

Guidelines and would not create an aesthetically offensive project. Therefore, and consistent with the findings of EIR 411, significant impacts would not occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory

a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: GIS database, SWAP Figure 6, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution), EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact: The proposed Project is located within Zone B of the Mt. Palomar Observatory Nighttime Lighting Policy Area, as depicted on SWAP Figure 6. The proposed changes to the Specific Plan Land Use Plan would result in a reduction in the total number of residential units allowed on-site and also would result in a slight reduction in the total acreage devoted to residential use, thereby resulting in an incremental reduction in the amount of exterior lighting as compared to the lighting levels assumed in EIR 411. Additionally, all development on the property would be regulated by County Ordinance No. 655, which identifies requirements for outdoor lighting that minimize potential adverse effects on observations at the Mt. Palomar observatory. Furthermore, impacts to the Mt. Palomar Observatory were previously evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which found that impacts would not occur because the proposed Project would be subject to the SP312 Design Guidelines, which include requirements that implement the provisions of County Ordinance No. 655 (e.g., the use of low pressure sodium vapor street lights). With mandatory compliance with Ordinance No. 655 and the SP 312 Design Guidelines, impacts to the Mt. Palomar Observatory would not occur. This conclusion is consistent with the information disclosed in EIR 411.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

3. Other Lighting Issues

a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Description, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact:

a & b) Impacts associated with Project lighting were previously evaluated as part of EIR 411, which found that compliance with the Specific Plan Design Guidelines would preclude significant lighting impacts. Addendum No. 1 also concluded that lighting impacts would be less than significant because "all street lights within the project area will be hooded and implement low pressure sodium which emit light that can be filtered." Standards included in the Specific Plan would ensure that all development in SP 312, including development proposed in the areas that are the focus of this EIR Addendum (Planning Areas 17A, 18A, 18B, 19, and 34), would not create new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. These applicable Specific Plan standards also would ensure that development within the entire Specific Plan area would not expose residential property to unacceptable light levels. Because proposed SP312A1 would result in a reduction in the number of residential dwelling units allowed on-site, and would result in an overall reduction in acreage subject to residential

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

development, lighting impacts would be reduced as compared to what was evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411. As such, Project-related lighting impacts would not occur and would not be increased above the level evaluated in EIR 411.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES Would the project

4. Agriculture

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Ord. No. 625, General Plan EIR, and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) Impacts to agricultural resources were fully evaluated and disclosed in EIR No. 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that such impacts would be less than significant because the proposed Project site does not contain any soils identified as Prime, Statewide Important, or Unique Farmland by the State FMMP. Changes proposed as part of SP312A1 and proposed implementing TR 32289M1 and TR 36418 would not result in impacts to any areas within SP 312 that were not already identified for impact as part of EIR 411 or Addendum No. 1. As such, impacts to Important Farmland types would not occur and would not be substantially different from what was evaluated in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

b) Impacts associated with the conversion of the SP 312 property from agriculture to non-agricultural use were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which found that such impacts would not occur. The Project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract nor is it located within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve. Additionally, the only lands surrounding SP 312 that are zoned for agricultural use are located westerly and northerly of the northern portions of the Specific Plan (A-1-10, A-2-10, and A-1-2½ Zones); however, these off-site properties are all designated for residential use by the SWAP Land Use Plan. Accordingly, no direct impact to agricultural zoning, agricultural use, or Williamson Act contract status would occur with development of the property either as approved by SP 312 and its approved, implementing tract maps or as proposed to be modified by SP312A1 and TR 32289M1 and TR 36418. Therefore, and consistent with the findings of EIR 411, a significant impact due to a conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use, or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or Agricultural Preserve would not occur

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

c) Impacts to surrounding agriculturally zoned properties were not discussed in EIR 411. The only lands surrounding SP 312 that are zoned for agricultural use are located westerly and northerly of the northern portions of the Specific Plan (A-1-10, A-2-10, and A-1-2½ Zones); however, these properties are all designated for residential development by the SWAP and the County General Plan. Only a portion of these lands are currently subject to agricultural uses (i.e., westerly of Planning Area 26). The proposed addition of Planning Area 34 as part of SP312A1 would add a 1.2-acre open space buffer along the Specific Plan's frontage with Keller Road, further separating development in the Specific Plan with off-site, agriculturally zoned properties. Proposed TR 32289M1 and TR 36418 are not located within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property. Development within the portions of the Specific Plan that are within 300 feet of active agricultural uses would be required to comply with Ordinance No. 625, "Right-to-Farm." Therefore, impacts to existing agriculturally zoned property would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required. Thus, no new or more severe impacts to surrounding agricultural uses would occur beyond what was previously evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411.

