

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

319B



**FROM:** TLMA – Planning Department

**SUBMITTAL DATE:**  
November 25, 2009

**SUBJECT: RESOLUTION NO. 2009-339 CERTIFYING SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 507 - FAST TRACK NO. 2008-07 – (Environmental Impact Report) – Applicant: First Industrial Reality Trust – Engineer/Representative: Thiens Engineering Inc. - First Supervisorial District – Mead Valley Area Plan: Community Development: Business Park (CD: BP) (0.25-0.60 Floor Area Ratio) – Location: northerly of Nuevo Road, southerly of Citrus Avenue, easterly of Webster Avenue and westerly of Harvill Avenue – 104.45 Gross Acres - Zoning: Industrial Park (I-P) and Light Agriculture (A-1) – **REQUEST:** The Environmental Impact Report has been prepared to inform decisions makers and the public of the potential significant environmental effects associated with the development of the proposed plot plan and tentative parcel map per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).– APN(s): 305-180-009, 014, 018, 019, 027, 029, 034, 054, 305-270-001, 034, 035, 036, 045, 047, 058, 061**

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:**

**ADOPTION** of RESOLUTION NO. 2009-339 Certifying Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 507 and approving Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530 Revision No. 1 which has been completed in compliance with CEQA Guidelines.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ron Goldman  
Planning Director

|                       |                               |      |                         |     |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|------|-------------------------|-----|
| <b>FINANCIAL DATA</b> | Current F.Y. Total Cost:      | \$ 0 | In Current Year Budget: | N/A |
|                       | Current F.Y. Net County Cost: | \$ 0 | Budget Adjustment:      | N/A |
|                       | Annual Net County Cost:       | \$ 0 | For Fiscal Year:        | N/A |

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>SOURCE OF FUNDS:</b> N/A | <b>Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30</b> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| APPROVE                     | <b>Requires 4/5 Vote</b> <input type="checkbox"/>                |

**C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:**  
BY   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tina Grande  
**County Executive Office Signature**

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL  
BY: MICHELLE CLACK  
DATE: 12/3/09  
Departmental Concurrence

Dept't Recomm.:  Consent  Policy

Per Exec. Ofc.:  Consent  Policy

**Prev. Agn. Ref.:** | **District:** FIRST | **Agenda Number:** 3.58

**RESOLUTION NO. 2009-339  
CERTIFYING SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 507  
AND APPROVING  
TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 33530R1**

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to the provisions of applicable law, a public hearing was held before the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in Riverside, California on December 22, 2009 to consider Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530R1.

**WHEREAS**, all the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, (CEQA), and Riverside County CEQA implementing procedures have been satisfied, and Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) No. 507, prepared in connection with Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530R1 (referred to alternatively herein as "the project"), is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially significant effects of the project on the environment and measures necessary to avoid or substantially lessen such effects have been evaluated in accordance with the above-referenced Act and Procedures; and,

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

**BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside, in regular session assembled on December 22, 2009 that:

- A. Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530R1 is a Schedule E subdivision located north of Nuevo Road, south of Citrus Avenue, west of Harvill Avenue, and east of Webster Avenue. Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530R1 proposes to revise Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530, which was previously approved by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors on July 3, 2007. Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530 was approved to subdivide 63.49 acres, of which 16.24 acres are currently proceeding with development under Plot Plan No. 23170. The remaining 47.25 acres of previously-approved Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530, along with an additional 57.2 acres, are included within the boundaries of proposed Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530R1. Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530R1 proposes the subdivision of approximately 104.45 acres into nine (9) parcels, in addition to roadways and other infrastructure improvements needed to

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL  
BY: MICHELLE CLACK  
DATE: 12/23/09

1 accommodate the future development of light industrial and warehouse distribution business  
2 center land uses.

3 B. Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530R1 is associated with Plot Plan No. 23332 which identifies the  
4 location and orientation of buildings proposed on the site. Two versions of Plot Plan No. 23332  
5 are proposed for subsequent consideration by the Planning Director. Option A proposes the  
6 construction of eight buildings, and Option B proposes the construction of six buildings. The  
7 primary difference between these two options occurs in the western portion of the site, where  
8 Option A consists of three smaller buildings and Option B consists of one large building. Both  
9 options propose a total of 2,124,774 square feet (s.f.) of building space, as well as the installation  
10 of surface parking areas and drive aisles, loading docks, roadway improvements, traffic controls,  
11 utility infrastructure, landscaping, water quality/detention basins, and other site improvements.

12 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental  
13 impacts associated with the project are potentially significant unless otherwise indicated, but each of these  
14 impacts will be avoided or substantially lessened by the identified mitigation measures:

15 A. Land Use and Planning

16 1. Impacts.

17 The project is consistent with its zoning classification of "Industrial Park (I-  
18 P)" as applied by County Ordinance No. 348 to approximately 96.7 acres of  
19 the project site. The remaining 7.75 acres of the project site are classified  
20 by County Ordinance No. 348 as "Light Agriculture, one-acre minimum lot  
21 size (A-1-1)" and "Residential Agriculture, one-acre minimum lot size (R-  
22 A-1)" and the light industrial and warehouse distribution business center  
23 uses proposed by the project would not be consistent with these  
24 classifications. Inconsistencies with the A-1-1 and R-A-1 zoning  
25 classifications will be lessened to below a level of significance with the  
26 application of the mitigation measure listed below.  
27  
28

1 The project is consistent with its land use designation of "Business Park  
2 (BP)" as applied by the Riverside County General Plan and the Mead  
3 Valley Area Plan. The project is also consistent with all applicable General  
4 Plan and Area Plan policies related to the physical environment. There will  
5 be no impact related to General Plan or Area Plan consistency.

6 The project is located in the Redevelopment Agency for the County of  
7 Riverside's I-215 Corridor Project Area, and development of the project as  
8 proposed would advance the goal of Riverside County to promote infill  
9 development in this area. There will be no impact related to  
10 Redevelopment Plan consistency.

11 The project will not generate population growth beyond that envisioned to  
12 occur in the Mead Valley Area Plan. The project will provide additional  
13 employment opportunities, improving the County's jobs to housing balance.  
14 There will be no adverse impact related to growth inducement or jobs to  
15 housing balance.

16 The project site is located in the Western Riverside County Multiple  
17 Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) area, but is not within the MSHCP  
18 Criteria area and is not designated for open space preservation. The project  
19 complies with all MSHCP requirements. There will be a less than  
20 significant impact related to compliance with the MSHCP.

21 The project site is not located near a proposed Community and  
22 Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP)  
23 transportation corridor. Therefore, there will be no impact related to  
24 CETAP consistency.

25 The project is consistent with the growth projections envisioned in the  
26 Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) Regional  
27

1 Comprehensive Plan and Guide, and no inconsistency with SCAG's  
2 Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide will occur:

3 The project site is located in the City of Perris sphere of influence. The  
4 City of Perris General Plan designates the site as "Neighborhood  
5 Commercial (NC)" in the east, "Light Industrial (LI)" in the center and  
6 southeast portions, "Business Park (BP)" in the west and southwest portions  
7 of the site, and "Single-Family Residential, 10,000 s.f. minimum (R-  
8 10,000)" in the westernmost and northern parcels. Inconsistency with the  
9 City's Residential and Neighborhood Commercial designations is  
10 considered a less than significant impact because the City of Perris General  
11 Plan does not govern development of the site.

12 The project site is located within the March Air Force Base (AFB) sphere  
13 of influence. On November 20, 2008, the Riverside County Airport Land  
14 Use Commission (ALUC) found the project to be consistent with the  
15 requirements of the AFB ALUC, and issued conditions of approval that will  
16 be enforced with implementation of the project. Satisfaction of the ALUC  
17 conditions would be required and would ensure that significant impacts  
18 would not occur as a result of project implementation.

19 The project site is located within the Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting  
20 Policy Area. Potential impacts to the Mount Palomar Observatory from the  
21 project's artificial lighting will be below a level of significance with  
22 mandatory compliance to County Ordinance No. 655.

23  
24 2. Mitigation.

25 The project has been modified to mitigate or avoid potentially significant  
26 impacts by the following mitigation measure, which is hereby adopted and  
27 will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation, Monitoring, and  
28 Reporting Program.

- 1 a. Prior to recordation of Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530R1, the  
2 zoning classification of four existing parcels (APNs 305-180-009,  
3 305-180-016, 305-180-017, and 322-280-001), shall be changed to  
4 Industrial Park (I-P).

5 B. Aesthetics

6 1. Impacts.

7 The project site contains no visually prominent features or scenic resources;  
8 therefore, project implementation will result in a less than significant  
9 impact to on-site scenic features and resources.

10 The project site is not located adjacent to a scenic highway corridor and will  
11 not be highly visible from a scenic highway corridor. Therefore, the project  
12 would have a less than significant impact to scenic highways.

13 The project will not obstruct or degrade views of an existing scenic resource  
14 or vista due to the project site's distance from such views and resources.  
15 Public views to scenic resources (the San Bernardino and Lakeview  
16 Mountains to the east and Gavilan Hills to the west) would remain possible  
17 from public roadways and these views would not be substantially obscured  
18 by the project. Impacts to off-site scenic resources would be less than  
19 significant.

20 The project will not be visually offensive. Landscaping and architectural  
21 articulation is proposed to create visual interest and avoid the appearance of  
22 long, box-like structures when the project area is viewed from off-site  
23 locations. However, the positioning of a 12-foot high noise attenuation/  
24 screen wall along a portion of the southern site boundary has the potential  
25 to be considered visually offensive, and is identified as a significant visual  
26 quality impact. Impacts associated with the construction of this 12-foot  
27  
28

1 high noise attenuation/screen wall will be lessened to below a level of  
2 significance with the application of the mitigation measures listed below.

3 The project site is located within the Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting  
4 Policy Area. Potential impacts to the Mount Palomar Observatory from the  
5 project's artificial lighting will be below a level of significance with  
6 mandatory compliance to County Ordinance No. 655.

7 With mandatory compliance to Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 and  
8 the lighting requirements in Ordinance No. 348, Article X, Section 10.4, the  
9 project would have a less than significant lighting impact on adjacent and  
10 nearby residential properties. Headlight glare from west-facing vehicles  
11 positioned at the A Street stop sign (future traffic light) at Harvill Avenue  
12 has the potential to occur if reflective building surfaces (glass) are not  
13 adequately screened. Impacts associated with glare from vehicular  
14 headlights will be lessened to below a level of significance with the  
15 application of the mitigation measures listed below.

16 2. Mitigation.

17 The project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially  
18 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures, which are hereby  
19 adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation, Monitoring,  
20 and Reporting Program.

- 21 a. The County shall review construction drawings and landscape plans  
22 for the Nuevo Road streetscape and southern project perimeter to  
23 ensure that noise attenuation/screen walls over six feet in height are  
24 visually softened by landscaping or include design features (such as  
25 color changes or pop outs) that reduce their visual prominence as  
26 viewed from the south.  
27  
28

1 b. Prior to the issuance of building permits for implementation of Plot  
2 Plan No 23332 (Option A), the County shall review landscaping  
3 plans and the architecture façade plans for Buildings 2, 3, and 4 to  
4 ensure the use of non-reflective building materials, or the adequate  
5 screening of reflective building materials that minimize the potential  
6 for glare from west-facing vehicle headlights at the A Street/Harvill  
7 Avenue intersection.

8 c. Prior to the issuance of building permits for implementation of Plot  
9 Plan No. 23332 (Option B), the County shall review landscaping  
10 plans and the architecture façade plans for Buildings 1, 3, and 4 to  
11 ensure the use of non-reflective building materials, or the adequate  
12 screening of reflective building materials that minimize the potential  
13 for glare from west-facing vehicle headlights at the A Street/Harvill  
14 Avenue intersection.

15 C. Agricultural Resources

16 1. Impacts.

17 The project site is not designated as an agricultural preserve under a  
18 California Land Conservation Act contract (Williamson Act). Therefore,  
19 the project has no ability to result in the conversion of an agricultural  
20 preserve to a non-agricultural use.

21 The project site is located within 300 feet of off-site properties zoned A-1-1  
22 by Riverside County, which is a zone described as being “primarily for  
23 agricultural purposes.” Mandatory compliance with Riverside County  
24 Ordinance No. 625.1 (“Right-To-Farm Ordinance”) would ensure that this  
25 potential impact is less than significant.

26 The project site is not designated by the County or the California Farmland  
27 Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) as containing Prime Farmland,  
28

1 Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, the  
2 project has no potential to convert lands having these designations to a non-  
3 agricultural use.

4 Changes to the existing environment resulting from the project would have  
5 no significant potential to cause the direct or indirect conversion of  
6 farmlands to non-agricultural use. Therefore, a significant impact related to  
7 changes in the existing environment which could result in the conversion of  
8 farmland to a non-agricultural use would not occur.

9 2. Mitigation.

10 None required.

11 D. Air Quality

12 1. Impacts.

13 Implementation of the project would generate greenhouse gas emissions  
14 resulting from construction; natural gas, electricity, water consumption, and  
15 vehicle use. Global climate change impacts are considered less than  
16 significant and less than cumulatively considerable because the project is in  
17 compliance with the December 2008 California Air Resources Board  
18 (CARB) Scoping Plan, which sets forth strategies and measures to  
19 implement in order to achieve the greenhouse gas reduction goals set forth  
20 in the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32), as well as  
21 greenhouse gas emission reduction strategies set forth in the 2006 Climate  
22 Action Team Report, prepared in response to Executive Order S-3-05,  
23 which established total GHG emissions targets for the State of California.  
24 Additionally, the project includes numerous energy reduction and  
25 environmental design features that will be applied during project  
26 construction and operation to reduce reliance on fossil fuels, the burning of  
27 which produces greenhouse gas emissions. The project's global climate  
28

1 change impacts are considered less than significant and less than  
2 cumulatively considerable.

3 The project's proposed light industrial and distribution warehouse business  
4 center land uses are not considered to be sensitive receptors. Therefore, the  
5 project will not involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located  
6 within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter, and  
7 significant impacts would not occur.

8 Project-related emissions of Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) at the point of  
9 maximum impact have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to  
10 pollutant levels in excess of SCAQMD standards. However, no sensitive  
11 receptors exist at the point of maximum impact, and direct impacts are  
12 therefore evaluated as less than significant. Cumulative impacts associated  
13 with project-related DPM emissions are addressed below under "Air  
14 Quality – Project-Specific and Cumulative."

15 With mandatory adherence to SCAQMD requirements, any potential uses  
16 that emit odors would be controlled, and reduced to below a level of  
17 significance. Any odors generated by construction of the project are  
18 considered short-term and are therefore less than significant. Furthermore,  
19 any short-term odors that may occur with operation of the project (such as  
20 temporary refuse storage) are considered short-term and are therefore less  
21 than significant.

