means of mechanical ventilation (e.g. air conditioning).

14 All homes facing Briggs Road shall be provided with upgraded dual-glazed
15 windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 31.

16 All lots facing Pat Road, Briggs Road, and Baxter Road shall be provided
17 with weather-stripped solid core exterior doors, and exterior wall/roof
18 assemblies shall be free of cut-outs and openings.

19 M. Open Space, Parks and Recreation

20 1. Impacts:

21 The proposed project will provide 8.3 acres of linear parks/paseos and 9.2
22 acres of parks which is more than double the project's Quimby Act
23 requirement. Because the project will provide sufficient park land,
24 significant impacts will not occur. Regional parks and open space needs
25 are met on a Countywide basis through implementation of the County
26 General Plan. The project will provide 19.5 acres of open space
27 contribution to the MSHCP Preserve.
28

1 P. Solid Waste

2 1. Impacts:

3 Ultimate project development, as well as the construction phase of the
4 proposed project, would increase the amount of solid waste generated in the
5 area; in turn, shortening the life span of the affected landfills, as well as
6 increasing the demand upon waste haulers. The project's cumulative
7 contribution to landfill capacity reduction is considered a potentially
8 significant cumulative impact.

9 2. Mitigation:

10 Prior to the issuance of building occupancy permits, the refuse hauler for
11 the project site shall be advised of the efforts the developer will be pursuing
12 relating to recycling and waste reduction (i.e., curbside recycling, buy back
13 centers, etc.) in accordance with County Resolution No. 90-688. The use of
14 such facilities shall be encouraged by the developer through information
15 (e.g., location, materials accepted, etc.) provided in sales literature.

16 The project applicant shall participate in established Countywide programs
17 to reduce solid waste generation.

18 The master Homeowners' Association and/or landscape maintenance entity
19 shall either mulch (shred and leave on landscaped areas), compost on-site,
20 or separate from other types of waste to send to a composting facility within
21 the local area, green waste (i.e., trimmings from grass, shrubs, or trees)
22 from common project landscaped areas and the on-site parks and linear
23 parks/paseos.

24 During construction activities, the project developer shall pursue and
25 implement any available and feasible source reduction programs for the
26 disposal of construction materials to the satisfaction of the Riverside
27 County Waste Management Department.
28

1 Q. Schools

2 1. Impacts:

3 The proposed project would generate students in excess of available
4 capacity at the elementary and high school levels. This increased demand
5 on existing educational facilities and services would be regarded as a
6 significant direct and cumulative impact. In addition, the increase of
7 students to Bell Mountain Middle School would incrementally degrade the
8 available capacity of this school, and this is regarded as a cumulatively
9 significant impact.

10 2. Mitigation:

11 Prior to the issuance of each residential building permit(s), school fees shall
12 be paid in accordance with the requirements of the State of California
13 (Senate Bill 50) or the applicant shall enter into a mitigation agreement with
14 the Menifee Union School District and the Perris Union High School
15 District.

16 R. Libraries

17 1. Impacts:

18 Development of the proposed project will increase the region's population,
19 creating an additional demand for library facilities and services. The
20 increase in population to be served would require an increase in funding to
21 the Riverside County Public Library to maintain the current level of service.
22 This is regarded as a cumulatively significant impact.

23 2. Mitigation:

24 Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits, the applicant shall comply with
25 the provisions of the County Development Impact Fee (DIF) Ordinance
26 (Ord. No. 659), which requires a fee payment that the County applies to the
27 funding of public facilities, including library facilities.
28

1 S. Health Services

2 1. Impacts:

3 The increase in population of 1,544 people by the proposed project (County
4 Ordinance No. 460, Section 10.35) will generate an increase demand for in
5 medical services, thereby resulting in a significant cumulative impact to
6 health care services.

7 2. Mitigation:

8 Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits, the applicant shall comply with
9 the provisions of the County Development Impact Fee (DIF) Ordinance
10 (Ord. No. 659), which requires a fee payment that the County applies to the
11 funding of public facilities, including public health facilities.

12 T. Energy Resources

13 1. Impacts:

14 The project will be supplied with energy by Southern California Edison and
15 gas by Southern California Gas Co., which have indicated an ability to
16 service the project site using existing and planned capacities. The provision
17 of energy resources to the site would not result in the need to expand or
18 extend energy infrastructure that would create an off-site physical impact on
19 the environment.

20 2. Mitigation:

21 None required.

22 U. Utilities

23 1. Impacts:

24 Utility service providers have indicated an ability to service the project
25 based on existing and planned infrastructure. The provision of utilities to
26 the site would not result in the need to expand or extend utilities that would
27 create an off-site physical impact on the environment.

1 2. Mitigation:

2 None required.

3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following impacts
4 potentially resulting from the approval of the project cannot be fully mitigated and will be only partially
5 avoided or lessened by the mitigation measures hereinafter specified; a statement of overriding findings is
6 therefore included herein:

7 A. Circulation and Traffic

8 1. Impacts:

9 The project would generate 4,948 daily vehicle trips at buildout. Of this
10 total, approximately 388 vehicles per hour are expected to be generated
11 during the morning peak hour and 522 vehicles per hour are anticipated
12 during the evening peak hour. At the time this EIR was prepared, funding
13 for the proposed extension of Clinton Keith Road had not been secured by
14 the County. Because this improvement is reasonably foreseeable but cannot
15 be assured prior to project implementation, the traffic impacts associated
16 with and without the Clinton Keith Road extension was considered.