d) As indicated above, only areas located westerly and northerly of the northern portion of SP 312 are subject to agricultural uses under existing conditions (and only lands westerly of Planning Area 26 are subject to active agricultural operations). No aspect of the currently proposed Project would result in a changed condition associated with inducing the conversion of off-site farmlands to non-agricultural use. Under the proposed Project, SP 312 would be built out as a master-planned residential community, although at a slightly less development intensity than originally approved and as evaluated by EIR 411. Additionally, areas all of the agriculturally zoned properties located adjacent to the Specific Plan area are designated by the SWAP and County General Plan for development with residential uses. The effects associated with converting agricultural properties to non-agricultural uses as called for by the General Plan were previously evaluated as part of the Riverside County's General Plan EIR (SCH No. 2002051143), which found that the conversion of such properties represent a significant and unavoidable impact Countywide. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in an increase in impacts associated with farmland conversion beyond levels previously evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411 and the County General Plan EIR. Accordingly, and consistent with the findings of EIR 411, the proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts associated with farmland conversion.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

5. Forest

a) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Govt. Code section 51104(g))?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: General Plan Figure OS-3 "Parks, Forests and Recreation Areas," EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

a) through c): The proposed Project site does not contain any forest lands, is not zoned for forest resources, nor is it identified as containing forest resources by the Riverside County General Plan. There are no components of the proposed Project that could result in significant impacts, either directly or indirectly, to forestland resources or that could result in the conversion of forestland resources to non-forest use. No impact would occur. Although the specific topic of Forest was not evaluated in EIR 411, the EIR disclosed extensive information about the property's existing conditions and surrounding environment, including vegetation types, to reasonably conclude that the property and immediately surrounding area do not contain forest lands and that development in the Specific Plan area would have no adverse effects on forests.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project

6. Air Quality Impacts

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to substantial point source emissions?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, SCAQMD AQMP, SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, General Plan EIR (Section 4.5, *Air Quality*)

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB or "Basin") and under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAB encompasses approximately 6,745 square miles and includes Orange County and the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. The SCAB is bound by the Pacific Ocean to the west; the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east, respectively; and the San Diego County line to the south. The SCAQMD is principally responsible for air pollution control and has adopted a series of Air Quality Management Plans (AQMPs) to reduce emissions from stationary, mobile, and indirect sources to meet state and federal ambient air quality standards. When EIR 411 was certified in 2001, the SCAQMD's 1997 AQMP was applicable. Subsequently, the SCAQMD Governing Board adopted the Draft Final 2007 AQMP for the SCAB, on June 1, 2007. The SCAQMD is currently working on a 2012 AQMP but it is not yet adopted so the SCAQMD 2007 AQMP remains the applicable air quality for consistency analysis. For purposes of evaluation and to determine whether the proposed Project would result in any new or more severe air quality impacts than

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

disclosed in EIR 411, consistency with both the then-applicable 1997 AQMP and the currently applicable 2007 AQMP are discussed below.

EIR 411 did not directly address the 1997 AQMP, although EIR 411 did determine that the proposed Project, with mitigation, would comply with all applicable SCAQMD requirements. The proposed Project is consistent with the County's General Plan and SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), which is used as the basis for its growth assumptions. The proposed Project would not create a new or more severe impact associated with 1997 AQMP compliance because the land use modifications proposed by SP312A1 would result in reducing the approved development intensity on the property. Therefore, the land use changes proposed by the Project would not result in any new conflict with the regional growth projections contained within the 1997 AQMP.

Under existing conditions, the 2007 SCAQMD AQMP is the applicable air quality plan for the Project area. This AQMP was based on the assumptions provided by both the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in the EMFAC 2007 model for the most recent motor vehicle and demographics information, respectively.

The Project's consistency with the 2007 AQMP is discussed below. Criteria for determining consistency with the AQMP are defined in Chapter 12, Section 12.2 and Section 12.3 of the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* (1993).

- ☐ **Consistency Criterion No. 1:** *The proposed project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP.*

The violations that Consistency Criterion No. 1 refers to are the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). EIR 411 included an analysis of SP 312's impacts to air quality, and found that cumulative impacts to regional air quality would remain significant and unavoidable even following the incorporation of mitigation measures. However, the proposed Project would result in an overall reduction in intensity on-site due to the reduction in dwelling units (from 1,793 units as ultimately approved pursuant to SP 312 to 1,671 as proposed pursuant to SP312A1), the elimination of school uses within Planning Area 19, and the addition of passive park uses within Planning Areas 15 and 34. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would result in an overall decrease in total emissions from the site, and would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations beyond what was already identified and disclosed as part of EIR 411. On the basis of the preceding discussion, the proposed Project would be consistent with Consistency Criterion No. 1.