22 2. Mitigation.

23 None required. Refer below to the mitigation measures presented under  
24 "Air Quality – Project-Specific and Cumulative" in the section discussing  
25 impacts that cannot be fully mitigated. Many of these measures would also  
26 reduce greenhouse gas emissions and odor.

27  
28 E. Biological Resources

1                   1.     Impacts.

2                   The project site is located within the Western Riverside County MSHCP  
3                   area, but is not within the MSHCP Criteria Area and is not designated for  
4                   open space preservation. The project complies with all MSHCP  
5                   requirements, and therefore the project's biological impacts related to all  
6                   MSHCP Covered Species and habitats are mitigated to a level of  
7                   insignificance.

8                   The Stephens' kangaroo rat (SKR), a federally endangered and state  
9                   threatened species, was not located on the project site during biological  
10                  field surveys. However, the site contains habitat that can support the  
11                  species. Because the project site lies within Riverside County's SKR  
12                  Habitat Conservation Plan and SKR Fee Assessment Area, the project  
13                  Applicant is required to pay fees in accordance with County Ordinance No.  
14                  633, which would reduce any impacts to the SKR to below a level of  
15                  significance.

16                 The project has the potential to impact the western burrowing owl.  
17                 Although the western burrowing owl is not present on the project site, the  
18                 species could be impacted if it migrates onto the property prior to the  
19                 commencement of ground-disturbing construction activities. With  
20                 implementation of the mitigation measures identified below, impacts to the  
21                 western burrowing owl would be reduced to below a level of significance.

22                 A Cooper's hawk nest with four fledglings was observed in a tree in the  
23                 southwest corner of the property. The hawks would be impacted if the  
24                 active nest is disturbed. With implementation of the mitigation measures  
25                 identified below, along with adherence to the federal Migratory Bird Treaty  
26                 Act, impacts to Cooper's hawk would be reduced to below a level of  
27                 significance.  
28

1 Other candidate, sensitive, or special status species observed on the site or  
2 with potential to occur on the site are Covered Species under the MSHCP.  
3 The potential of the project to impact migratory nesting birds is considered  
4 a significant impact if active nests are disturbed during project construction.  
5 Mandatory compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act,  
6 payment of the MSHCP Mitigation Fee in accordance with Riverside  
7 County Ordinance No. 810.2, and implementation of the mitigation  
8 measures identified below, would reduce project impacts to migratory  
9 nesting birds and MSHCP Covered Species to a level below significant.  
10 There is no potential for the project to interfere with the movement of fish  
11 or impede the use of a native wildlife nursery site. The project would also  
12 not have the ability to interfere with an established migratory wildlife  
13 corridor or result in wildlife movement impacts on the MSHCP Preserve.  
14 There would be no adverse effects on sensitive natural plant communities  
15 because none of the vegetation types found on the project site are  
16 considered sensitive. Additionally, no riparian areas or wetlands are  
17 located on the property. Significant impacts to sensitive natural plant  
18 communities and riparian/wetland habitat would not occur.  
19 The project would not result in impacts to federally protected wetlands  
20 because the project site does not contain any federal or state jurisdictional  
21 waters or wetlands and does not contain any habitats meeting the MSHCP  
22 definition for riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools; therefore, a significant  
23 impact would not occur.  
24 The project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances  
25 governing biological resources, and a significant impact would not occur.  
26

27 2. Mitigation.  
28

1 The project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially  
2 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures, which are hereby  
3 adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation, Monitoring,  
4 and Reporting Program.

5 a. Pursuant to Objective 6 of the Species Account for the burrowing  
6 owl included in the Western Riverside County Multiple Species  
7 Habitat Conservation Plan, within 30 days prior to the issuance of a  
8 grading permit, a pre-construction presence/absence survey for the  
9 burrowing owl shall be conducted. The survey shall be conducted by  
10 a qualified biologist and the results of this presence/absence survey  
11 shall be provided in writing to the Environmental Programs  
12 Department (EPD) at Riverside County. If it is determined that the  
13 project site is occupied by burrowing owl, take of "active" nests  
14 shall be avoided pursuant to the MSHCP and the Migratory Bird  
15 Treaty Act. However, when the burrowing owl is present, relocation  
16 outside of the nesting season (March 1 through August 31) by a  
17 qualified biologist shall be required. The County Biologist shall be  
18 consulted to determine appropriate type of relocation (active or  
19 passive) in accordance with accepted protocol. If burrowing owls  
20 are found on the project site before grading, a grading permit may be  
21 issued once the County Biologist specifies the protocol to be  
22 followed and the applicant follows this protocol. If the grading  
23 permit is not obtained within 30 days of the survey, a new survey  
24 shall be required.

25  
26 b. If vegetation that is suitable for migratory bird nesting is to be  
27 removed during the nesting season (recognized from February 1  
28 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird

1 survey of potentially suitable nesting vegetation three (3) days prior  
2 to vegetation removal. If active nests are identified during nesting  
3 bird surveys, then the nesting vegetation shall be avoided until the  
4 nesting event has completed and the juveniles can survive  
5 independently from the nest. The biologist shall flag the nesting  
6 vegetation and shall establish an adequate buffer (e.g., construction  
7 fencing) around the nesting vegetation. The size of the buffer shall  
8 be based on the type of bird nesting (i.e., raptors shall be afforded  
9 larger buffers). Clearing/grading shall not occur within the buffer  
10 until the nesting event has completed, which shall be determined by  
11 the qualified biologist.

12 F. Cultural Resources

13 1. Impacts.

14 No known historic sites or resources as defined in California Code of  
15 Regulations Section 15064.5 are present on the project site. Therefore,  
16 implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts to  
17 historic resources or sites.

18 No important or unique archaeological resources are known to be present at  
19 the project site. However, three archaeological sites were identified during  
20 field surveys of the project site, although these sites were determined to be  
21 neither important nor unique. Therefore, the loss of two of these sites and a  
22 portion of a third site by project construction would be less than significant.  
23 Because the area is considered archaeologically sensitive, the potential  
24 exists for the discovery of additional archaeological sites beneath the  
25 surface of the project site during earthmoving construction activities. If  
26 important or unique archaeological sites are unearthed during construction,  
27 a significant impact to those sites has the potential to occur. Impacts will be  
28

1 reduced to below a level of significance with the application of the  
2 mitigation measures listed below

3 No human remains have been discovered at the project site and no human  
4 remains are known to be buried beneath the surface of the site. If human  
5 remains are uncovered during ground disturbing construction activities and  
6 are determined to be of Native American decent, compliance with  
7 California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety  
8 Code Sections 8010-8011 would reduce the potential impact to below a level  
9 of significance.

10 No existing religious or sacred uses are located on the project site;  
11 therefore, the project would not impact existing religious or sacred uses.

12 No paleontological resources were found on the project site as a result of  
13 records searches and field surveys; however, the potential exists for  
14 subsurface paleontological resources to be found during ground disturbing  
15 construction activities. If paleontological resources are uncovered and  
16 determined to be important, then a significant impact has the potential to  
17 occur. Impacts will be lessened to below a level of significance with the  
18 application of the mitigation measures listed below.

19 2. Mitigation.

20 The project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially  
21 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures, which are hereby  
22 adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation, Monitoring,  
23 and Reporting Program.

- 24 a. Prior to any clearing, grubbing, and/or earthmoving activities, a  
25 qualified archaeologist approved by the Riverside County  
26 Environmental Programs Department shall be retained by the  
27 Project Developer. The potential for discovery of archaeological  
28

1 resources beneath the surface of the site is high; therefore,  
2 consultation with the appropriate Native American tribe (Pechanga  
3 Band of Luiseño Indians) is required to continue until the  
4 completion of ground-disturbing construction activities or until all  
5 parties agree that consultation has been completed, whichever  
6 occurs sooner. The archaeologist shall conduct a pre-grading  
7 meeting with the grading contractor and invite representatives of  
8 the Pechanga Band to attend for the purpose of ensuring an  
9 understanding of the mitigation measures required during  
10 earthmoving activities and construction.

11 b. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the qualified archaeologist  
12 shall develop a mitigation plan and a discovery clause/treatment  
13 plan, which shall include mitigation monitoring to be implemented  
14 during earthmoving on the project site. The treatment plan shall  
15 be developed in consultation with the Pechanga Band of Luiseño  
16 Indians and shall account for the treatment of any archaeological  
17 remains and associated data uncovered by brushing, grubbing, or  
18 earthmoving.

19 c. The Project Developer shall enter into a cultural resources  
20 treatment and monitoring agreement with the Pechanga Band of  
21 Luiseño Indians. The agreement(s) shall address tribal monitoring  
22 requirements and treatment and disposition of all archaeological  
23 resources discovered during earthmoving and grading activities.

24 d. In accordance with the Agreement entered into pursuant to  
25 Mitigation Measure MM 4.6-3, Native American monitors from  
26 the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians shall be allowed to monitor  
27 all grading, excavation, and ground-breaking activities. Native  
28

1 American monitors from the Soboba Band of Mission Indians  
2 shall also be allowed to monitor all grading, excavation, and  
3 ground-breaking activities. The Native American monitors will  
4 have the authority to temporarily stop and redirect grading  
5 activities to evaluate the significance of any archaeological sites or  
6 resources discovered on the property, in conjunction with the  
7 consulting archaeologist and the Riverside County Archaeologist.

8 e. The landowner shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources,  
9 including all archaeological artifacts that are of Native American  
10 origin, found in the project area to the Pechanga Band of Luiseño  
11 Indians for proper treatment and disposition, upon submittal of a  
12 Phase IV Archaeological Monitoring report to the County  
13 Archaeologist.

14 f. Monitoring by the qualified archaeologists and tribal monitor(s)  
15 shall be conducted on a full-time basis for all grading and ground-  
16 disturbing activities, including archaeological testing, until the  
17 project archaeologist in consultation with the Pechanga Band of  
18 Luiseño Indians and the County of Riverside determines that  
19 resources are not likely to be discovered.

20 g. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, Riverside County shall  
21 review the project's grading plan to confirm that a portion of site  
22 P-33-017181 is preserved in place and left undisturbed by grading  
23 activities, as depicted on approved Tentative Parcel Map No.  
24 33530R1. The project applicant shall offer to convey the  
25 preserved portion of this site to the County and shall agree to  
26 provide for maintenance of the site through the project CC&Rs. If  
27 the County does not accept the conveyance, the project applicant  
28

1 shall offer to convey the preserved portion of the site to the  
2 Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians.

- 3 h. If a previously unknown archaeological site or resource is  
4 encountered or unearthed during project grading or construction  
5 and it requires additional mitigation beyond the methods outlined  
6 in the treatment plan to reduce impacts to below a level of  
7 significance, a plan or proposal shall be prepared by the qualified  
8 archaeologist, in consultation with the Pechanga Band of Luiseño  
9 Indians, the County of Riverside Archaeologist, and the County of  
10 Riverside Planning Director, outlining the plan of action that needs  
11 to be implemented to mitigate the new site or resource. Prior to  
12 approval of the supplemental cultural resources recovery plan,  
13 grading activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural  
14 resource(s) shall be prohibited. Grading and further ground  
15 disturbance shall not resume within the area of discovery until an  
16 agreement has been reached by all parties as to the appropriate  
17 mitigation for the discovered site. If the Developer and the  
18 Pechanga Band cannot agree on the significance of the site or  
19 resource, or the mitigation for such sites or resources, these issues  
20 will be presented to the Riverside County Planning Director for  
21 decision. The Planning Director shall make the determination  
22 based on the provisions of the California Environmental Quality  
23 Act with respect to archaeological resources and shall take into  
24 account the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the  
25 Pechanga Band. The Project Developer shall follow all mitigation  
26 measures that the Riverside County Planning Director decides are  
27 necessary to reduce impacts to below a level of significance.  
28

- 1 i. Archaeological resources recovered during grading and ground-  
2 disturbing construction activities that are not considered  
3 ceremonial or sacred by the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians  
4 shall be identified, recorded, mapped, and artifacts catalogued as  
5 required by standard archaeological practices. Examination by an  
6 archaeological specialist shall be included where necessary,  
7 dependent upon the artifacts, features or sites that are encountered  
8 and in consultation with the Pechanga Band. Specialists shall  
9 identify, date, and/or determine CEQA significance potential, in  
10 consultation with the Pechanga Band.
- 11 j. At the completion of earthmoving activities, a final report of  
12 findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist for submission to  
13 the Eastern Information Center and the County of Riverside  
14 Archaeologist. The report shall describe parcel history,  
15 summarize field and laboratory methods used, if applicable, and  
16 include any testing or special analysis information conducted to  
17 support the findings.
- 18 k. A trained paleontological monitor approved by Riverside County  
19 shall be retained by the Project Developer and shall be present on  
20 the project site during all ground-disturbing construction activities  
21 within sediments that are determined by the paleontological  
22 monitor and shown on the Riverside County Paleontological  
23 Sensitivity Map to likely contain paleontological resources.  
24 Monitoring shall be conducted initially on a half-time basis. If  
25 fossil resources are encountered, the monitoring shall increase to  
26 full time. If too few or no fossil remains are recovered,  
27  
28

1 monitoring may be reduced or suspended once 50% of  
2 earthmoving activities are completed.

3 l. If paleontological resources are discovered or suspected, the  
4 paleontological monitor shall have the authority to temporarily  
5 halt or redirect construction activities to ensure the avoidance of  
6 adverse impacts. If the monitor is not on the project site when the  
7 fossil remains are uncovered, earthmoving activities shall be  
8 diverted around the fossil site and the monitor shall be called to  
9 the site immediately. The paleontological monitor shall be  
10 equipped to remove any large fossil specimens encountered during  
11 excavation.

12 m. During monitoring, samples shall be collected and processed to  
13 recover microrvertebrate fossils (small fossil remains). Processing  
14 shall include wet screen washing and microscopic examination of  
15 the residual materials to identify small vertebrate remains.

16 n. If a large deposition of bone is encountered, salvage of all bone in  
17 the area shall be conducted with additional paleontological field  
18 staff and in accordance with modern paleontological techniques.

19 o. All fossils collected from the project site shall be prepared to a  
20 reasonable point of identification by a trained paleontologist.  
21 Excess sediment or matrix would be removed from the specimens  
22 to reduce the bulk and cost of specimen storage. The specimens  
23 and itemized catalogs of all material collected and identified shall  
24 be offered to an accredited museum repository for permanent  
25 curation and storage. If accredited museums decline to accept the  
26 specimens after a reasonable number of attempts are made to offer  
27 the specimens, the trained paleontologist in consultation with the  
28

1 Riverside County Environmental Programs Department shall  
2 determine an alternative acceptable location for storage.

3 p. A report documenting the results of the monitoring and salvage  
4 activities, and the significance of the fossils, shall be prepared and  
5 submitted to the Project Developer and the Riverside County  
6 Environmental Programs Department. One copy of the report also  
7 shall accompany any fossils transmitted to a museum repository.