17 Implementation of the proposed project would not directly cause any study
18 area intersection to drop below an acceptable level of service. However, the
19 level of service at study area intersections would only be maintained at
20 acceptable levels with implementation of the improvements envisioned by
21 the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element and the SWAP
22 Circulation Plan. Thus, project implementation would result in a
23 cumulatively significant impact to study area intersections without the
24 planned improvements. Additionally, the project's incremental contribution
25 to freeway mainlines is considered a significant cumulative impact.

26 The following mitigation measures would reduce the project's cumulative
27 traffic impacts, but not to a level below significant. There is no mechanism
28 available for payment of fair share contributions to mitigate freeway

1 impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts to I-15 and I-215 freeway
2 segments would remain significant and unavoidable. In addition, several
3 identified improvements listed in Tables 4-11 and 4-12 of the EIR
4 require the approval of Caltrans or the City of Murrieta. In the event that
5 the approval of the other jurisdictions for identified intersection
6 improvements cannot be obtained, cumulative impacts to be mitigated by
7 these improvements would remain significant and unavoidable.

8 2. Mitigation:

9 Pat Road shall be constructed at its ultimate half-section width as a
10 Collector Roadway (34 foot part width pavement section) from Briggs Road
11 to the easterly project boundary in conjunction with development.

12 Briggs Road shall be constructed at its ultimate full-section width as a
13 Major Roadway from Pat Road to Baxter Road in conjunction with
14 development.

15 Baxter Road shall be constructed at its ultimate half-section width as a
16 Secondary Roadway from Briggs Road to the easterly project boundary in
17 conjunction with the proposed development.

18 Briggs Road shall be constructed as a 32-foot paved section between Baxter
19 Road and Winchester Road (SR-79) in conjunction with development.

20 Baxter Road shall be constructed as a 32-foot paved section between the
21 easterly project boundary and Leon Road in conjunction with development.

22 Internal roadways shall be constructed as Collector Roadways in
23 accordance with County Transportation Department standards.

24 Traffic signals shall be installed at the following intersections in
25 conjunction with the proposed development, when warranted:

26 Briggs Road (NS) at:

27 -- Pat Road (EW)

28 -- Main Driveway 1 (EW)

1 -- Baxter Road (EW)

2 On-site traffic signing and striping shall be implemented in conjunction
3 with detailed construction plans for the project site.

4 Sight distance at each project access roadway shall be reviewed with respect
5 to standard Caltrans and County of Riverside sight distance standards at the
6 time of preparation of final grading, landscape, and street improvement
7 plans.

8 The project applicant shall participate in the phased construction of off-site
9 traffic signals through the County's traffic signal fee program.

10 The project applicant shall participate in funding construction of off-site
11 improvements through payment of required TUMF and RBBB fees.

12 B. Air Quality – Project-Specific and Cumulative

13 1. Impacts:

14 The analysis contained in the EIR indicates that project's short-term
15 emissions from grading activities, construction equipment, construction
16 workers' vehicles, and off-gas emissions from painting and asphalt paving
17 (NO_x, PM₁₀, CO, and ROG) would exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds.
18 Thus, the project's short-term emissions would be considered significant.

19 Additionally, the project's long-term mobile source emissions would exceed
20 the SCAQMD thresholds for CO, ROG, and NO_x; thus, creating a
21 cumulatively significant impact.

22 Mitigation would reduce these impacts, but not to the point that they will
23 fall under the SCAQMD's thresholds. Thus, the project would result in un-
24 mitigable air quality impacts associated with construction (NO_x, PM₁₀, and
25 ROG) and operational (CO) activities.

26 The proposed project's cumulatively significant air quality impacts were
27 accounted for in the County's General Plan EIR (SCH No. 2002051143),
28 for which the County adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

1 Construction access roads shall be paved at least 100 feet onto the project
2 site from the main roadway.

3 Concurrent with construction activities, disturbed areas shall be revegetated
4 as quickly as possible.

5 Concurrent with construction activities, all streets shall be swept daily if
6 visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets.

7 Prior to beginning each phase of project development, regularly scheduled
8 engine maintenance shall be required for construction equipment to
9 minimize equipment emissions.

10 Construction equipment with low emission factors and high energy
11 efficiency shall be used whenever feasible.

12 Electric or diesel powered construction equipment rather than gasoline
13 powered engines shall be used whenever feasible.

14 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered the following
15 alternatives identified in the EIR No. 457 in light of the environmental impacts which cannot be fully
16 avoided or substantially lessened and has rejected those alternatives as infeasible for the reasons
17 hereinafter stated:

18 A. No Project Alternative

19 1. The No Project Alternative assumes that no development occurs on
20 the proposed project site, and the existing agricultural use and open
21 space would remain. In addition, Briggs Road and other roadways
22 would not be constructed through the property. The northwest
23 portion of the site would remain as natural open space, and would
24 not be placed in a conservation easement ensuring its continued
25 preservation.