- ☐ **Consistency Criterion No. 2:** *The proposed project will not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP or increments based on the years of project build-out phase.*

Assumptions used in the AQMP for projecting future emissions levels are based in part on land use data provided by lead agency general plan documentation. Projects that propose general plan amendments and changes of zone may increase the intensity of use may result in increased stationary area source or mobile source emissions that exceed projections contained within the AQMP. The Project proposes a Specific Plan Amendment and a Change of Zone, which would result in a decrease in the maximum number of residential units allowed within SP 312. As such, Project-related emissions would be less than assumed for the implementation of SP 312 and less

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

than evaluated and disclosed in EIR 411. As such, the Project would not substantially exceed assumptions in the AQMP and the Project would be consistent with Consistency Criterion No. 2.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the proposed Project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP. Additionally, the proposed Project would not exceed the growth assumptions in the AQMP and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP.

Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and implementation of the Project would not result in new impacts that were not previously identified in EIR 411.

b) & c) Air quality impacts that would result from buildout of all or portions of SP 312 were previously evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. EIR 411 found that impacts to regional air quality would be cumulatively significant and unavoidable even after incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures identified as part of EIR 411 would continue to apply to the proposed Project, and would be enforced by Riverside County as part of the Project's conditions of approval. As indicated above, the proposed Project would result in a net reduction in intensity allowed on-site, which would have a concomitant reduction in the amount of air quality emissions generated on-site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would result in a decrease in the Project's significant unavoidable cumulative impact to regional air quality, and no new impacts beyond those already identified in EIR 411 would occur. Accordingly, no new mitigation measures would be required.

d) The proposed Project would consist of a residential community and would not include any uses that have the potential to generate substantial amounts of point source emissions. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors which are located within one mile of the Project site to substantial point source emissions, and no impact would occur.

e) Land uses within one mile of the proposed Project site include open space land uses, agricultural uses (dryland farming), residential uses, school uses, and commercial retail. None of these uses comprise a source of substantial point source emissions. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in the construction of a sensitive residential receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter, and a significant impact would not occur.

f) The Project proposes to develop the site with residential, recreation, and open space land uses, as well as associated infrastructure (roadways, water mains, wastewater mains). These land uses are not typically associated with the generation of objectionable odors. Accordingly, long-term operation of the Project would not generate objectionable odors that affect a substantial number of people. Long-term odor impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

Construction activities on the Project site may result in objectionable odors from construction equipment exhaust, application of asphalt, and the application of architectural coatings. However, mandatory compliance with applicable regulatory standards, including SCAQMD Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings), would minimize odor impacts associated with Project construction activities. Furthermore, odors generated during construction would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction. As such, short-term odor impacts associated with Project construction would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project				
7. Wildlife & Vegetation				
a. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: GIS database, WRC-MSHCP, On-site Inspection, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Focused Burrowing Owl Survey, Biological Assessment.

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed Project is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), which was adopted by Riverside County in 2003. At the time that EIR 411 was certified in 2001, there was no habitat conservation plan applicable to the proposed Project site; as such, EIR 411 did not address the proposed Project's consistency with the MSHCP. The MSHCP identifies conservation criteria for portions of the County that are identified for conservation as part of the MSHCP. According to Riverside County GIS, the westernmost portions of SP 312 (i.e., Planning Areas 15, 16, and 18A, and the western portions of Planning Areas 18B and 17A) are located within MSHCP Conservation Cell 5476, which is part of Cell Group Z; however, the Conservation Criteria associated with MSHCP Cell Group Z indicates that "Conservation...will range from 75%-85% of the Cell Group focusing in the western portion of the Cell Group." The portions of SP 312 that are located within Cell Group Z occur in the easternmost portion of the Group; accordingly, the proposed Project site is not identified for conservation as part of the MSHCP, and the proposed Project would not conflict with the MSHCP. In

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

addition, since SP 312 was adopted at the time the MSHCP was approved by Riverside County, SP 312 was assumed by the MSHCP to be eventually developed. In addition, the southern-most portion of the Specific Plan area is located within Cell 5572, which is not a part of any Cell Group. However, this portion of the Specific Plan is already developed or is under construction in accordance with approved SP 312, and the Conservation Criteria for Cell 5572 requires the conservation of only 20%-30% of the Cell, focusing in the southeastern portion of the Cell; the required conservation is accommodated within Planning Area 1 of SP 312, which is a 19.8-acre area designated as Open Space-Conservation (OS-C). Proposed PS312A1 does not propose to change the acreage or configuration of Planning Area 1.