8 G. Geology and Soils

9 1. Impacts.

10 The project site is suitable for development from a geotechnical standpoint,  
11 and would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects;  
12 therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

13 No known active or potentially active faults traverse the site, and the site is  
14 not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; therefore, the  
15 potential for ground rupture of the project site does not exist, and no  
16 impacts would occur.

17 The potential for the project site to be impacted by seismically-induced  
18 ground failure and soil liquefaction is very low due to the depth of the  
19 groundwater table and composition of the site's soils. Therefore, impacts  
20 related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be  
21 less than significant.

22 The principal geologic hazard that could affect the site is ground shaking  
23 resulting from a seismic event. With the construction of structures in  
24 compliance with the Riverside County Building Code and the California  
25 Building Code, buildings would be designed not to collapse as the result of  
26 seismic ground shaking. With these standard regulatory requirements,  
27

1 impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than  
2 significant.

3 The project site's near-surface fill soils and alluvium are subject to  
4 significant collapse when exposed to moisture infiltration and subject to  
5 consolidation when exposed to load (weight) increases in the range of those  
6 that would be exerted by the foundations of the proposed project's  
7 buildings. This is evaluated as a significant impact. However, with  
8 implementation of the mitigation measures identified below, impacts would  
9 be reduced to less than significant levels. There are no other geologic  
10 conditions on site that would become unstable as a result of the project that  
11 could result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or  
12 rockfall hazards.

13 Soils on the site have the potential to contain concentrations of soluble  
14 sulfates that can be corrosive to concrete and some metals. If high  
15 concentrations of soluble sulfates are present and come in direct contact  
16 with building materials susceptible to corrosion, damage to the building  
17 materials may occur. These soil conditions are evaluated as a significant  
18 impact of project development. Implementation of the mitigation measures  
19 identified below would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.  
20 There are no other geologic conditions on-site which could result in impacts  
21 associated with ground subsidence.

22 Due to the site's location from the Pacific Ocean and other large bodies of  
23 water, there is no potential for tsunami, seiche, volcanic hazards, or  
24 mudflow to occur. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

25 Upon development of the project, the site's topography would be changed  
26 and manufactured slopes would be created. Manufactured slopes would be  
27 constructed at a maximum gradient of 2:1. The change in topography  
28

1 would not create any adverse environmental effects, and the manufactured  
2 slopes would be stable. Therefore, significant impacts associated with  
3 changed topography or the creation of unstable cut or fill slopes would be  
4 less than significant.

5 No subsurface sewage systems are known to exist on the site that could be  
6 negated by project grading; no significant impact would occur.

7 Soils would be particularly prone to water and wind erosion during grading  
8 and site development, especially during heavy rains and on steep slopes.  
9 With the application of mandatory regulatory requirements, including the  
10 preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, erosion impacts would be less  
11 than significant.

12 The project would not be impacted by expansive soils because the site's  
13 soils consist of silty sands that possess a very low expansion potential  
14 (expansion index equal to zero). Therefore, impacts associated with  
15 expansive soils would be less than significant.

16 Two water quality/detention basins are proposed to filter sediment from  
17 water prior to it leaving the site. Any change in water volume or velocity of  
18 the San Jacinto River compared to existing conditions would be negligible.  
19 Therefore, rivers, channels, streams, or lakes will not be measurably  
20 affected by the project, and impacts would be less than significant.

21  
22 2. Mitigation.

23 The project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially  
24 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures, which are hereby  
25 adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation, Monitoring,  
26 and Reporting Program.

- 27 a. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a final geotechnical and  
28 soils report shall be prepared by a qualified geotechnical consultant

1 for review and approval by the County Geologist that addresses  
2 recommendations for site grading based on proposed locations and  
3 designs of building foundations and slabs. All grading and  
4 construction shall be performed in accordance with applicable  
5 provisions of the approved report.

6 b. Remedial grading (removal and compaction) shall be performed as  
7 described in the project's geotechnical report, including the  
8 following:

- 9 1. Remedial grading is recommended to be performed within the  
10 new building pad areas. Over excavate existing soils within the  
11 building areas to a depth of five (5) feet below existing grade  
12 (six (6)± feet within the Dodson and Newton parcels) and to a  
13 depth of three (3) feet below proposed pad grade. Over excavate  
14 soils within the proposed foundation influence zones to a depth  
15 of three (3) feet below proposed foundation bearing grade.
- 16 2. After over excavation has been completed, the resulting  
17 subgrade soils should be evaluated by a geotechnical engineer to  
18 identify any additional soils that should be over excavated.  
19 Previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted  
20 structural fill.
- 21 3. Scarify, thoroughly moisture, condition, and recompact parking  
22 area subgrade soils to a depth of 12± inches and to at least 90%  
23 of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density.
- 24 4. Over excavate existing soils within the areas of proposed  
25 retaining to a depth of two (2) feet below foundation bearing  
26 grade and replace the soil as compacted structural fill, as  
27 discussed above for proposed building pad areas.  
28

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

5. Over excavate subgrade soils in areas of non-retaining site walls to a depth of one (1) foot below proposed bearing grade.

6. The over excavation subgrade soils shall be evaluated by a qualified geotechnical engineer prior to scarifying, moisture conditioning, and recompacting the upper 12 inches of exposed subgrade soils. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill.

c. Manufactured slopes shall include terrace drains at appropriate intervals, as designed by a civil engineer. Locations of terrace drains shall be shown on grading plans.

d. A qualified geotechnical consultant shall be retained by the project developer to be present on the site to observe and/or test geologic and soil conditions during various stages of construction, including but not limited to initial site clearance, overexcavation work, removal of compressible soils, fill placement and compaction, moisture conditioning, soil compaction, footing excavations, and trenching backfills.

e. The upper portion of the topsoil/alluvial soils shall be removed to depths of competent soils in all areas to receive fill or settlement-sensitive improvements. Deleterious material and porous soils shall be completely removed if encountered at the bottom of grading areas. After required removals, the exposed ground surface shall be scarified to a minimum depth of 12 inches, moisture-conditioned to slightly above optimum moisture content and compacted to at least 90% of the maximum dry density. Fill soils may then be placed and compacted in layers to the design finish grade elevations.

- 1 f. Cut and fill slopes shall not have inclinations steeper than 2:1  
2 (horizontal: vertical).
- 3 g. Initial site preparation should include stripping of any topsoil,  
4 surficial vegetation (native grass and weed growth), and trees  
5 (including any root masses); these materials shall be disposed of off  
6 site or in non-structural areas of the property.
- 7 h. To avoid soil saturation beneath structures, building pads shall be  
8 properly finish graded after the buildings and other improvements  
9 are in place so that drainage is directed away from foundations,  
10 pavements, concrete slabs, and slope tops to controlled devices.
- 11 i. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, soil samples shall be tested  
12 for corrosion. If improvements susceptible to corrosion (such as  
13 concrete and metals) are planned to be in contact with soils having  
14 corrosion characteristics, further evaluation by a corrosion engineer  
15 shall be performed. These results and the recommendations from  
16 the corrosion engineer shall be reviewed and approved by the  
17 County Geologist and forwarded to the appropriate design team  
18 members (i.e. project architect, engineer, etc.) for incorporation into  
19 the building plans and implemented during construction.
- 20 j. After the completion of rough grading, soils shall be tested for  
21 soluble sulfates. If soluble sulfates are found to be present and if  
22 improvements susceptible to corrosion are planned in direct contact  
23 with soil or water containing high concentrations of soluble sulfates,  
24 specialized concrete mix designs shall be used as recommended by a  
25 qualified geotechnical engineer.
- 26 k. If soil is imported, it should be no more expansive or corrosive than  
27 the on-site materials. Imported soil should be free of organic  
28

1 material and construction debris, and not contain rock larger than 12  
2 inches in maximum dimension. Import soil shall be sampled and  
3 approved by the project's geotechnical consultant prior to its  
4 transportation to the site.

5 H. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

6 1. Impacts.

7 There are no known existing site conditions that could expose people or the  
8 environment to toxic substances or hazardous materials. During grading,  
9 the potential exists for the discovery of buried hazardous materials, and the  
10 potential discovery of such materials is evaluated as a significant impact.  
11 Implementation of the mitigation measures identified below would reduce  
12 this impact to less than significant levels.

13 With mandatory adherence to blasting requirements, no hazardous materials  
14 releases would occur from blasting activities. Also, improper use,  
15 transportation, and handling of hazardous materials have the potential to  
16 occur during construction. If businesses that use or store hazardous  
17 materials occupy buildings on the project site, the business owners and  
18 operators would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and  
19 local regulations to ensure proper use, storage, emission, and disposal of  
20 hazardous substances. With mandatory regulatory compliance, the project  
21 is not expected to pose a significant hazard to the public or the  
22 environment.

23 No emergency facilities exist on the project site, and the site does not serve  
24 as an emergency evacuation route. As such, project implementation would  
25 not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan  
26 or emergency evacuation plan. With approval by the Riverside County Fire  
27 Department, appropriate emergency ingress and egress would be available  
28

1 to and from each parcel and building on the project site to ensure public  
2 safety. Therefore, impacts related to emergency response plans and  
3 emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant.

4 Although the project site is located within one-quarter mile of three schools,  
5 future on-site businesses that may use or store hazardous materials would  
6 be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local  
7 regulations to ensure proper use, storage, and disposal of hazardous  
8 substances. With mandatory regulatory compliance, hazardous materials  
9 impacts to nearby schools would be less than significant.

10 The project site is not listed on any list of hazardous materials compiled  
11 pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, indicating no significant  
12 impacts would occur.

13 The project site is located within the influence area of March Air Reserve  
14 Base. The project was reviewed by the Riverside County Airport Land Use  
15 Commission, which determined that the project is consistent with the  
16 airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). Therefore, impacts  
17 associated with potential conflicts with an Airport Master Plan, Airport  
18 Land Use Commission policies, or safety hazards to existing public airport  
19 facilities would be less than significant. In addition, the project site is not  
20 located in the vicinity of a private airstrip or heliport, indicating no impacts  
21 to such facilities would occur.

22 Proposed on-site structures would be separated from off-site wildfire hazard  
23 zones by paved areas, irrigated and drought-resistant landscaped areas,  
24 roadway right-of-ways, and walls; therefore, the project would not expose  
25 people and structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death related to  
26 wildfire.

27 Mitigation.  
28

1 The project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially  
2 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures, which are hereby  
3 adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation, Monitoring,  
4 and Reporting Program.

- 5 a. Any hazardous or potentially hazardous material encountered during  
6 site clearing, soil removal, and/or grading shall be evaluated by an  
7 experienced environmental consultant prior to removal, and shall be  
8 properly disposed of in accordance with federal, state and Riverside  
9 County Department of Environmental Health requirements.
- 10 b. In the event that any subsurface hazardous materials are found  
11 during grading or construction, all activity in the area of discovery  
12 and/or in an appropriate radius of the area of discovery shall  
13 temporarily cease and the County of Riverside Department of  
14 Environmental Health shall be notified. Prior to the resumption of  
15 any grading and/or construction activity in the area of discovery, the  
16 site shall be deemed safe by the Riverside County Department of  
17 Environmental Health.
- 18 c. If soil is to be exported to, from, or within the site during grading  
19 and other construction activities, the transported soil shall be  
20 sampled for contaminants (including petroleum hydrocarbons and  
21 VOCs) prior to proposed use or disposal and handled in accordance  
22 with prevailing environmental laws and regulations, including Land  
23 Disposal Restrictions, if applicable.
- 24 d. Users of hazardous materials such as paints, roofing materials and  
25 solvents during construction shall comply with applicable federal,  
26 state, and local regulation requiring elimination and reduction of  
27 waste at the source by prevention of leakage and by segregation of  
28

1 hazardous wastes. To ensure compliance, a Construction Waste  
2 Management Plan shall be prepared and enforced by the  
3 construction superintendent.

- 4 e. The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) required for the  
5 project (see SEIR Subsection 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality)  
6 shall include emergency procedures for accidental hazardous  
7 materials releases during construction. The procedures shall include  
8 necessary personal protective equipment, spill containment  
9 procedures, and training of workers to respond to accidental  
10 spills/releases. The SWPPP also shall include Best Management  
11 Practices for hazardous materials storage during construction to  
12 minimize the potential for releases to occur.

13 I. Hydrology and Water Quality

14 1. Impacts.

15 With implementation of the proposed project, the drainage pattern of the  
16 site would not be substantially altered and there would be no alteration of a  
17 stream or river course. As such, there would be no direct or indirect erosion  
18 effects and no increased potential for flooding.

19 The project would install storm drain facilities, including two water  
20 quality/detention basins, so that runoff flows would not exceed the capacity  
21 of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Additionally, the  
22 project is required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan  
23 (SWPPP) and obtain coverage under Construction General Permit No. 99-  
24 08-DWQ and to implement source control and treatment control BMPs as  
25 specified in its Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP); all water quality  
26 impacts would be below a level of significance.  
27  
28

1 The project would not install any water wells or physically impact any  
2 existing wells. project grading would not extend to the depth of the  
3 groundwater table and water would continue to percolate into the  
4 groundwater table in the same general manner as planned by Perris Valley  
5 MDP. The project would, therefore, not result in any impacts associated  
6 with the depletion or substantial interference with groundwater recharge or  
7 groundwater supplies.

8 The project site is not located within a 100-year or 500-year Flood Hazard  
9 Area as mapped by the County or FEMA; therefore, no impacts associated  
10 with flood hazards would occur.

11 The project would not expose people or structures to a significant loss,  
12 injury, or death involving flooding because the site is not located in mapped  
13 flood zones or dam inundation zones and no new flood hazards would be  
14 created by project construction or operation; therefore, a significant impact  
15 would not occur.

16 The project would comply with all water quality standards and would not  
17 otherwise adversely affect water quality in the area. With the mandatory  
18 requirements to obtain coverage under Construction General Permit No. 99-  
19 08-DWQ, prepare and implement a SWPPP, and implement source control  
20 and treatment control BMPs as specified in the project's WQMP, surface-  
21 and groundwater quality impacts would be below a level of significance.

22 The operation of the proposed Treatment Control Best Management  
23 Practices will not result in significant environmental effects. The two  
24 proposed water quality/detention basins will be designed to infiltrate or  
25 drain within the required 48 hours after storm events. Therefore, the  
26 inclusion of new stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices  
27

1 as proposed by the project will not result in significant environmental  
2 effects, including increased vectors and/or odors.