26 2. The No Project Alternative would not be consistent with the
27 Riverside County General Plan and Southwest Area Plan, which
28 designate the site for a "Medium Density Residential (2-5 du/ac)"

1 land use. Additionally, the construction of the Briggs and Baxter
2 roads as anticipated by the General Plan Circulation Element would
3 not be implemented under this alternative. Because this alternative
4 would conflict with the General Plan designations for the site,
5 impacts to land use would be increased under this alternative as
6 compared to the proposed project.

7 3. Because no new development would be allowed under this
8 alternative, the existing visual environment would be maintained.
9 There would be no new sources of light and glare. As a result,
10 implementation of the No Project Alternative would have fewer
11 impacts on aesthetics, visual quality, light, and glare.

12 4. Under the No Project Alternative, the agricultural uses would have
13 the potential to expand on-site into previously undisturbed areas,
14 resulting in the potential to further impact the on-site drainage areas
15 and to impact natural habitat areas existing on the property.
16 Potential impacts to sensitive plant communities, and sensitive plant
17 and animal species have the potential, therefore, to be greater than
18 the proposed project.

19 5. Continued agricultural use of the site would not likely result in
20 ground disturbance at greater depths than exist under existing
21 conditions. Therefore, as with the proposed project, impacts to
22 archaeological and paleontological resources under this alternative
23 would not be significant.

24 6. Under this alternative, the existing drainage conditions of the site
25 would be maintained. Because there would be no alteration to the
26 site's existing hydrology, impacts would not be significant and
27 would be less than that of the proposed project.
28

- 1 7. Under the No Project Alternative, chemical fertilizers associated
2 with agricultural activities have the potential to create significant
3 impacts to water quality. Because of the potential impacts to water
4 quality associated with fertilizer application, impacts to water
5 quality under the No Project Alternative would be less than
6 significant, but would increase relative to the proposed project.
- 7 8. Because no new residential development is proposed, this alternative
8 would expose fewer people to potential seismic hazards. Therefore,
9 impacts to geology and slope stability under this alternative would
10 not be significant and would be less than impacts resulting from the
11 proposed project.
- 12 9. Although erosion conditions would not change relative to existing
13 conditions, erosion is typically high in agricultural fields due to
14 times when the fields are fallow and in cultivation. Therefore,
15 erosion impacts would increase under this alternative as compared to
16 the proposed project.
- 17 10. Under the No Project Alternative, existing agricultural operations on
18 the project site could continue to operate. Impacts to agriculture
19 would not occur under this alternative, whereas the proposed project
20 would develop single-family residences within 300 feet of
21 agriculturally zoned property.
- 22 11. The No Project Alternative does not propose to develop residential
23 units; therefore this alternative would not expose people to the
24 potential hazards associated with the use or storage of hazardous
25 materials associated with urban development. Fertilizers and
26 pesticides used in farming are considered to be hazardous in high
27 concentrations and the application of such chemicals would occur
28

1 with implementation of this alternative, thereby resulting in a greater
2 impact as compared to the proposed project.

3 12. Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not physically
4 alter the proposed project site. Therefore, as with the proposed
5 project, significant impacts to mineral resources would not occur.

6 13. Continued agricultural use of the site would not result in significant
7 traffic impacts to surrounding roadways. Therefore, impacts to
8 circulation and traffic associated with the No Project Alternative
9 would not be significant and would be less than the proposed
10 project.

11 14. Because the agricultural uses associated with the No Project
12 Alternative would contribute to the non-attainment of regional air
13 quality standards within the South Coast Air Basin, impacts to air
14 quality associated with the No Project Alternative would be
15 cumulatively significant and could not be fully mitigated. Unlike
16 the proposed project however, direct impacts to air quality would
17 not occur under this alternative. Therefore, impacts to air quality
18 under this alternative would be significant, but would be less than
19 that of the proposed project.

20 15. Potential noise impacts sources generated by this alternative would
21 be limited to noise associated with farmland equipment, which
22 would not result in significant impacts to sensitive noise receptors.
23 Therefore, impacts to noise associated with the No Project
24 Alternative would not be significant and would be reduced as
25 compared to the proposed project.

26 16. Implementation of this alternative would not generate a demand for
27 parks, recreation, or open space amenities. Thus, impacts to open
28

1 space, parks, and recreation would not be significant under this
2 alternative.

3 17. Because this alternative would not generate a population or create
4 structures requiring fire protection, impacts to fire protection
5 services would not be significant and would be reduced as compared
6 to the proposed project.

7 18. Because this alternative would not generate a population requiring
8 law enforcement services, impacts on sheriff services would not be
9 significant and would be reduced as compared to the proposed
10 project.

11 19. Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not result in an
12 increase in the area's population and would not result in cumulative
13 impacts on the capacity of existing landfills. Therefore, impacts to
14 solid waste management services would not be significant and
15 would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

16 20. The property is dry farmed and does not use water for irrigation and
17 does not require wastewater services. Therefore, implementation of
18 the No Project Alternative would have no impact on water and
19 wastewater services, and impacts to water and wastewater services
20 would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

21 21. Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not generate
22 school students, and demands for school services would not increase
23 under this alternative. Accordingly, implementation of the No
24 Project Alternative would have no impact on school services, and
25 potential impacts would be reduced as compared to the proposed
26 project.