3 The project would not cause significant changes to absorption rates.  
4 Although the rate and amount of surface runoff would be changed by the  
5 project, this change would not cause or create adverse effects to any  
6 element of the physical environment; impacts would be less than  
7 significant.

8 Construction and operation of the project would not result in a measurable  
9 change to the amount of surface water in any water body, and such impacts  
10 would be less than significant.

11 2. Mitigation.

12 None required.

13 J. Noise

14 1. Impacts.

15 The project site is within the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence  
16 Area Safety Zone Area III, but as an industrial and warehouse distribution  
17 business center, the project site is not considered to be a noise-sensitive  
18 land use. As such, single event noise levels from periodic aircraft  
19 overflight would not significantly impact the proposed project.

20 The project site is located approximately 2.1 miles northwest of the  
21 privately-owned public use Perris Valley Airport, but as an industrial and  
22 warehouse distribution business center, the project site is not considered to  
23 be a noise-sensitive land use. As such, single event noise levels from  
24 periodic aircraft overflight would not significantly impact the proposed  
25 project.  
26  
27  
28

1 The project is not considered to be a noise-sensitive land use; therefore,  
2 proposed uses on the project site would not be significantly impacted by  
3 noise.

4 During project construction, noise impacts to surrounding land uses would  
5 be reduced to below a significant level through mandatory compliance with  
6 County Ordinance No. 847 and the mitigation measures specified below.

7 During project operation, stationary noise impacts could occur to  
8 surrounding noise sensitive land uses from noise sources such as truck  
9 loading, operations with forklifts, and truck movements; therefore, the  
10 project's contributions to surrounding noise sensitive land uses would be  
11 significant. Implementation of the mitigation measures listed below would  
12 ensure that operational noise impacts are reduced to less than significant  
13 levels.

14 Traffic generated by the project would not increase noise levels on public  
15 roads by the "barely perceptible" level of 3.0 dBA CNEL; therefore, the  
16 project's contributions to off-site roadway noise increases would be less  
17 than significant.

18 Because of the proximity of portions of Building 6 to the BNSF railroad  
19 line, Building 6 has the potential to experience vibration levels that would  
20 interfere with vibration-sensitive activities and precision equipment. Long-  
21 term impacts related to railroad vibration are potentially significant for  
22 tenants located in Building 6. Implementation of the mitigation measure  
23 listed below would reduce this impact to less than significant levels.

24 Because of the potential for nearby sensitive receptors to be impacted by  
25 vibration as a result of rock blasting during construction activities, short-  
26 term impacts are regarded as significant. Implementation of the mitigation  
27

1 measures listed below would reduce this impact to less than significant  
2 levels.

3 2. Mitigation.

4 The project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially  
5 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures, which are hereby  
6 adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation, Monitoring,  
7 and Reporting Program.

- 8 a. Prior to construction activities, the Project Developer shall prepare a  
9 construction noise mitigation program to be implemented  
10 throughout project construction. This program shall include noise  
11 monitoring at selected noise sensitive locations, monitoring of  
12 complaints, and identification and mitigation of the major sources of  
13 noise.
- 14 b. Concurrent with excavation and grading activities, construction  
15 contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile,  
16 with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with  
17 manufactures' standards.
- 18 c. Concurrent with all construction activities, the construction  
19 contractor shall locate all stationary construction equipment so that  
20 emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the  
21 project site (residential homes located to the west and south).
- 22 d. Concurrent with construction activities, the construction contractor  
23 shall limit haul deliveries of construction materials to the same  
24 hours specified for construction activity by Riverside County  
25 Ordinance No. 847. To the extent feasible, construction material  
26 haul vehicles should not use Nuevo Road or Webster Avenue  
27 adjacent to the project boundary and haul routes in general should  
28

1 not pass sensitive land uses or residential dwellings when another  
2 feasible route is available.

3 e. Construction activity on West Nuevo Road west of "A" Street shall  
4 be limited to vehicular and truck traffic. This restriction shall be  
5 noted on all construction drawings and be specified in construction  
6 contracts.

7 f. Solid noise attenuation barriers shall be constructed along the  
8 project's northern, western, southwestern, and southern boundaries  
9 as follows. The barrier shall consist of a solid noise attenuation wall  
10 or other comparable noise attenuation barrier.

11 1. A 6-foot-high barrier shall be constructed along the entire length  
12 of the northern project boundary

13 2. A 550-foot long, 6-foot-high barrier shall be constructed along  
14 Webster Avenue from the project's northwestern corner, south  
15 along the site's western boundary. From that point a 4-foot-high  
16 barrier shall be constructed along Webster Avenue along the  
17 site's western boundary south to the southwestern corner of the  
18 site, across from the Webster Avenue/Pooley Drive intersection.

19 3. A 12-foot-high barrier shall be constructed along the entire  
20 length of the project's southern boundary where the boundary  
21 abuts residential property.

22 4. A 6-foot-high barrier shall be constructed along the southern  
23 project boundary where the boundary is adjacent to Nuevo Road.

24 5. A 12-foot-high barrier shall be constructed along the northern  
25 boundary of Parcel 8.

26 6. A 12-foot-high barrier shall be built either along the western  
27 boundary of the detention/water quality basin in Parcel 6 or  
28

1 along the southern boundary of the detention/water quality basin  
2 in Parcel 6.

3 g. As a condition of the project's occupancy permits, driveway and  
4 loading dock closures shall be required in the southwestern and  
5 southern portions of the site from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m., as follows:

6 1. For implementation of Plot Plan No. 23332 (Option A), all  
7 loading docks positioned on the southern facades of Buildings 2,  
8 and 6, and the façade of Building 7 shall be closed during the  
9 hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

10 2. For implementation of Plot Plan No. 23332 (Option A), all  
11 loading areas, driveway isles and parking areas positioned  
12 between the southern facades of Buildings 2 and 6 and the  
13 parcels' southern boundaries and the facades of Building 7 and  
14 the parcel's southern and western boundaries shall be closed  
15 during the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

16 3. For implementation of Plot Plan No. 23332 (Option B), all  
17 loading docks positioned on the southern facades of Buildings 1,  
18 and 6, and the façade of Building 7 shall be closed during the  
19 hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

20 4. For implementation of Plot Plan No. 23332 (Option B), all  
21 loading areas, driveway aisles, and parking areas positioned  
22 between the southern facades of Buildings 1 and 6 and the  
23 parcels' southern boundaries and the facades of Building 7 and  
24 the parcel's southern and western boundaries shall be closed  
25 during the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

26 h. At least 24 hours before rock blasting or drilling occur during  
27 construction activities that may affect nearby sensitive land uses  
28

1 (residential homes located west and south of the site), the project  
2 Developer or construction contractor shall post clearly visible  
3 notifications along Nuevo Road and Webster Avenue, and include  
4 contact information for questions or complaints.

- 5 i. Traditional rock blasting methods shall not occur within 200 feet of  
6 any sensitive receptor (occupied residential home). In these areas,  
7 rock breaking must be performed with non-explosive methods.
- 8 j. The project's construction contractor shall use seismographs to  
9 measure vibrations during all blasting operations, and shall design  
10 the blasting activities in order to limit the peak particle velocity to  
11 less than 2.0 inches per second.
- 12 k. Information regarding vibration effects from the BNSF railroad shall  
13 be provided to owners and tenants of Building 6 in all sales and  
14 leasing literature. Information shall disclose that Building 6 could  
15 be affected by train-related vibration and uses with vibration-  
16 sensitive activities and precision equipment may be adversely  
17 affected.

18 K. Public Services

19 1. Impacts.

20 The project would be adequately served by Fire Station No. 1 and would  
21 not require the construction or alteration of a fire protection facility. With  
22 mandatory compliance with Riverside County Ordinance Nos. 460, 787,  
23 and 659.7, and project-generated increases in the County's tax base that  
24 funds fire protection services, indirect impacts on fire protection services  
25 would be reduced to a level below significance.

26 Indirect population growth due to the project would not result in the need to  
27 construct a new sheriff's station or to expand an existing station. With  
28

1 mandatory compliance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 460 and  
2 project-generated increases in the County's tax base that funds sheriff  
3 services, indirect impacts on sheriff's protection services would be reduced  
4 to a level below significance.

5 The project would not generate a resident population requiring public  
6 school or public library services; no impact would occur.

7 The project would create nominal demand on County public health services.  
8 With mandatory compliance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 460 and  
9 the ongoing payment of County taxes that fund health services, any impacts  
10 would be reduced to a level below significance.

11 2. Mitigation.

12 None required.

13 L. Recreation

14 1. Impacts.

15 A segment of a County-planned community trail would be constructed  
16 along the southern boundary of the site paralleling Nuevo Road. The  
17 construction and operation of this trail segment is an integral part of the  
18 proposed project and would have less than significant adverse effects on the  
19 physical environment.

20 Project-generated demand on existing recreational resources would be very  
21 low. Any incidental use of existing recreational resources by the project's  
22 employees and visitors would not accelerate or cause substantial physical  
23 deterioration of existing recreational facilities, and impacts would be less  
24 than significant.

25 The project site is not located within a County Service Area (CSA) or  
26 within a recreation and park district; therefore, this is no potential for the  
27

1 project to cause adverse physical impacts within a CSA or recreation and  
2 park district boundary.

3 The project would have no physical impacts on the location of planned  
4 County community trails along Webster Avenue and Nuevo Road. The  
5 Webster Avenue trail is planned to occur along the west side of the road  
6 opposite the project site. The proposed project accommodates the Nuevo  
7 Road trail along the site's southern boundary. The project would have less  
8 than significant impacts on trail operation because no new driveways or  
9 other vehicular access points would occur along Webster Avenue or Nuevo  
10 Road and landscaping would occur between the trails and the proposed  
11 project's buildings and vehicular use areas. Impacts to recreational trails  
12 would be less than significant.

13 2. Mitigation.

14 None required.

15 M. Transportation and Traffic

16 1. Impacts.

17 The project would not have a significant parking impact because it is  
18 designed to provide more parking spaces than required by Riverside County  
19 Ordinance No. 348.

20 The project would not interfere with air traffic patterns at the March Air  
21 Reserve Base, or any other airport; impacts would therefore be less than  
22 significant.

23 The movement of people and goods to and from the project site would not  
24 directly involve transportation by water, rail, or air. Any indirect use of  
25 water, rail, or air transport would not result in the need to alter  
26 transportation patterns. Impacts to waterborne, rail, and air traffic would  
27 therefore be less than significant.  
28

1 The project would not increase the severity of an existing hazardous  
2 roadway or transportation condition and would not create any new  
3 transportation conflicts or hazards; therefore, impacts due to hazards of a  
4 design feature or incompatible uses would be less than significant.

5 Loaded trucks accessing the project site would be heavy in weight and have  
6 the potential to cause accelerated roadway maintenance issues. Failure to  
7 construct Harvill Avenue improvements to specifications needed to carry  
8 truck traffic volumes could result in a significant impact associated with  
9 road maintenance. Implementation of the mitigation measure identified  
10 below would reduce this impact to less than significant levels.

11 Roads adjacent to the project site may be temporarily affected by temporary  
12 construction detours or delays. Implementation of the mitigation measures  
13 listed below would reduce near-term construction-related impacts to less  
14 than significant levels.

15 Adequate emergency vehicle access would be provided to the project site at  
16 all times. The project would not cause inadequate emergency access to  
17 nearby uses; therefore, impacts related to emergency access would be less  
18 than significant.

19 The project would be in compliance with the County's General Plan  
20 policies regarding alternative transportation. A community trail is planned  
21 to occur along the north side of Nuevo Road and the project accommodates  
22 this trail by proposing to construct a 12-foot wide trail within a 14-foot  
23 wide easement. Therefore, the project's impacts to adopted policies  
24 supporting alternative transportation would be less than significant.

25  
26 2. Mitigation.

27 The project has been modified to mitigate or avoid these potentially  
28 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures, which are hereby

1 adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation, Monitoring,  
2 and Reporting Program.

- 3 a. Improvements to Harvill Avenue that are the responsibility of the  
4 project as specified in the project's conditions of approval issued by  
5 the Riverside County Transportation Department shall be  
6 constructed with a traffic index of 9.0 with a minimum asphalt  
7 concrete (A.C.) thickness of 0.46 feet to alleviate increased  
8 maintenance issues associated with heavy weight vehicles.
- 9 b. Prior to the commencement of construction of the proposed project,  
10 a traffic management plan shall be developed by the construction  
11 supervisor to minimize traffic flow interference from construction  
12 activities. Construction traffic shall be scheduled to not interfere  
13 with peak hour traffic on adjacent roadways and to minimize  
14 obstruction of through traffic lanes. If necessary, a flag person shall  
15 be retained by the construction supervisor to control construction  
16 traffic into and out of the site, and to maintain safety on adjacent  
17 roadways during construction.

18 N. Utility and Service Systems

19 1. Impacts.

20 Water would be conveyed to the site by gravity through EMWD's existing  
21 water line network from the Cajalco water storage tank. The installation of  
22 local water lines to service the project would result in less than significant  
23 environmental impact. With the exception of local water conveyance lines,  
24 the project would not require the installation of any additional water  
25 facilities that could result in significant environmental impacts. Therefore,  
26 impacts associated with the construction or expansion of water treatment  
27 facilities would be less than significant.  
28

1 EMWD will service the project with domestic water based on planned and  
2 existing water supplies as documented in its Urban Water Management  
3 Plan and a Water Supply Assessment prepared for the project. Adequate  
4 water supplies are available to service the site, and no new or expanded  
5 water entitlements would be needed that could result in significant  
6 environmental impacts. Impacts to water supplies would be less than  
7 significant.

8 Project-generated wastewater would be treated at the Perris Valley Regional  
9 Water Reclamation Facility. The installation of local sewer lines to service  
10 the project would result in a less than significant environmental impact.  
11 Development of the project would not require or result in a need for  
12 construction or expansion of wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore,  
13 project impacts to wastewater treatment capacity and the construction of  
14 wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant.

15 The project would generate construction and operational waste requiring  
16 disposal at a landfill. The contribution to daily or total landfill capacity  
17 from the disposal of waste is considered a potentially significant cumulative  
18 impact. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified below would  
19 reduce this cumulative impact to less than significant levels.

20 The project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local  
21 statutes and regulations related to solid waste disposal, reduction, and  
22 recycling. Therefore, impacts due to non-compliance with federal, state,  
23 and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes would be less than  
24 significant.

25 Utility extensions to the project would be constructed on site. Off-site  
26 utilities would be constructed within existing roadway rights-of-way and  
27 not cause significant adverse environmental impact. Therefore, the  
28

1 construction of facilities needed to serve the site would result in less than  
2 significant impacts.

3 2. Mitigation.