27 22. Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not generate a
28 population which would place a demand on library services.

1 Accordingly, implementation of the No Project Alternative would
2 not result in significant impacts to library services, and impacts to
3 library services would be reduced as compared to the proposed
4 project.

5 23. Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not generate a
6 population which would place demand on medical facilities.
7 Accordingly, implementation of the No Project Alternative would
8 not result in impacts to medical facilities, and impacts to medical
9 facilities would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

10 24. Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not create new
11 demand for additional energy resources. The No Project Alternative
12 would have no impact on energy resources, and impacts to utilities
13 would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

14 25. Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not create new
15 demand for additional utility services. Therefore, impacts to utilities
16 would not be significant and would be less than the proposed
17 project.

18 26. Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not expose
19 people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death
20 involving wildland fires, erosion, seismic activity, blowsand, or
21 flooding. Therefore, impacts to disaster preparedness associated
22 with the No Project Alternative would not be significant and would
23 be similar to the proposed project.

24 27. The No Project Alternative was rejected as an alternative to the
25 proposed project because it would increase impacts to biological
26 resources, water quality, soils and erosion, and toxic substances. In
27 addition, the No Project Alternative would not eliminate the projects
28 cumulatively significant air quality impacts. The No Project

1 Alternative would fail to meet the project's goals and objectives, as
2 described in EIR Section 3.0. Furthermore, the project would: 1)
3 fail to assist the County in meeting the demand for regional housing
4 needs; 2) would fail to implement the land use designations of the
5 Riverside County General Plan and Southwest Area Plan; and 3)
6 would fail to implement improvements to Briggs Road and Baxter
7 Road as required by the General Plan Circulation Element.

8 B. Reduced Project Alternative

- 9 1. The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the development
10 intensity of the proposed project, primarily to comply with existing
11 zoning and reduce impacts to air quality, landform alteration,
12 hydrology, and public services. Under the Reduced Project
13 Alternative, 28 residential dwelling units would be constructed on
14 179.2 acres, and Briggs Road would be constructed through the site
15 as shown in the County's General Plan Circulation Element.
- 16 2. The Reduced Project Alternative would not be consistent with the
17 Riverside County General Plan which designates the site for
18 medium density residential uses. In addition, reservation of the
19 right-of-way for the construction of Briggs and Baxter Roads would
20 occur, but the construction of these roadways through the site as
21 anticipated by the General Plan Circulation Element would not be
22 implemented under this alternative because the road construction
23 could not be financed by the construction of 28 homes. Therefore,
24 because this alternative would conflict with the General Plan
25 designations for the site, impacts to land use would be increased
26 under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.
- 27 3. Under the Reduced Project Alternative, the placement of residential
28 dwelling units on the west side of the proposed realignment of

1 Briggs Road would obstruct the visibility of the resources from
2 viewpoints east of Briggs Road, resulting in increased impacts on
3 these scenic vistas as compared to the proposed project. Light and
4 glare impacts would be decreased due to the development of fewer
5 residential dwelling units and roadways. However, as with the
6 proposed project, impacts under this alternative would not be
7 regarded as significant.

- 8 4. Under this alternative, residential dwelling units would be
9 constructed on the west side of the proposed Briggs Road alignment,
10 and would directly impact the 0.7-acre on-site patch of Riversidean
11 sage scrub. This would be regarded as a significant impact to
12 biological resources, and these impacts would increase relative to
13 the proposed project. Also as part of this alternative, land area west
14 of Briggs Road would not be designated for conservation as part of
15 the County's MHSCP. Consistency with the MSHCP would not
16 occur and a significant impact to biological resources would result.
- 17 5. Grading quantities would be less than the proposed project;
18 therefore, potential impacts to archaeological and paleontological
19 resources under this alternative would be less than the proposed
20 project, but still potentially significant.
- 21 6. Detention basins and/or water quality detention basins would be
22 required under this alternative. These detention/water quality basins
23 would slow the water and allow for increased infiltration into the
24 groundwater basin, thereby reducing the amount of surface runoff
25 exiting the proposed project site. Therefore, impacts to hydrology,
26 flooding and drainage, would be reduced to below a level of
27 significance and would be similar to the proposed project.

- 1 7. Under this alternative, construction of impervious streets, roofs, and
2 parking facilities, and irrigation of landscaped areas would alter
3 surface runoff. This runoff, typical of urban use, would contribute
4 to the incremental degradation of the water quality downstream.
5 This is regarded as a significant cumulative water quality impact and
6 mitigation would be required to reduce these impacts to below a
7 level of significance. However, because fewer residential lots are
8 proposed under this alternative, impacts to water quality would be
9 reduced as compared to the proposed project.
- 10 8. The Reduced Project Alternative proposes to construct residential
11 dwelling units on the site's steeper natural slopes located west of the
12 proposed Briggs Road easement. Thus, under this alternative,
13 potential impacts to geology and slope stability would be increased
14 as a result of constructing homes west of Briggs Road, but the
15 impact is not anticipated to be significant.
- 16 9. Alterations to the natural landform would occur under this
17 alternative, and 19.5 acres of the site's steeper slopes located west of
18 the proposed Briggs Road alignment would be altered for the
19 development of residential dwelling units. Grading activities on the
20 site have the potential to increase the rate of runoff and increase
21 erosion susceptibility which is regarded as a potentially significant
22 short-term impact. Generally, impacts would be increased under this
23 alternative due to the development on the site's steeper slopes west
24 of Briggs Road.
- 25 10. Implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would result in
26 the construction of residential dwelling units within 300 feet of
27 agriculturally zoned property. Mitigation measures would be
28 required to reduce these impacts to below a level of significance.

1 Impacts to agricultural would be reduced to below a level of
2 significance, as with the proposed project.

3 11. The potential for hazardous material use typical in urban
4 developments would be the same under this alternative as would
5 occur under the proposed project, resulting in the same level of
6 potential impact and requiring similar mitigation.

7 12. Traffic and circulation impacts associated with this alternative
8 would be less than those identified for the proposed project, but
9 impacts would remain cumulatively significant and mitigation
10 would be required. In addition, the Reduced Project Alternative
11 does not propose enough residential dwelling units to justify the cost
12 of improving the proposed realignment of Briggs Road. Therefore,
13 the Reduced Project Alternative would result in direct impacts to
14 traffic. Due to the lack of improvements to Briggs Road, the No
15 Project Alternative would result in greater impacts to circulation and
16 traffic than would the proposed project.

17 13. Mobile source emissions would be decreased under this alternative.
18 The amount of grading would be similar under this alternative and
19 would therefore result in a potentially significant cumulative short-
20 term air quality impact due to PM-10 emissions associated with
21 grading activities. In addition, the Reduced Project Alternative
22 would result in a decrease in evaporative emissions of volatile
23 compounds (VOC) from paints, solvents, asphalt, roofing tar, and
24 other coatings due to the substantial decrease in residential dwelling
25 units. Impacts to air quality under the Reduced Project Alternative
26 would be less than the proposed project but would remain
27 cumulatively significant.
28

14. The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the number of average daily trips, thereby reducing the number of vehicles on surrounding roadways and resulting in a decrease in vehicular related noise impacts. Temporary noise impacts during construction would be similar to the proposed project.
15. The Reduced Project alternative would create the demand for 0.25 acre of local and regional parkland and 2.1 acres of open space based on Quimby Act and Riverside County requirements. Because the Reduced Project Alternative does not propose parks or open space, impacts to open space, parks, and recreation would be significant and would increase relative to the proposed project.
16. When considered on a cumulative basis in conjunction with other projects in the area, the Fire Department's ability to serve the planned population may be adversely affected under this alternative. Because the Reduced Project Alternative has fewer dwelling units, impacts to Fire Protection Services would be reduced relative to the proposed project.
17. When considered on a cumulative basis in conjunction with other projects in the area, the Sheriff Department's ability to serve the planned population may be adversely affected under this alternative. Because the Reduced Project alternative proposes fewer dwelling units, impacts to Sheriff Services would be reduced relative to the proposed project.
18. The Reduced Project Alternative would cumulatively degrade the capacity at existing County landfills. The Reduced Project Alternative proposes fewer dwelling units than the proposed project, and would therefore result in fewer impacts to solid waste.

- 1 19. The Reduced Project Alternative proposes fewer dwelling units.
2 Therefore, impacts to water and wastewater services would be less
3 than the proposed project. However, as with the proposed project,
4 these impacts would not be significant.
- 5 20. Because the Reduced Project Alternative proposes fewer dwelling
6 units, the number of students generated would be less than that of
7 the proposed project. Because fewer students would be generated
8 by the Reduced Project Alternative, direct and cumulative impacts
9 to school services would decrease under this alternative relative to
10 the proposed project.
- 11 21. Because the Reduced Project Alternative proposes fewer dwelling
12 units than the proposed project, impacts to library services would be
13 reduced relative to the proposed project.
- 14 22. Because the Reduced Project Alternative proposes fewer dwelling
15 units than the proposed project, cumulative impacts to health
16 services would be reduced.
- 17 23. Because the Reduced Project Alternative proposes fewer dwelling
18 units than the proposed project, impacts to energy resources would
19 be reduced compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed
20 project, however, impacts to energy resources would not be
21 significant.
- 22 24. Because the Reduced Project Alternative proposes fewer dwelling
23 units than the proposed project, impacts to energy resources would
24 be reduced. As with the proposed project, however, impacts to
25 utilities would not be significant.
- 26 25. Implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would not
27 expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or
28 death involving wildland fires, erosion, seismic activity, blowsand,

1 or flooding. Therefore, impacts to disaster preparedness would not
2 be significant and would be similar to the proposed project.

3 26. The Reduced Project Alternative was rejected as an alternative to the
4 proposed project because it would result in increased impacts to
5 biology and land use. In addition, the Reduced Project Alternative
6 fails to eliminate the project's cumulatively significant air quality
7 impacts. The Reduced Project Alternative would fail to meet the
8 project's goals and objectives, as described in Section 3.0.
9 Furthermore, the project would: 1) fail to assist the County in
10 meeting the demand for regional housing needs; 2) would fail to
11 implement the land use designations of the Riverside County
12 General Plan and Southwest Area Plan; and 3) would fail to
13 implement improvements to Briggs Road and Baxter Road as
14 required by the General Plan Circulation Element.