4 The project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially  
5 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures, which are hereby  
6 adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation, Monitoring,  
7 and Reporting Program.

8 a. At least 75% of all non-hazardous project construction debris shall  
9 be recycled and/or salvaged.

10 b. Prior to the issuance of building permits, Planning/Recycling  
11 Division of the Riverside County Waste Management Department  
12 shall be advised by the Project Developer of all efforts that will be  
13 pursued at the project site relating to recycling and waste reduction  
14 during construction and operation. The Project Developer shall  
15 implement all recycling and waste reduction measures required by  
16 Riverside County.

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

21 A. Land Use – Project-Specific

22 1. Impacts.

23 The project is expected to exceed the California Ambient Air Quality  
24 Standards (CAAQS) during short-term construction due to emissions of  
25 particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5 (localized)) and long-term operational  
26 emissions of VOCs, NOx, CO, and PM10 (regional), even with  
27 implementation of the mitigation measures identified below to address the  
28

1 project's significant adverse air quality impacts. These levels of emissions  
2 would represent a significant and direct conflict with the South Coast Air  
3 Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) Air Quality Management Plan  
4 (AQMP). Thus, because the project will exceed the CAAQS, the project  
5 will not be compliant with the AQMP, and a significant and unmitigable  
6 impact would occur.

7 2. Mitigation.

8 Mitigation measures are identified below under the issue area of Air  
9 Quality. No additional mitigation measures are available to reduce the  
10 project's conflict with the SCAQMD AQMP during construction and long-  
11 term operation of the project beyond those identified below for Air Quality.  
12 Notwithstanding the foregoing, the implementation of the mitigation  
13 measures described below for the issue of Air Quality will not be sufficient  
14 to mitigate impacts due to a conflict with the SCAQMD AQMP during  
15 construction and long-term operation to below levels of significance. Even  
16 with implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, the project would  
17 exceed the CAAQS during short-term construction for emissions of  
18 particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5 (localized)) and long-term operational  
19 emissions of VOCs, NOX, CO, and PM10 (regional).

20 The significant and unavoidable land use impacts may be further reduced  
21 under the No Project/No Development Alternative, No Project/  
22 Implementation of PM No. 35350 Alternative, and Reduced Project  
23 Alternative discussed in the Final SEIR, but the SEIR identifies no other  
24 mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce these impacts to a  
25 level of less than significant. The County finds that specific economic,  
26 legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the No  
27 Project/No Development Alternative, No Project/Implementation of PM  
28

1 No. 35330 Alternative, Reduced Project Alternative, and Modified Southern  
2 Perimeter Design Alternative, even though implementation of any of these  
3 alternatives would reduce these impacts, as described more fully in the  
4 SEIR and these Findings. In that regard:

5 (a) The No Project/No Development Alternative, No  
6 Project/Implementation of PM No. 35330 Alternative, and Reduced Project  
7 Alternative will not allow the County to fully achieve the goals and  
8 objectives of the project, as provided on page 3-1 of the Draft SEIR.

9 (b) The economic opportunities provided by the project justify these  
10 impacts and render the No Project/No Development Alternative, No  
11 Project/Implementation of PM No. 35330 Alternative, Reduced Project  
12 Alternative, and Modified Southern Perimeter Design Alternative infeasible  
13 and/or unacceptable. With respect to the No Project/No Development  
14 Alternative, the alternative would do nothing to alleviate the jobs/housing  
15 balance deficit in the County in furtherance of the County General Plan  
16 policies. Further, this alternative would be economically infeasible because  
17 the project applicant purchased the project site to develop the project and  
18 would receive no return on its investment if the project did not go forward.  
19 As compared to the proposed project, fewer jobs would be created by the  
20 No Project/Implementation of PM No. 35330, Reduced Project, and  
21 Modified Southern Perimeter Design Alternatives.

22 (c) The No Project/No Development Alternative would not  
23 implement the policies and vision of the County General Plan Business Park  
24 land use designation and would not be consistent with the Redevelopment  
25 Agency for the County of Riverside's I-215 Corridor Project Area, which  
26 identifies the project site among 9,720 acres of property along the I-215 as  
27 an area targeted for redevelopment and job growth. The Reduced Project  
28

1 Alternative and the No Project/Implementation of PM No. 35330  
2 Alternative also are inconsistent with the Business Park land use  
3 designation because neither alternative would achieve the recommended  
4 floor area ratio ("FAR") as set forth in the Business Park designation.  
5 Further, the No Project/Implementation of PM No. 35330 Alternative,  
6 Reduced Project Alternative, and Modified Southern Perimeter Design  
7 Alternative would not be as effective in implementing the Redevelopment  
8 Agency for the County of Riverside's I-215 Corridor Project as would the  
9 project.

10 (d) The Modified Southern Perimeter Design Alternative would  
11 reduce, but would not eliminate, the project's conflict with the SCAQMD  
12 AQMP. Under this alternative, there would only be an approximate 4%  
13 reduction in building area. Similar to the proposed project, the building  
14 intensity proposed under this alternative would exceed the growth  
15 assumptions as stated in the SCAQMD AQMP, and adoption of this  
16 alternative would result in only a minor and incremental reduction in  
17 building square footage as compared to the proposed project.

18 Any land use impacts due to an inconsistency with the SCAQMD AQMP  
19 remaining following the implementation of the mitigation measures  
20 specified for the issue area of Air Quality are determined to be acceptable  
21 due to the overriding social, economic, environmental, or other benefits of  
22 the project, as more fully set forth in the Statement of Overriding  
23 Considerations set forth below.

24  
25 B. Air Quality – Project-Specific and Cumulative

26 1. Impacts.

27 Implementation of the proposed project would conflict with the  
28 SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) because project

1 emissions would exceed the California Ambient Air Quality Standards.  
2 Specifically, the project would exceed the CAAQS during grading and  
3 construction activities for emissions of VOC, NOx, CO, and PM10 and  
4 would exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds (LSTs) for  
5 PM2.5 and PM10. These impacts would be reduced with the application of  
6 standard regulatory requirements and the mitigation measures listed below,  
7 but the project's construction-related impacts would not be reduced to  
8 below a level of significance and no additional feasible mitigation measures  
9 are available to further reduce the impact.

10 The project also would exceed the CAAQS during long-term operational  
11 activities for emissions of VOC, NOx, CO, and PM10. Operational impacts  
12 to air quality would be reduced with the application of standard regulatory  
13 requirements and the mitigation measures listed below, but the project's  
14 operational-related impacts would not be reduced to below a level of  
15 significance and no additional feasible mitigation measures are available to  
16 further reduce the impact.

17 Construction activities would result in short-term direct impacts to air  
18 quality associated with VOCs, NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions.  
19 Localized significance thresholds also would be exceeded for PM10 and  
20 PM2.5 during construction. Long-term direct operational impacts  
21 associated with VOCs, NOx, CO, and PM10 emissions also would result  
22 from project implementation. Although standard regulatory requirements  
23 and the enforcement of the mitigation measures listed below would reduce  
24 these near- and long-term impacts, the level of emissions following  
25 mitigation would remain above the SCAQMD thresholds of significance.  
26 Therefore, near-term construction activities and long-term operation of the  
27 project would result in violations of existing air quality standards for the  
28

1 criteria pollutants identified above and would contribute to an existing air  
2 quality violation for particulate matter, and these impacts would remain  
3 significant and unmitigable even following the incorporation of all feasible  
4 mitigation.

5 As noted above, emissions of PM10 and PM2.5 during project construction  
6 would exceed criteria pollutant thresholds established by the SCAQMD.  
7 Furthermore, the emissions of PM10 and PM2.5 during project operation  
8 would exceed criteria pollutant thresholds established by the SCAQMD.  
9 Additionally, results of the LSTs analysis indicate that construction  
10 activities associated with the proposed project would exceed the LSTs for  
11 PM10 and PM2.5 emission thresholds set forth by the SCAQMD. The  
12 South Coast Air Basin ("SCAB") fails to meet the national air quality  
13 standards for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5, and is therefore considered a non-  
14 attainment area for these pollutants. Because the SCAB is located in a non-  
15 attainment area for PM10 and PM2.5, project-related emissions of these  
16 pollutants during near-term construction and long-term operation would  
17 result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for  
18 which the project region is non-attainment. Although application of  
19 standard regulatory requirements and the mitigation measures identified  
20 below would reduce project-related air quality impacts, these impacts would  
21 remain significant and unmitigable.

22 Emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM) would be considered  
23 significant at the point of maximum impact; however, no sensitive receptors  
24 are currently located at the point of maximum impact. Construction of the  
25 project would also expose sensitive receptors to PM10 and PM2.5  
26 emissions. Application of standard regulatory requirements and the  
27 mitigation measures identified below would reduce project-related air  
28

1 quality impacts to nearby sensitive receptors during both construction and  
2 long-term operation; however, additional mitigation is not available to  
3 reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, these  
4 impacts would remain significant and unmitigable.

5 2. Mitigation.

6 The project has been modified to mitigate or avoid these potentially significant  
7 impacts by the following mitigation measures, which are hereby adopted  
8 and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation, Monitoring, and  
9 Reporting Program.

- 10 a. Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the County of  
11 Riverside shall ensure that construction and grading plans include  
12 statements that work crews must shut off equipment when not in  
13 use. Idling times shall be limited to five (5) minutes or less.
- 14 b. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project  
15 Developer and/or construction supervisor shall post signs on the site  
16 indicating that vehicular travel on unpaved roads shall be limited to  
17 speeds of 15 miles per hour or less.
- 18 c. Concurrent with construction activities, regularly scheduled engine  
19 maintenance to minimize equipment emissions shall be performed  
20 by the contractor. The contractor(s) shall maintain a construction  
21 equipment maintenance log that is available for inspection by the  
22 County upon request.
- 23 d. Concurrent with construction activities, the construction contractor  
24 shall utilize CARB Tier I, II, or III certified equipment or better, as  
25 follows: 1 Dozer – CARB Tier I, 1 Dozer – CARB Tier II, 6  
26 Scrapers – CARB Tier III, 2 Scrapers – CARB Tier II, 1 Blade –  
27 CARB Tier I.  
28

1 e. The Project Developer shall prepare a Fugitive Dust Control Plan,  
2 which shall be submitted to the Riverside County Building and  
3 Safety Department. The Fugitive Dust Control Plan shall include,  
4 but not be limited to, the following measures:

5 1. Concurrent with construction activities, the construction  
6 supervisor shall use periodic watering for short-term  
7 stabilization of disturbed surface area and haul roads to  
8 minimize visible fugitive dust emissions. Watering, with  
9 complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three  
10 times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and  
11 following the completion of work for the day.

12 2. Concurrent with construction activities, the construction  
13 supervisor shall reduce "spill-over" effects by preventing soil  
14 erosion, washing dirt from vehicles entering public roadways,  
15 and washing/sweeping project access to public roadways on a  
16 regular schedule. All streets shall be swept once a day if visible  
17 soil materials are carried to adjacent streets. Wheel washers  
18 shall be installed where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads  
19 onto paved roads.

20 3. Immediately after clearing, grading, earthmoving or excavation  
21 is completed, the construction supervisor shall ensure that the  
22 entire area of disturbed soil is treated with non-toxic soil  
23 stabilizers if subsequent development is delayed or expected to  
24 be delayed more than five days. Chemical soils stabilizers, if  
25 used, shall be applied according to manufacturers' instructions.  
26 If the delay in construction is due to precipitation that dampens  
27  
28

1 the disturbed soil sufficiency to eliminate visible fugitive dust  
2 emissions, this measure is not required.

3 4. The construction supervisor shall ensure that the entire area of  
4 disturbed soil shall be covered with a vegetative ground cover  
5 within 21 working days if active operations cease.

6 5. Concurrent with construction activities, the construction  
7 supervisor shall ensure all soil stockpiled for more than two days  
8 is covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent  
9 dust generation.

10 6. During clearing, grading, earthmoving, excavation, or  
11 transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler  
12 systems shall be used at least two times per day to prevent dust  
13 from leaving the site.

14 7. Concurrent with construction activities, the construction  
15 supervisor shall ensure all clearing, grading, earthmoving, or  
16 excavation activities cease when winds exceed 25 miles per hour  
17 averages over a one-hour duration.

18 8. Trucks transporting soil, sand, cut or fill materials and/or  
19 construction debris to or from the site shall be tarped from point  
20 of origin.

21 f. In order to reduce localized project impacts to sensitive receptors in  
22 the project vicinity during construction, the construction supervisor  
23 shall ensure that equipment staging areas are positioned at least 300  
24 feet away from the sensitive receptors (residential homes) to the  
25 north, south, and west of the project site.

26 g. A construction traffic control plan shall be prepared by the Project  
27 Developer and submitted to the Riverside County Transportation  
28

1 Department for review and approval. The construction traffic  
2 control plan shall require the following:

- 3 1. Timed construction activities so as to not interfere with peak  
4 hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes  
5 adjacent to the site;
- 6 2. A flag person to maintain safety and smooth traffic flow  
7 adjacent to existing roadways during all phases of construction;
- 8 3. Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow on the  
9 arterial system to off-peak hours, to the extent practical; and
- 10 4. Routing of construction trucks away from congested streets and  
11 residential areas, to the extent practical.

12 h. Coatings and solvents with a VOC content lower than required  
13 under SCAQMD Rule 1113 (100 grams/liter of VOC) shall be used,  
14 if commercially available. Construction drawings shall indicate that  
15 contractors shall use High Pressure Low Volume (HPLV) paint  
16 applicators with a minimum transfer efficiency of 50% or other  
17 application techniques with equivalent or higher transfer efficiency.

18 i. Signs shall be posted along public roadways abutting the project  
19 site, indicating the contact name and phone number of the entity to  
20 be contacted to report concerns about airborne dust during project  
21 construction. The entity shall either be a Riverside County, project  
22 contractor, or project applicant representative who is designated to  
23 resolve such concerns.

24 j. Prior to construction activities, the Project Developer shall ensure  
25 the future locations of permanent truck routing signs are indicated  
26 on construction drawings. These truck routing signs shall be located  
27 at project's primary vehicular driveway exit points and direct traffic  
28 to I-215. The signs shall be installed prior to issuance of the first  
certificate of occupancy.