15 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has balanced the benefits of
16 the project against the unavoidable adverse environmental effects thereof, and has determined that the
17 following benefits outweigh and render acceptable those environmental effects:

- 18 A. The project will create a desirable living environment for Riverside County
19 residents, providing necessary infrastructure, recreational amenities and landscape
20 and design elements.
- 21 B. The project will provide housing to assist in accommodating the projected
22 population increases in western Riverside County.
- 23 C. The project will provide transportation system improvements to address project
24 specific and cumulative circulation impacts, thereby contributing to improvements
25 at critical intersections and roadways.
- 26 D. The project will provide funding for various elements of regional infrastructure
27 through the County's mitigation fee programs.
28

- 1 E. The project represents a logical extension of urban development in an area already
2 designated for development by the County's General Plan and Southwest Area
3 Plan.
4 F. The project will add approximately 19.5 acres to the MSHCP Preserve to assist in
5 meeting regional conservation goals.
6 G. The project will provide 8.3 acres of linear parks/paseos and 9.2 acres of park
7 which is more than double the project's Quimby Act requirement.

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

13 A. Economic, Population or Housing Growth

14 The project proposes development of a maximum of 503 residential
15 dwelling units, an activity park, neighborhood park, mini-park ,and linear
16 park/greenbelt system on a 188.1-acre site, and result in an increase in the
17 County's population by approximately 1,514 persons. In addition to the
18 residential component and neighborhood parks, the project would include
19 detention basins and other supporting infrastructure. This proposed
20 development is consistent with SCAG growth forecasts. An extensive
21 analysis of the balance of jobs and housing was conducted as part of the
22 Housing Element of the County's General Plan. Because the proposed
23 project would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use Plan,
24 implementation of the proposed project would not create an imbalance
25 between jobs and housing within the project vicinity.

26 B. Removal of An Impediment To Growth

27 Currently, the project site is relatively vacant. The project site is bounded
28 on the west by natural open space, on the north and south by agricultural

1 and large lot residential developments, and on the east by the approved
2 French Valley Specific Plan, which is currently undeveloped. Three school
3 sites are planned within one-mile of the site. Extension of urban utilities to
4 the proposed project area may act as an inducement to other lands within
5 the vicinity to undertake development. Such induced development would
6 be consistent with the existing Riverside County General Plan within
7 unincorporated areas and with the General Plans of adjacent jurisdictions.

8 C. Precedent - Setting Effects

9 Indirect growth inducing impacts at the local level result from a demand for
10 additional goods and services associated with the increase in project
11 population. This occurs in suburban or rural environments where
12 population growth results in increased demand for service and commodity
13 markets responding to the new population. This type of growth is, however,
14 a regional phenomenon resulting from introduction of a major employment
15 center or regionally significant housing project like the proposed project
16 site. The implementation of the proposed project could result in growth
17 inducing impacts to the region, but not beyond that anticipated through
18 buildout of the County's General Plan and Southwest Area Plan.

19 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the project will implement
20 applicable elements of the Riverside County General Plan as follows:

21 A. Land Use Element

22 Development of the site with residential and park land uses is consistent
23 with the Land Use Element in that the property would be developed in
24 accordance with the Community Development Foundation Component land
25 use designation depicted by the General Plan, and in accordance with the
26 Medium Density Residential (2-5 du/ac) land use designation depicted by
27 the Southwest Area Plan. Consistent with the Area Plan, Tentative Tract
28 Map No. 30433 proposes to construct residential housing at a gross

1 residential density of 2.7 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) on areas of the site
2 designated for Medium Density Residential. In addition, Tentative Tract
3 Map No. 30433 would comply with applicable Countywide Design
4 Standards and Guidelines.

5 B. Circulation Element

6 As part of the proposed project, Briggs Road would be realigned and
7 improved to TUMF and County standards through the site and would
8 extend off-site to the south to connect with Winchester Road (Hwy. 79).
9 Briggs Road is a critical TUMF Circulation Element and is planned as an
10 important component of the local and regional transportation system.
11 Additionally, Baxter Road would be improved in a manner that is consistent
12 with the County General Plan Circulation Plan and extended off-site to the
13 east to connect with Leon Road. The project's technical traffic report
14 concludes that implementation of the proposed project, in conjunction with
15 planned improvements, would not degrade the level of service of any
16 existing or proposed intersection below an acceptable level; however, the
17 contribution of traffic to freeway mainlines would be cumulatively
18 significant and unavoidable. The proposed project is consistent with the
19 General Plan Land Use Plan, and is thereby consistent with the traffic
20 volumes envisioned by the General Plan Land use Plan. The project also is
21 consistent with the Highway 79 Policy Area traffic reduction policies and
22 therefore would generate less traffic than anticipated by the General Plan.
23 Internal to Tentative Tract Map No. 30433, non-motorized transportation
24 would occur in the form of pedestrian sidewalks, pathways, and bicycle
25 lanes. The project's greenbelt/paseo system would assist in providing
26 access between the residential areas and the on-site parks as well as off-site
27 walkways, parks, and elementary school sites planned in the adjacent
28 French Valley Specific Plan area.