- 1 k. Prior to the approval of a building permit for any building over  
2 100,000 s.f., the County Planning Department shall review the  
3 parking lot striping and security gating plan to ensure that on-site  
4 truck parking areas are adequate and allow for overnight parking to  
5 minimize trucks parking on streets outside the project boundary.
- 6 l. All buildings shall exceed minimum statewide energy requirements  
7 a minimum of 10% beyond Title 24. The list of energy efficient  
8 features shall be included on construction drawings and buildings  
9 plans, and approved by the Riverside County Department of  
10 Building and Safety.
- 11 m. Prior to final building inspection for any building, the Riverside  
12 County Planning Department shall verify that an easily accessible  
13 area that serves the entire building is dedicated to the collection and  
14 storage of non-hazardous materials for recycling.
- 15 n. Prior to final building inspections, sign(s) stating that "EXTENDED  
16 IDLING OF TRUCK ENGINES IS NOT PERMITTED" shall be  
17 located at the entrance to warehouse facilities and at truck parking  
18 areas. The sign(s) shall not be less than twenty four inches square  
19 and shall provide directions to truck parking spaces with electrical  
20 hookups.
- 21 o. Tenants receiving shipping container refrigerator units (RUs) shall  
22 provide electrical hookups at all loading dock door positions as part  
23 of the tenant improvement project for the building. The use of truck  
24 engines or auxiliary generators to power refrigerated shipping  
25 containers for more than five (5) minutes is not permitted.  
26 Installation of electrical hook-ups shall be verified by Riverside  
27 County as part of final building inspections.
- 28 p. Loading dock positions that receive shipping container refrigerator  
units (RUs) shall not be located within 300 meters of any off-site  
sensitive receptor (residential home, school, day-care center). This  
prohibition shall be verified by Riverside County as part of final  
building inspections.

1 q. Prior to the approval of Site Plans and/or Plot Plans, the County  
2 Planning Department shall ensure that on-site stacking distances,  
3 truck check-in points, and driveways are placed and designed to  
4 prevent queuing of trucks outside the project boundary.

5 Notwithstanding the foregoing, the implementation of the mitigation  
6 measures described above will not be sufficient to mitigate impacts to air  
7 quality to below levels of significance. Even with implementation of all  
8 feasible mitigation measures, the project would conflict with the SCAQMD  
9 AQMP because near-term construction emissions would exceed the  
10 CAAQS for emissions of VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>, and would  
11 exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds (LSTs) for PM 2.5  
12 and PM<sub>10</sub>. Also, the project would exceed the CAAQS during long-term  
13 operational activities for emissions of VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub>. Project-  
14 related emissions during construction and long-term operation also would  
15 be significant because project-related emissions of PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> would  
16 contribute to an existing air quality violation within the South Coast Air  
17 Basin. Project-related emissions during both construction and long-term  
18 operation also have the potential to expose nearby sensitive receptors to  
19 substantial pollutant concentrations.

20 The significant and unavoidable air quality impacts may be further reduced  
21 under the No Project/No Development Alternative, No Project/  
22 Implementation of PM No. 35350 Alternative, Reduced Project Alternative,  
23 and Modified Southern Perimeter Design Alternative discussed in the Final  
24 SEIR, but the SEIR identifies no other mitigation measures or alternatives  
25 that would reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. The  
26 County finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other  
27 considerations make infeasible the No Project/No Development Alternative,  
28

1 No Project/Implementation of PM No. 35350 Alternative, Reduced Project  
2 Alternative, and Modified Southern Perimeter Design Alternative that  
3 would reduce these impacts, as described more fully in the SEIR and these  
4 Findings. The No Project/No Development Alternative, No  
5 Project/Implementation of PM No. 35350 Alternative, Reduced Project  
6 Alternative, and Modified Southern Perimeter Design Alternative will not  
7 allow the County fully to achieve the goals and objectives of the project, as  
8 provided on page 3-1 of the Draft SEIR. In particular, the economic  
9 opportunities provided by the project justify these impacts and render the  
10 No Project/No Development Alternative, No Project/Implementation of PM  
11 No. 35350 Alternative, Reduced Project Alternative, and Modified Southern  
12 Perimeter Design Alternative infeasible and/or unacceptable.

13 Any remaining air quality impacts are determined to be acceptable due to  
14 the overriding social, economic, environmental, or other benefits of the  
15 project, as more fully set forth in the Statement of Overriding  
16 Considerations set forth below.

17 C. Circulation and Traffic – Cumulative Impacts

18 1. Impact:

19 The project would generate approximately 6,400 daily vehicle trips in  
20 passenger car equivalents, which would contribute traffic to two  
21 intersections that are projected to operate below acceptable levels of service  
22 in the near-term and nine intersections that are projected to operate below  
23 acceptable levels of service in the cumulative condition. Project traffic may  
24 pass through these intersections before planned intersection improvements  
25 are made to improve their operation to acceptable service levels. Impacts  
26 would remain significant and unmitigable to two intersections in the near-  
27  
28

1 term and eight intersections in the cumulative condition prior to the  
2 completion of required improvements.

3 The project would contribute traffic to segments of Interstate 215 that  
4 already operate below acceptable levels of service. Impacts would be  
5 cumulative and temporary in nature and would be alleviated when planned  
6 improvements are constructed by Caltrans and service levels improve. The  
7 project's incremental contribution of traffic to I-215 mainline segments is  
8 considered a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact, until freeway  
9 segment improvements are made by Caltrans. The Riverside County  
10 Transportation Commission ("RCTC") recently approved funding to  
11 complete the I-215 widening. It is estimated that the widening will be  
12 complete from I-15 in Temecula up to Nuevo Road by 2012 and the  
13 widening will be complete from Nuevo Road up to State Route 60 by 2015.  
14 Thus, it is estimated that this temporary cumulative impact will be  
15 alleviated by 2015.

16 2. Mitigation:

17 The project has been modified to mitigate or avoid this potentially  
18 significant impact by the following mitigation measures, which are hereby  
19 adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation, Monitoring,  
20 and Reporting Program.

- 21 a. At the intersection of Harvill Avenue (NS) at A Street (EW) / Street  
22 "A" (EW), the project shall install intersection improvements in  
23 accordance with the geometric configuration specified in the  
24 project's conditions of approval issued by the Riverside County  
25 Transportation Department. These improvements shall include the  
26 installation of a traffic signal and the construction of dual  
27  
28

1 northbound and southbound left turn lanes and a westbound right  
2 turn lane.

3 Notwithstanding the foregoing, the implementation of the mitigation  
4 measure described above may not be sufficient to mitigate impacts to two  
5 intersections in the near-term and eight intersections in the cumulative  
6 condition, because project traffic may pass through these intersections before  
7 planned improvements are installed. Finally, the identified mitigation  
8 would not be sufficient to mitigate impacts to the freeway mainline system.  
9 The freeway system is under the authority of Caltrans. There is no  
10 mechanism available for payment of fair share contributions to Caltrans to  
11 mitigate freeway impacts.

12 As noted above, the RCTC has plans to widen the I-215. According to a  
13 recent press announcement, the RCTC approved funding for the completion  
14 of the entire I-215 widening project from the junction of I-15/I-215 in  
15 Temecula to State Route 60 in Riverside. The widening will cover 29.25  
16 miles and is designed to relieve traffic congestion and improve freeway  
17 operation. However, until physical improvements are completed and  
18 acceptable levels of service are maintained, the project's temporary  
19 cumulative impact will remain significant. As noted above, it is estimated  
20 that the I-215 widening project will be complete by 2015, with the segment  
21 from Temecula at the I-15 up to Nuevo Road (where the project is located)  
22 completed by 2012.

23 The significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to study area  
24 intersections and freeway segments may be further reduced under the No  
25 Project/No Development Alternative, Reduced Project Alternative, and  
26 Modified Southern Perimeter Design Alternative discussed in the Final  
27 SEIR, but the SEIR identifies no other mitigation measures or alternatives  
28

1 that would reduce these cumulative impacts. Until the I-215 improvements  
2 planned by RCTC are physically constructed (estimated to be complete by  
3 2015), impacts to freeway mainline segments remain significant and  
4 unmitigable under any alternative except for the No Project/No  
5 Development Alternative. In addition, near-term impacts to study area  
6 intersections would remain impacted until TUMF or other County funding  
7 sources identify funding for the necessary improvements. The County finds  
8 that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations  
9 make infeasible the No Project/No Development Alternative, No  
10 Project/Implementation of PM No. 35350 Alternative, Reduced Project  
11 Alternative, and Modified Southern Perimeter Design Alternative described  
12 more fully in the SEIR and these Findings. The No Project/No  
13 Development Alternative, Reduced Project Alternative, and the Modified  
14 Southern Perimeter Design Alternative will not allow the County to fully  
15 achieve the goals and objectives of the project, as provided on page 3-1 of  
16 the Draft SEIR. In particular, the economic opportunities provided by the  
17 project justify these impacts and render the No Project/No Development  
18 Alternative, Modified Southern Design Alternative, and Reduced Project  
19 Alternative infeasible and unacceptable. In addition, the No  
20 Project/Implementation of PM No. 35350 Alternative would result in an  
21 increase of approximately 75 average daily vehicle trips as compared to the  
22 proposed project; therefore, adoption of this alternative would result in  
23 increased impacts as compared to the proposed project and is deemed  
24 unacceptable for this reason.

25  
26 Near-term and cumulative impacts to study area intersections and  
27 cumulative impact to freeway segments are determined to be acceptable due  
28 to the overriding social, economic, environmental, or other benefits of the

1 project, as more fully set forth in the Statement of Overriding  
2 Considerations set forth below.

3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered the following  
4 alternatives identified in the SEIR in light of the environmental impacts which cannot be fully mitigated,  
5 avoided, or substantially lessened and has rejected those alternatives as infeasible for the reasons  
6 hereinafter stated:

7 A. No Project/No Development (“No Development”) Alternative

- 8 1. The No Project/No Development Alternative (hereafter the “No  
9 Development” Alternative) allows the decision-makers to compare the  
10 impacts of approving the proposed project against the impacts that would  
11 occur if the site were to remain undeveloped for the foreseeable future. The  
12 104.45-acre project site in its existing condition contains three occupied  
13 residential homes, fences, tree stumps, and 10 to 15 small trees. Vegetation  
14 on the project site is highly disturbed due to past residential development on  
15 the western portion of the site and agricultural use on the eastern portion of  
16 the site.
- 17 2. The No Development Alternative would fail to implement the Riverside  
18 County General Plan and Mead Valley Area Plan, which designate the  
19 project site for development of Business Park (BP) land uses.  
20 Improvements to Nuevo Road, Harvill Avenue, and Webster Avenue would  
21 not be implemented under this alternative, and a public recreational trail  
22 along the community trail segment along the project site’s southern  
23 boundary with Nuevo Road would not be constructed. Erosion and  
24 sedimentation would continue under existing conditions.
- 25 3. The project as proposed is estimated to provide up to 1,000 jobs during the  
26 operational phase. Temporary construction jobs would also be created for  
27 the construction phase of the project. The No Project/No Development  
28

1 Alternative would fail to provide additional employment opportunities for  
2 nearby residents. The Riverside County General Plan Program SEIR No.  
3 441 concluded that Riverside County is “rich in housing and poor in jobs.”  
4 Furthermore, Riverside County General Plan Program SEIR No. 441 states,  
5 “this means that residents of Riverside County are traveling to surrounding  
6 counties to work, which, in turn equates to longer commute times, increased  
7 air quality impacts, and a lower quality of life.” The No Project/No  
8 development Alternative would do nothing to alleviate the jobs/housing  
9 balance in the County.

- 10 4. Because no discretionary action would be required, MSHCP fee payment  
11 per County Ordinance No. 810 would not be required.
- 12 5. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not be consistent with  
13 the Redevelopment Agency for the County of Riverside’s I-215 Corridor  
14 Project Area. The Redevelopment Area identifies 9,720 acres of property  
15 along I-215 as an area targeted for redevelopment and job growth. The No  
16 Project/No Development Alternative also would not meet the objectives of  
17 the Southern California Association of Governments’ Comprehensive Plan  
18 and Guide and Regional Transportation Plan, which by Policy 3.13  
19 encourages developments in and around activity centers, transportation  
20 corridors, infrastructure systems, and areas needing recycling and  
21 redevelopment. The project site is located in a redevelopment area and  
22 selection of the No Project/No Development Alternative would not provide  
23 for reuse of a vacant site in an area of the County that has been identified  
24 for redevelopment adjacent to a transportation corridor.
- 25 6. The No Project/No Development Alternative would meet none of the basic  
26 project objectives because it would not provide for a light industrial and  
27 warehouse distribution business center to attract new businesses and jobs in  
28

1 the Mead Valley Area in order to provide a more equal jobs/housing  
2 balance in western Riverside County and reduce the need for members of  
3 the existing local workforce to commute outside of the area for  
4 employment. Furthermore, retention of the site in its existing undeveloped  
5 condition would be inconsistent with the General Plan and the Mead Valley  
6 Area Plan, which call for development of the site consistent with the  
7 County's Business Park land use designation.

8 7. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not meet the County's  
9 land use and economic development objectives. The County's General Plan  
10 Land Use Element Policies LU 7.1 and LU 7.2 promote a balance of land  
11 uses and stable employment uses that enhance fiscal viability. Policy LU  
12 7.12 encourages the maintenance of a balance between jobs and housing  
13 within the County and the County's jobs/housing balance is addressed  
14 through implementation of the land use designations assigned by the  
15 County's General Plan and Area Plan land use maps. The No  
16 Project/Agriculture Alternative would not implement the site's Business  
17 Park land use designation and, therefore, would not meet the County's  
18 objectives to enhance fiscal viability and improve the County's  
19 jobs/housing balance.

20 8. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not meet the County's  
21 General Plan Policy C.1.1 to design a transportation system in accordance  
22 with the County's Circulation Plan. Namely, Circulation Element road  
23 improvements to Nuevo Road, Harvill Avenue, and Webster Avenue would  
24 not occur within the site or along the site's frontage under the No  
25 Project/No Development Alternative. Additionally, the No Project/No  
26 Development Alternative would not advance the construction of a  
27 community trail along the project site's southern boundary with Nuevo  
28

1 Road as called for by the Mead Valley Area Plan's Trails and Bikeway  
2 Systems map.

- 3 9. The No Project/No Development Alternative would also not be  
4 economically feasible because the project applicant purchased the project  
5 site for the purpose of developing the project. If no development occurs,  
6 the project applicant would earn no return on its investment and the project  
7 site's value has dropped since the purchase; thus, the project applicant  
8 would lose any return on its investment. Such a loss is not acceptable for a  
9 reasonably prudent developer of an industrial project.