1 C. Multipurpose Open Space Element

2 The General Plan designates the site as a Community Development area and
3 does not anticipate long-term use of the site for agricultural pursuits. The
4 majority of the proposed project site has been historically disturbed by
5 agricultural activities. As a consequence, areas of natural vegetation on the
6 project site are limited. As part of the proposed project and consistent with
7 the project's HANS/JPR review and approval process, the western portion
8 of the project site would be conserved as part of the County's MSHCP and
9 would be revegetated with sage scrub habitat. A portion of the on-site
10 MSHCP area will contain a revegetated manufactured slope required for the
11 construction of Briggs Road. In conformance with the Countywide Design
12 Standards and Guidelines, drought-tolerant species would be provided
13 throughout the proposed landscaped areas. There are adequate facilities
14 within the project vicinity to treat project-generated wastewater flows to
15 avoid wastewater impacts to watershed quality. Impacts to jurisdictional
16 drainage areas will be reduced to below a level of significance through
17 adherence to the mitigation measures set forth in EIR Section 4.3. Ground
18 disturbance in the form of clearing, excavation, and/or installation of
19 underground facilities required for the project could result in the loss of
20 archaeological and paleontologic resources. However, mitigation measures
21 proposed in the EIR would mitigate the potential impacts to below a level of
22 significance. The project would provide recreation facilities in the form of
23 on-site parks and a linear park/paseo system totaling 17.5 acres which is
24 more than double the project's Quimby Act requirement. Maintenance of
25 the on-site recreation facilities would be the responsibility of Valley Wide
26 Recreation and Park District with the exception of those facilities that occur
27 within the roadway rights-of-way, which would be managed by the
28 Riverside County Transportation Department, and drainage facilities that

1 will be maintained by the Project's HOA. The project site is not located
2 within or adjacent to any identified scenic corridors nor is it mapped within
3 a valuable mineral resource area.

4 D. Safety Element

5 The proposed residential homes within Tentative Tract Map No. 30433
6 would be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code
7 (UBC) and any site-specific conditions imposed by the County Geologist;
8 thus insuring geologic safety. The project site is not located within a
9 blowsand area, is not subject to wind erosion, is not located within a dam
10 inundation area, and would not conflict with any disaster preparedness plan.
11 Compliance with the requirements of the Riverside County Fire
12 Department, and the required payment of mitigation fees pursuant to
13 Ordinance 659.6 would insure fire safety. Lastly, the project does not
14 include the use of or creation of hazardous materials.

15 E. Noise Element

16 As indicated in Section 4.6 of EIR No. 457, impacts associated with noise
17 are anticipated to be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation
18 measures, including noise attenuation, in the form of physical barriers (e.g.,
19 landscaped berms, solid block walls, etc).

20 F. Housing Element

21 The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use
22 Plan and the Southwest Area Plan. Because the proposed project would
23 implement the residential land uses contemplated by the Area Plan, and
24 because the Area Plan implements the Housing Element, the proposed
25 project would be consistent with the General Plan Housing Element.

26 G. Air Quality Element

27 As disclosed in Section 4.5 of the EIR, the project applicant would be
28 required to implement mitigation measures intended to reduce direct air

1 quality impacts to the greatest feasible extent. Implementation of the
2 mitigation measures would ensure consistency with the Air Quality
3 Element. Not unlike other development projects in Riverside County, and
4 as also disclosed in the EIR prepared for the County General Plan (SCH No.
5 2002051143), direct and cumulative air quality impacts would remain
6 significant and unmitigable. Although the project's contribution to air
7 quality impacts is significant, the mitigation measures presented in Section
8 4.5 would reduce those impacts to the greatest extent possible, in
9 conformance with SCAQMD, EPA, and California Air Resources Board
10 requirements.

11 H. Administration Element

12 The Administration Element contains information regarding administration
13 of the General Plan. No policy directives are included in this Element.

14 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the project is in conformance
15 with the conservation requirements of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Conservation Plan
16 (MSHCP) in that:

- 17 A. The proposed project site is located within quadrant 5476 of Cell Group Z and quadrant
18 5370 of Cell Group X, both of which are located within Subunit 5 (French Valley/Lower
19 Sedco Hills) of the Southwest Area Plan. Conservation requirements for Cell Group X is
20 focused on chaparral, coastal sage scrub, grassland, riparian scrub, woodland and forest
21 habitat adjacent to Warm Springs Creek. Areas conserved within this Cell Group are
22 intended to be connected to chaparral, coastal sage scrub and grassland habitat proposed for
23 conservation in Cell Group Y to the west, and to chaparral, coastal sage scrub, grassland,
24 riparian scrub, woodland and forest habitat proposed for conservation in Cell Group Z to
25 the south. In addition, the proposed project site is located within the northeastern portion
26 of Cell Group Z, and occupies the northern portion of Quadrant 5476. This portion of the
27 project site does not contain the targeted habitats, as the site has historically been disturbed
28 by agricultural uses. The proposed project was reviewed through the County's Habitat

1 Negotiation and Acquisition Strategy (HANS). Pursuant to the HANS process, it was
2 determined that the on-site RSS would be preserved within natural open space, and would
3 be contiguous with Quadrant 5369 (Group X) to the west. The remaining portions of the
4 project site do not contain any coastal sage scrub, grassland, riparian scrub, woodland, or
5 forest habitat. The western portion of the property west of realigned Briggs Road will be
6 revegetated with sage scrub and preserved as open space as part of the County's MSHCP.
7 Thus, the project as proposed would not conflict with Reserve Assembly, because the
8 habitats identified for conservation in the applicable Cell Groups are either not present or
9 conserved with the project.