10 B. No Project/Implementation of PM No. 35350 ("No Project") Alternative

- 11 1. The No Project/Implementation of Tentative Parcel Map (PM) No. 35350  
12 Alternative (hereafter, "No Project Alternative") considers development of  
13 the site in accordance with approved PM No. 33530. Under this alternative,  
14 47.25 acres of the site, which were tentatively subdivided by approved PM  
15 No. 33530, would be developed with light industrial uses and the remainder  
16 of the site (57.2 acres) would remain in its existing condition. The Lead  
17 Agency selected this alternative for consideration because CEQA Section  
18 15126.6(e) requires that an alternative be included that describes what  
19 would reasonably be expected to occur on the property in the foreseeable  
20 future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and  
21 consistent with available infrastructure and community services. It is  
22 reasonable to expect that approved PM No. 33530 would be implemented.
- 23 2. The No Project Alternative would fail to implement the Riverside County  
24 General Plan and Mead Valley Area Plan, which designate the entire site for  
25 the development of Business Park land uses, because 57.2 acres of the site  
26 would not be developed and would remain vacant. Because the No Project  
27 Alternative would only develop a portion of the site with light industrial  
28

1 land uses, while leaving the remainder of the site as residential and vacant  
2 land, development of this alternative would result in a substantial alteration  
3 of the planned land use for the area.

4 3. The No Project Alternative would result in a reduction of employment  
5 opportunities for nearby residents as compared to the proposed project, as  
6 the 57.2-acre portion of the site that would remain undeveloped would not  
7 provide for employment opportunities associated with the development of  
8 that portion of the project site. Further, less construction jobs would be  
9 created during the construction phase than would be created with the project  
10 The Riverside County General Plan Program SEIR No. 441 concluded that  
11 Riverside County is "rich in housing and poor in jobs." Furthermore,  
12 Riverside County General Plan Program SEIR No. 441 states, "this means  
13 that residents of Riverside County are traveling to surrounding counties to  
14 work, which, in turn equates to longer commute times, increased air quality  
15 impacts, and a lower quality of life." The No Project Alternative would not  
16 be as effective at alleviating the jobs/housing balance in the County as  
17 would the project.

18 4. Under the No Project Alternative, water leaving the undeveloped portions  
19 of the site would not be filtered and would continue to contain sediment and  
20 other potential pollutants, as occurs under existing conditions. The potential  
21 for water quality impacts associated with sedimentation would be increased  
22 under this alternative.

23 5. The No Project Alternative would not implement the Redevelopment  
24 Agency for the County of Riverside's I-215 Corridor Project Area as  
25 effectively as the proposed project, because approximately 57.2 acres of the  
26 site would not be developed and would remain vacant. The Redevelopment  
27 Area identifies 9,720 acres of property along I-215 as an area targeted for  
28

1 redevelopment and job growth. The No Project Alternative also would not  
2 meet the objectives of the Southern California Association of Governments'  
3 Comprehensive Plan and Guide and Regional Transportation Plan, which by  
4 Policy 3.13 encourages developments in and around activity centers,  
5 transportation corridors, infrastructure systems, and areas needing recycling  
6 and redevelopment. The project site is located in a redevelopment area and  
7 selection of the No Project Alternative would not be as effective as the  
8 proposed project in providing for reuse of a vacant site in an area of the  
9 County that has been identified for redevelopment adjacent to a  
10 transportation corridor.

11 6. The No Project Alternative would meet a majority of the project's goals and  
12 objectives, but to a much lesser degree than the proposed project. The No  
13 Project Alternative would not allow for Business Park land uses to occur on  
14 the 57.2 acres of the site that would remain undeveloped under this  
15 alternative. General Plan Policies LU 2.1 and LU 3.1 specify that land use  
16 development be accommodated in accordance with the patterns and  
17 distribution of use and density depicted on the General Plan Land Use Map.  
18 Also, Policy LU 6.1 requires land uses to develop in accordance with the  
19 General Plan and Area Plans to ensure land use compatibility. The No  
20 Project Alternative would retain portions of the site in an undeveloped  
21 condition and would not result in development on the site in accordance  
22 with the General Plan's Business Park (BP) land use designation.

23  
24 7. The No Project Alternative would not be as effective as the proposed  
25 project in meeting the County's land use and economic development  
26 objectives. The County's General Plan Land Use Element Policies LU 7.1  
27 and LU 7.2 promote a balance of land uses and stable employment uses that  
28 enhance fiscal viability. Policy LU 7.12 encourages the maintenance of a

1 balance between jobs and housing within the County and the County's  
2 jobs/housing balance is addressed through implementation of the land use  
3 designations assigned by the County's General Plan and Area Plan land use  
4 maps. The No Project Alternative would not implement the site's Business  
5 Park (BP) land use designation on approximately 57.2 acres of the site and,  
6 therefore, would not be as effective in meeting the County's objectives to  
7 enhance fiscal viability and improve the County's jobs/housing balance.

8 8. The No Project Alternative would produce 75 more vehicle trips in  
9 passenger car equivalents than would the proposed project because the  
10 existing PM No. 35350 proposes smaller buildings that are associated with a  
11 higher trip generation rate as compared to the large buildings proposed by  
12 the project. The increase in traffic associated with this alternative would  
13 result in a greater severity of environmental impact associated with  
14 operational-related traffic, air quality, and noise. The project's significant  
15 an unavoidable air quality and traffic impacts would be further exasperated  
16 by the selection of the No Project Alternative.

17 9. The No Project Alternative would not be economically feasible for the  
18 Project applicant because it purchased the 57.2 acres for the development of  
19 the project. If no development occurs on the 57.2 acre portion of the project  
20 site, the project applicant would earn no return on that investment and the  
21 project site value has dropped since the purchase; thus, the project applicant  
22 would lose any return on its investment for the 57.2 acres. Such a loss is  
23 not acceptable for a reasonably prudent developer of an industrial project.

24 C. Reduced Project Alternative

25 1. The Reduced Project Alternative considers the development of the site with  
26 the same building configuration as proposed by Plot Plan No. 23332  
27 (Option A) and Plot Plan No. 23332 (Option B); however, this alternative  
28

1 would eliminate the mezzanine floor spaces interior to the proposed  
2 buildings. The elimination of the mezzanine floor spaces would reduce the  
3 maximum building area of the site, thereby reducing the total development  
4 intensity as compared to the proposed project. However, the building  
5 development footprint remains the same as the project. The Reduced  
6 Project Alternative would result in a reduction of 370,196 square feet of  
7 total building area under Plot Plan No. 23332 (Option A) (a 17.5%  
8 reduction) and a reduction of 296,669 square feet of total building area  
9 under Plot Plan No. 23332 (Option B) (a 14% reduction). Improvements to  
10 Nuevo Road, Harvill Avenue, and Webster Avenue would occur as they  
11 would under the project.

12 2. For nearby residents, the Reduced Project Alternative would provide fewer  
13 job opportunities for nearby residents than the proposed project due to the  
14 proposed reduction in building area. The Riverside County General Plan  
15 Program SEIR No. 441 concluded that Riverside County is “rich in housing  
16 and poor in jobs.” Furthermore, Riverside County General Plan Program  
17 SEIR No. 441 states, “this means that residents of Riverside County are  
18 traveling to surrounding counties to work which, in turn equates to longer  
19 commute times, increase air quality impacts, and a lower quality of life.”  
20 The Reduced Project Alternative would be less effective at alleviating the  
21 jobs/homes balance in the County than development of the project would.

22 3. The Reduced Project Alternative reduces some of the project’s  
23 environmental impacts, especially in the areas of air quality and traffic, due  
24 to the decreased amount of maximum amount of square footage of building  
25 area allowed for development. In that regard, the Reduced Project  
26 Alternative would avoid the project’s significant and unmitigated impacts  
27 associated with operational-related PM10 emissions and diesel particulate  
28

1 emissions at the maximum point of impact. However, the Reduced Project  
2 Alternative does not fully eliminate the project's direct and cumulative air  
3 quality impacts and cumulative impacts to study area intersections and  
4 freeway mainlines that cannot be reduced to a level below significance with  
5 feasible mitigation. Thus, development of the Reduced Project Alternative  
6 would required the same mitigation measures as would the project and  
7 would still (1) exceed the CAAQS during grading and construction  
8 activities for VOC, NOx, CO and PM 10; (2) exceed the SCAQMD LSTs  
9 for PM 2.5 and PM 10; and (3) exceed the CAAQS during long-term  
10 operational activities for emissions of VOC, NOx and CO.

11 4. Traffic and circulation impacts associated with this Alternative would be  
12 reduced. With the reduction in the number of traffic trips, cumulative  
13 impacts associated with the contribution of traffic to impacted study area  
14 intersections and freeway mainline segments (which are under the authority  
15 of Caltrans) would be less severe, but not eliminated. The contribution of  
16 project traffic to study area intersections would result in near-term  
17 significant cumulative impacts that would remain until TUMF or other  
18 funding sources identify, fund, and implement improvements to these  
19 locations. Finally, no program exists to which Development Impact Fees  
20 for freeway impacts may be paid. Until physical improvements planned for  
21 I-215 are completed and acceptable levels of service are maintained, the  
22 cumulative impact will remain significant.

23 5. The Reduced Project Alternative does not promote an efficient use of land  
24 because a substantial portion of the site's development potential would not  
25 be realized. The Reduced Project Alternative would be inconsistent with  
26 the County's General Plan Land Use Element states that "land must be used  
27 wisely and efficiently." Land Use Policy 7.4 also directs the County to  
28

1 reevaluate the appropriateness of employment land use designations that are  
2 inefficient; therefore, the development of an inefficient site design as would  
3 occur under the Reduced Project Alternative is not appropriate.

- 4 6. The Reduced Project Alternative would not meet the project objectives to  
5 the same extent as the proposed project because it would provide for less  
6 light industrial and warehouse distribution business center development on  
7 the site and provide fewer new business and employment opportunities,  
8 while not fully eliminating the significant direct and cumulative air quality  
9 impacts and cumulative traffic impacts, which are unavoidable impacts of  
10 the project.
- 11 7. As noted above, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in a reduction  
12 of employment opportunities on-site. Thus, the Reduced Project  
13 Alternative would not be as effective as the project in meeting the County's  
14 economic development objectives to stimulate industrial/business-type  
15 clusters, promote the development of focused employment centers, and  
16 enhance the County's fiscal viability (General Plan Land Use Policies LU  
17 7.1, LU 7.2, LU 7.3, and LU 7.8).
- 18 8. The Reduced Project Alternative is not consistent with the General Plan  
19 Business Park land use designation that is applicable to the project site. The  
20 Business Park land use designation recommends a FAR range of between  
21 .25-.60. The project FAR range is .23-.69 for Option A and .23-.55 for  
22 Option B (total average FAR is .49). The Reduced Project Alternative FAR  
23 range is between .12-.49 for Option A and .12-.46 for Option B. Thus the  
24 FAR range for the Reduced Project Alternative is not consistent with the  
25 Business Park land use designation.
- 26 9. According to data submitted in to the record by the project applicant, the  
27 Reduced Project Alternative is not economically feasible. Taking current  
28

1 market conditions into consideration, development and operation of the  
2 project is estimated to generate a modest profit of \$112,154 under both  
3 Option A and Option B. However, the Reduced Project Alternative is  
4 estimated to generate a loss of \$3,118,648 for Option A and a loss of  
5 \$2,840,819 for Option B. Further, the net annual rent for the project is  
6 estimated to be \$7,954,154, whereas the net annual rent for the Reduced  
7 Project Alternative is estimated to be \$6,404,615 for Option A and  
8 \$6,673,005 for Option B. According to information from the Project  
9 applicant, the loss and the annual rent expectation for the Reduced Project  
10 Alternative is below what is acceptable to the project applicant for funding  
11 and project operation. Further, these estimates are also below that which a  
12 reasonable prudent developer would expect for development and operation  
13 of a similar industrial project.

14 D. Modified Southern Perimeter Design Alternative

- 15
- 16 1. Under the Modified Southern Perimeter Alternative, the project's proposed  
17 12-foot noise attenuation wall would be replaced by a landscaped berm with  
18 a shorter 6-foot wall placed on top of the berm, along with minor changes to  
19 grading details as necessary to accommodate the berm. In addition, the size  
20 and configuration of Building 7 would be changed as necessary to  
21 accommodate the construction of the landscaped berm. This alternative  
22 would reduce the total building area of the site by approximately 4% as  
23 compared to the proposed project; however, the limits of grading considered  
24 by this alternative are identical to that of the proposed project.  
25 Improvements to Nuevo Road, Harvill Avenue, and Webster Avenue would  
26 occur as they would under the project.
  - 27 2. The Modified Southern Perimeter Design Alternative would provide  
28 slightly fewer job opportunities for nearby residents during the operation

1 phase. The Riverside County General Plan Program SEIR No. 441  
2 concluded that Riverside County is “rich in housing and poor in jobs.”  
3 Furthermore, Riverside County General Plan Program SEIR No. 441 states,  
4 “this means that residents of Riverside County are traveling to surrounding  
5 counties to work which, in turn equates to longer commute times, increase  
6 air quality impacts, and a lower quality of life.” Further, the Modified  
7 Southern Perimeter Design would not be as effective as the project in  
8 meeting the County’s economic development objectives to stimulate  
9 industrial/business-type clusters, promote the development of focused  
10 employment centers, and enhance the County’s fiscal viability (General  
11 Plan Land Use Policies LU 7.1, LU 7.2, LU 7.3, and LU 7.8).

12 3. The Modified Southern Perimeter Design Alternative would result in only a  
13 slight reduction in the project’s environmental impacts, with slight  
14 reductions to air quality and traffic impact due to the decreased amount of  
15 maximum amount of square footage of building area allowed for  
16 development. However, this Alternative does not eliminate the project’s  
17 direct and cumulative air quality impacts and cumulative impacts to study  
18 area intersections and freeway mainlines that cannot be reduced to a level  
19 below significance with feasible mitigation.

20 4. Traffic and circulation impacts associated with this Alternative would be  
21 slightly reduced. Even with the reduction in the number of traffic trips,  
22 cumulative impacts associated with the contribution of traffic to impacted  
23 study area intersections and freeway mainline segments (which are under  
24 the authority of Caltrans) would remain significant and not mitigated. The  
25 contribution of project traffic to study area intersections would result in  
26 near-term significant cumulative impacts that would remain until TUMF or  
27 other funding sources identify, fund, and implement improvements to these  
28

1 locations. Finally, no program exists to which Development Impact Fees  
2 for freeway impacts may be paid. Until physical improvements planned for  
3 I-215 are completed and acceptable levels of service are maintained, the  
4 cumulative impact will remain significant.

- 5 6. The Modified Southern Perimeter Design Alternative would meet most of  
6 the project objectives to a slightly lesser degree as the proposed project  
7 because it would provide for slightly less light industrial and warehouse  
8 distribution business center development on the site and provide slightly  
9 fewer new business and employment opportunities, while not eliminating  
10 the significant direct and cumulative air quality impacts and cumulative  
11 traffic impacts, which are unavoidable impacts of the project.