10 B. Pursuant to Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP, an assessment of potentially significant effects on
11 Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools which includes identification and mapping of
12 such areas located on the Project site is required if such resources are identified on the
13 project site. The jurisdictional delineation for the project determined that the site contains
14 unvegetated jurisdictional waters of the U.S. totaling 0.16-acre of federal and state
15 streambed. No riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools are located on the property. As
16 compensatory mitigation for its impacts on unvegetated ephemeral drainages, the project
17 impacts will be reduced to below a level of significance through adherence to the
18 mitigation measures set forth in EIR Section 4.3. Because no riparian, riverine or vernal
19 pool exist on the site, the project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.1.2.

20 C. Pursuant to Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP, habitat assessments and/or focused surveys for
21 certain Narrow Endemic Plant Species are required for properties within mapped survey
22 areas. The majority of the project site (99%) is disturbed, mostly in association with
23 actively cultivated dry farmed crops. Because the site has been used for dryland farming
24 over the past approximately 50 years, the potential for narrow endemics to occur is very
25 low. Regardless, focused surveys for clay endemics (Munz's onion, Hammitt's clay cress,
26 and many-stemmed dudleya) were conducted in April of 2005 with negative results.
27 California Orcutt grass is restricted to vernal pools and alkali playas, neither of which
28 occurs on site. San Diego ambrosia is associated with river terraces, vernal pools, and

1 alkali playas on Garretson gravelly fine sandy loams and Las Posas loams in close
2 proximity to Willows series soils. A small amount of Las Posas loams occurs on the site
3 but not in proximity to Willows series soils and not supporting appropriate habitat
4 associations. Spreading navarretia occurs in saline-alkaline soils in vernal pools,
5 depressions and ditches which are not present on site. Wright's trichocoronis is limited to
6 alkali soils, which are not present on site. No narrow endemics are located on the site;
7 therefore, the project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.1.3.

8 D. Pursuant to Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP, projects in close proximity to the MSHCP
9 Conservation Area are required to incorporate mechanisms to address indirect effects to the
10 MSHCP Conservation Area. Per the Conditions of Approval for the project and Mitigation
11 Measure Nos. 4.3-7 through 4.3-9 of the EIR, the applicant is required to implement the
12 guidelines contained in Section 6.1.4 related to controlling adverse effects for development
13 adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area. A manufactured slope required for the
14 construction of Briggs Road will be located on the MSHCP area on-site, and will be
15 revegetated with coastal sage scrub. Thus, the project would not indirectly affect the
16 MSHCP Conservation Area and would be consistent with the Guidelines Pertaining to the
17 Urban/Wildlands Interface established by the MSHCP.

18 E. Pursuant to Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP, habitat assessments and/or focused surveys for
19 certain additional plant and animal species are required for properties within mapped
20 survey areas. The MSHCP identifies wildlife species survey requirements on the site for
21 burrowing owl and Los Angeles pocket mouse. Focused surveys for these species were
22 conducted in 2005 that yielded negative results. The potential for Criteria Area plant
23 species to occur on site is low. Coulter's goldfields is limited to alkali soils, which are not
24 present on site. Davidson's saltscale is limited to alkali soils, which are not present on site.
25 Little mousetail is restricted to vernal pools and alkali playas, which do not occur on site.
26 Parish's brittlescale is limited to alkali soils, which are not present on site. Because the site
27 area is actively disced, Round-leaved filaree and thread-leaved brodiaea are not expected to
28

1 occur, and focused surveys in April 2005 were negative. Smooth tarplant is limited to
2 alkali soils, which are not present on site.

3 F. Pursuant to Section 6.4 of the MSHCP, fuels management is required to be considered.
4 The construction of Briggs Road will serve as a fuel break between development and
5 MSHCP Conservation Area. No fuel management will occur in the Conservation Area.

6 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that project is consistent with the
7 County of Riverside General Plan.

8 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and considered
9 EIR No. 457 in evaluating the project, that the EIR No. 457 is an accurate and objective statement that
10 complies with the California Environmental Quality Act and reflects the County's independent judgment,
11 and that the EIR No. 457 is incorporated therein by this reference.

12 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **CERTIFIES** the EIR No.
13 457, **ADOPTS** the Mitigation Monitoring Plan specified herein, **ADOPTS** the Statement of Overriding
14 Considerations as set forth above and **APPROVES** the project.

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

18
19
20
21 G:\Property\MDKing\Resolutions\Resolution 2006-074.ttm30433.cz6656.doc