12  
13 E. Alternative Sites

- 14 1. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2) requires that an SEIR identify  
15 alternatives to the project, but does not expressly require that it discuss  
16 alternative locations for the project.
- 17 2. The project's light industrial and warehouse distribution business center  
18 land use is consistent with the Business Park (BP) land use designation  
19 assigned to the property by the Mead Valley Area Plan. The property is  
20 generally flat and is highly disturbed due to past agriculture uses. The  
21 vegetation on the site consists of non-native and invasive plant species. The  
22 site is not located within an MSHCP Criteria Area and does not contain  
23 state or federally-listed plant or wildlife species; therefore impacts to  
24 biological resources is limited.
- 25 3. Few other properties in Western Riverside County would offer less  
26 developmental and environmental constraints, or fewer environmental  
27 impacts than the project site.
- 28

1                   4.     Development in an alternate location in Western Riverside County would  
2                             also result in freeway mainline impacts and long-term cumulative air  
3                             quality impacts. Therefore, there is no environmental benefit to considering  
4                             development of the project at an alternate location. Further, the project  
5                             applicant does not own or control any other possible sites for the project  
6                             within the County of Riverside that would satisfy the project objectives.

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

- 10           A.     The project provides development on the site that is consistent with the Mead Valley Area  
11                   Plan's land use designation of Business Park (BP) (recommended 0.25-0.60 Floor Area  
12                   Ratio range).
- 13           B.     The project proposes to develop nine (9) parcels with approximately 2,124,774 square feet  
14                   of light industrial and distribution warehouse business park development, which would  
15                   have the potential to foster economic growth in the surrounding area. Two versions of PP  
16                   No. 23332 have been submitted by the project Applicant for County review. Option A  
17                   proposes the development of eight light industrial and warehouse distribution business  
18                   center buildings on eight of the parcels, while Option B proposes to develop six buildings  
19                   on eight of the parcels; total building area would remain the same under either Option.  
20                   Business development is identified as a critical factor in improving air quality and reducing  
21                   traffic congestion. Increasing employment opportunities within the County will allow  
22                   residents to obtain jobs locally and reduce commute times. "The objective of the jobs-to-  
23                   housing ratio concept is to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by locating jobs and  
24                   housing closer together," according to the Riverside County General Plan (page AQ-19).  
25                   In this context, the project assists the County in achieving its air quality goals by providing  
26                   business and employment opportunities. The project would create temporary construction  
27                     
28

1 jobs during the construction phase and has the potential to create up to 1,000 permanent  
2 jobs during the operation of the project.

- 3 C. The project will attract new businesses that can provide jobs in Western Riverside County  
4 to assist in providing a better jobs/housing balance and reduce the need for the local  
5 workforce to commute to adjacent counties.
- 6 D. The project will provide an employment area near the I-215 corridor, where multiple  
7 transportation modes converge.
- 8 E. The project provides public roadway improvements on and adjacent to the site to facilitate  
9 safe vehicular travel to, from, and within the site.
- 10 F. The project will assist in implementing the Redevelopment Agency for the County of  
11 Riverside's I-215 Corridor Project Area, which was formed to encourage redevelopment  
12 and economic growth in the I-215 corridor area.
- 13 G. The project will make monetary contributions to Riverside County's Transportation  
14 Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) to assist in the construction of regional transportation  
15 improvements.
- 16 H. The project will make monetary contributions to the Western Riverside County MSHCP to  
17 assist in property acquisition and maintenance of habitat core and linkage areas.
- 18 I. The project will incorporate multiple design features to reduce operational energy  
19 consumption.
- 20 J. The project will qualify for a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)  
21 Silver certification, using LEED Version 2.0 for "Core and Shell."
- 22 K. The project will provide construction of a segment of a County-planned community trail  
23 along the southern boundary of the site paralleling Nuevo Road.

24  
25 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the State CEQA Guidelines  
26 (Section 15126 (g)) require an SEIR to discuss how a proposed project could directly or indirectly lead to  
27 economic, population, or housing growth. A project may be growth-inducing if it removes obstacles to  
28

1 growth, taxes community service facilities or encourages other activities which cause significant  
2 environmental effects. The discussion is as follows:

3 A. Economic, Population, or Housing Growth

4 The proposed project would accommodate approximately 2,124,774 square feet of  
5 light industrial and distribution warehouse business center development that would  
6 have the potential to foster economic growth in the surrounding environment.  
7 Development of the project would occur consistent with planned growth identified  
8 in the Riverside County General Plan, the Mead Valley Area Plan, and the  
9 Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive  
10 Plan. An extensive analysis of the balance of jobs and housing was conducted as  
11 part of the Housing Element of the County's General Plan. Because the project  
12 would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use Plan and the land use  
13 designations assigned to the property by the Mead Valley Area Plan,  
14 implementation of the project would be consistent with growth forecasts and would  
15 not create an imbalance between jobs and housing in the project vicinity. The  
16 project site is currently undeveloped and vacant except for three occupied  
17 residential homes, fences, tree stumps, and 10 to 15 small trees. Areas surrounding  
18 the project site contain a mixture of residential, light industrial, agriculture, vacant  
19 lands, and open space. Development is occurring in accordance with the Mead  
20 Valley Area Plan and in a phased manner with a logical extension of utility and  
21 infrastructure improvements. Implementation of the project would not stimulate  
22 growth in the area beyond that anticipated by the General Plan and the Mead Valley  
23 Area Plan.

24  
25 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the project will implement  
26 applicable elements of the Riverside County General Plan as follows:

27 A. Land Use Element

28

1 Development of the site with light industrial and warehouse distribution business  
2 center land uses is permitted by the Riverside County's "Business Park (BP)" land  
3 use designation. The project is therefore consistent with the Land Use Element in  
4 that the property would be developed in accordance with the Community  
5 Development Foundation Component land use designations applied to the site by  
6 the General Plan, and in accordance with the Business Park (BP) (0.25-0.60 Floor  
7 Area Ratio) land use designations applied to the site by the Mead Valley Area  
8 Plan.

9 B. Circulation Element

10 As part of the proposed project, construction of improvements to Harvill Avenue,  
11 Nuevo Road, and Webster Avenue would provide consistency with the  
12 designations assigned to these roadways by the County General Plan Circulation  
13 Plan. The project's technical traffic report concludes that implementation of the  
14 project, in conjunction with planned improvements, would not degrade the level of  
15 service of any existing or intersection below an acceptable level; however, the  
16 contribution of traffic to freeway mainlines and to nine (9) study area intersections  
17 would be significant and unavoidable. Mitigation is not available for the project's  
18 impacts to freeway mainlines because no program exists to which Development  
19 Impact Fees for freeway impacts may be paid. For eight of the cumulatively  
20 impacted intersections, impacts would remain significant in the near-term until  
21 TUMF or other funding sources identify and fund necessary improvements to these  
22 intersections. The project is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Plan, and  
23 is thereby consistent with the traffic volumes envisioned by the General Plan Land  
24 use Plan. All required improvements that are directly attributable to the project  
25 would be constructed as part of the proposed project and fair share costs would be  
26 contributed for improvements to affected off-site roadways through payment of the  
27  
28

1 Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF) and Development Impact Fees  
2 (DIF).

3 The General Plan identifies a Community Trail adjacent to Nuevo Road and  
4 Webster Avenue. The project includes the construction of a 12-foot trail (within a  
5 14-foot easement) along the project's frontage with Nuevo Road, in compliance  
6 with the General Plan. Because the trail along Webster Avenue is planned for the  
7 western side of the roadway, opposite the project site, it is not required to be built  
8 as part of the project.

9 C. Multipurpose Open Space Element

10 The project site is not identified for open space preservation by the General Plan or  
11 the MSHCP. The General Plan designates the site as a Community Development  
12 area for Business Park (BP) (0.25-0.60 Floor Area Ratio) uses. Vegetation on the  
13 project site is highly disturbed due to past residential development on the western  
14 portion of the site and ongoing routine maintenance of fallow fields on the eastern  
15 portion of the site. No state or federally listed plant or wildlife species exist on the  
16 site. The State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) identifies the  
17 site as containing Farmland of Local Importance, which is not a farmland  
18 designation of concern for conversion to a non-agricultural land use. The site has  
19 been completely disturbed by past development and ongoing maintenance of  
20 fallow fields on-site and, as such, is not environmentally sensitive. No known  
21 sensitive archaeological or paleontological resources are present; however, the  
22 project is preserving a portion of one archaeological site. The potential exists for  
23 the discovery of archaeological or paleontological resources during grading and  
24 construction and mitigation measures are presented in SEIR No. 507, Section 4.6  
25 to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. Additionally, the project site is  
26 not located within or adjacent to any identified scenic corridors nor is it mapped  
27 within a valuable mineral resource area.  
28

1 D. Safety Element

2 Any structures designated for development would be constructed in accordance  
3 with the California Building Code (CBC) and any site-specific conditions imposed  
4 by the County Geologist; thus insuring geologic safety. The project site is not  
5 located within a blowsand area, is not located within a dam inundation area, and  
6 would not conflict with any disaster preparedness plan. Compliance with the  
7 requirements of the Riverside County Fire Department, and the required payment  
8 of mitigation fees pursuant to Ordinance 659.6 would insure fire safety. Lastly, the  
9 project does not include the use of or creation of hazardous materials with the  
10 exception of building materials and products that are not hazardous in small  
11 concentrations. SEIR No. 507, Section 4.8 addresses remediation of potential  
12 hazardous wastes present on the site.

13 E. Noise Element

14 As indicated in Section 4.10 of SEIR No. 507, noise impacts are anticipated during  
15 construction and long-term on-site operations. SEIR No. 507, Section 4.10  
16 provides mitigation measures to ensure that noise created during project  
17 construction and/or long-term operation is mitigated to below acceptable levels.  
18 With application of the required mitigation measures, the project would be  
19 consistent with the General Plan Noise Element.

20 F. Housing Element

21 The General Plan Land Use designation for the project site is Business Park (BP)  
22 (0.25-0.60 Floor Area Ratio). The proposed project is consistent with the land use  
23 designations. Although the project site currently includes three occupied  
24 residential homes, of which two would be removed during construction of the  
25 project, the removal of these homes would not create the need to build substantial  
26 amounts of replacement housing, as there is sufficient housing stock available in  
27 western Riverside County. In addition, the project does not propose housing.  
28

1 Therefore, the no conflict with the Housing Element would occur with  
2 implementation of the project. The project also would not disrupt or divide any  
3 established community because the site is planned to be developed in accord with  
4 the land use designations assigned to the site by the General Plan.

5 G. Air Quality Element

6 As disclosed in Section 4.4 of SEIR No. 507, the project applicant would be  
7 required to implement mitigation measures intended to reduce direct air quality  
8 impacts to the greatest feasible extent. Implementation of the mitigation measures  
9 would ensure consistency with the Air Quality Element. Not unlike other  
10 development projects in Riverside County, and as disclosed in the SEIR prepared  
11 for the County General Plan (SCH No. 2002051143), direct and cumulative air  
12 quality impacts would remain significant and unmitigable. Although the project's  
13 contribution to air quality impacts is cumulatively significant, the mitigation  
14 measures presented in Section 4.4 of SEIR No. 507 would reduce those impacts to  
15 the greatest extent possible, in conformance with SCAQMD, EPA, and CARB  
16 requirements.

17 H. Administration Element

18 The Administration Element contains information regarding the structure of the  
19 General Plan as well as general planning principles and a statement regarding the  
20 vision for Riverside County. No policy directives are included in this Element.

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

- 24 A. The project site is not located within the MSHCP Criteria Area and as such is not  
25 designated for open space conservation by the MSHCP. Thus, the project would  
26 not conflict with Reserve Assembly, because the project site is not identified for  
27 conservation.  
28

- 1 B. Pursuant to Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP, an assessment of potentially significant  
2 effects on Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, which includes identification  
3 and mapping of such areas located on the project site, is required if such resources  
4 are identified on the project site. The property does not support federal or state  
5 jurisdictional waters, including vernal pools and wetlands. Therefore, impacts to  
6 jurisdictional drainages would not occur with implementation of the project.
- 7 C. Pursuant to Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP, habitat assessments and/or focused  
8 surveys for certain Narrow Endemic plant species are required for properties within  
9 mapped survey areas. Narrow endemic species surveys were conducted between  
10 May 30, 2008 and June 30, 2008 and did not result in the identification of any  
11 Narrow Endemic plant species. Because of the heavily disturbed nature of the site,  
12 and the absence of sensitive plant species, the potential for narrow endemic species  
13 to occur is very low and impacts are less than significant.
- 14 D. Pursuant to Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP, projects in close proximity to the MSHCP  
15 Conservation Area are required to incorporate mechanisms to address indirect  
16 effects to the MSHCP Conservation Area. The project site is not located adjacent  
17 to the MSHCP Criteria Area or any MSHCP Preserve; the nearest MSHCP Criteria  
18 Area is located approximately 0.5 mile to the north and west of the northern project  
19 boundary. Thus, the project has no potential to result in secondary edge effect  
20 impacts on the MSHCP Preserve.
- 21 E. Pursuant to Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP, habitat assessments and/or focused  
22 surveys for certain additional plant and animal species are required for properties  
23 within mapped survey areas. The MSHCP identifies wildlife species survey  
24 requirements on the site for burrowing owl. Focused Surveys for the burrowing  
25 owl were conducted in 2004 and 2008 and the results were negative. With  
26 implementation of the mitigation measures contained in Section 4.5 of SEIR No.  
27  
28

1                   507, potential impacts to this species would be reduced to a level below  
2                   significance.

3           F.           Pursuant to Section 6.4 of the MSHCP, fuel management is required to be  
4                   considered. No fuel management is required for the project; regardless, because the  
5                   project site is not located adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area, impacts of  
6                   fuel management would not affect the Conservation Area.

7           **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that Tentative Parcel Map No.  
8           33530R1 is consistent with the County of Riverside General Plan as adopted by the Riverside County  
9           Board of Supervisors in October of 2003.

10           **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and considered  
11           SEIR No. 507 in evaluating the project, that SEIR No. 507 is an accurate and objective statement that  
12           complies with the California Environmental Quality Act and reflects the County's independent judgment,  
13           and that SEIR No. 507 is incorporated herein by this reference.

14           **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **CERTIFIES** SEIR No. 507  
15           and **ADOPTS** the Mitigation Monitoring Plan specified therein.

16           **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that Tentative Parcel Map No.  
17           33530R1, on file with the Clerk of the Board, including the final conditions of approval and exhibits, is  
18           hereby approved for the real property described and shown on the map, and said real property shall be  
19           developed substantially in accordance with Tentative Parcel Map No. 33530R1, unless the map is  
20           amended by the Board.

21           **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that copies of the project shall  
22           placed on file in the Clerk of the Board, in the Office of the Planning Director, and in the Office of the  
23           Building and Safety Director, and that no applications for other development approvals shall be accepted  
24           for real property described and shown in the project, unless such applications are substantially in  
25           accordance herewith.  
26

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

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