In addition to the Conservation Criteria identified by the MSHCP for portions of the County, the MSHCP also incorporates policies requiring focused studies for certain plant and animal species. If such plant or animal species are present, the MSHCP identifies conservation requirements that may apply to proposed new development. These species-specific requirements would apply to the proposed Project, if any such species are identified on-site. However, focused studies conducted on the proposed Project site in conjunction with EIR 411 and as part of the 2004 Biological Assessment did not detect the presence of Munz's onion, San Diego ambrosia, Many-stemmed dudleya, Spreading navarretia, California Orcutt grass, or Wright's trichocoronis, which are identified as narrow endemic plant species as part of the MSHCP. EIR 411 includes mitigation measures requiring focused surveys prior to grading or vegetation clearance, and requires either preservation or relocation of such species; mitigation measures identified by EIR 411 would continue to apply to the proposed Project, and would ensure that implementation of the proposed Project does not result in any significant impacts to narrow endemic plant species. Additionally, no burrowing owls were detected on-site as part of EIR 411, a 2004 Biological Assessment, or a site-specific Burrowing Owl survey conducted in March 2005 which covered the entire SP 312 property. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in physical impacts beyond what was already assumed in EIR 411, since areas proposed for grading and development would not increase under the proposed Project. Therefore, with mandatory compliance with the mitigation measures identified in EIR 411, impacts due to a conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan would not occur and would not be increased relative to the analysis and conclusions as contained in EIR 411.

b & c) Potential impacts to endangered, threatened, candidate, sensitive, or special status species were previously evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which found that impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation, with exception of the loss of 608 acres of raptor foraging habitat which was identified as a significant unavoidable impact. Mitigation measures identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 would continue to apply to the proposed Project, and would be enforced by Riverside County as part of the Project's conditions of approval. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in impacts to endangered, threatened, candidate, sensitive, or special status species beyond what was already identified, disclosed, and mitigated for as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. In addition, since approval of SP 312, the County has adopted the MSHCP, which provides for long-term habitat and preservation for endangered, threatened, candidate, sensitive, and special status species. The MSHCP also considers issues such as foraging habitat for certain sensitive species. As indicated under the analysis of Threshold 7.a, above, the proposed Project would be fully consistent with the MSHCP. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts to endangered, threatened, candidate, sensitive, or special status species, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

d) The proposed Project site occurs within the MSHCP, which considers regional wildlife movement corridors. As indicated above, when the MSHCP was approved, SP 312 was already in effect and assumed ultimate development of the Project site in conformance with the land use plan contained within SP 312. Additionally, the proposed Project site is not identified for conservation as part of the MSHCP. Additionally, the proposed Project accommodates a north-east trending open space area within Planning Area 1, and preserves an existing drainage within Planning Areas 2A, 3A, 2B, 2C, and 2D; the

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

preservation of these corridors would help to establish the MSHCP Proposed Constrained Linkage 18 and would thereby accommodate wildlife movement between proposed conservation areas to the south and to the east. Accordingly, no significant impacts to wildlife movement corridors would occur with implementation of the proposed Project. Additionally, EIR 411 did not identify any native wildlife nursery sites within the Project vicinity, and no native wildlife nurseries have been established in the Project vicinity since EIR 411 was certified; thus, there has been no change in circumstance with respect to wildlife nurseries. Therefore, and consistent with the findings of EIR 411, no significant impacts to wildlife nurseries native resident or migratory wildlife corridors would occur.

e) Impacts to riparian habitats and sensitive natural communities were previously evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. As concluded in EIR 411, buildout of SP 312 would result in impacts to 0.23 acre of riparian woodlands, in addition to impacts to 557.9 acres of agricultural lands, 10.25 acres of developed areas, 5.65 acres of ruderal habitat, 4.44 acres of annual grasslands, 1.38 acres of exotic woodlands, 1.34 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, and 0.61 acres of rock outcrop. Impacts to these communities were identified as less than significant either because they are not sensitive or because of their limited distribution throughout the proposed Project site. Impacts to 0.23 acre of riparian woodlands also were evaluated as less than significant as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 because mitigation for these areas would be required as part of future Wildlife Agency permitting (which were enforced as part of the Conditions of Approval for Tentative Map 30696). Since EIR 411 was certified, some portions of the SP312 area have been developed, other areas are under construction, and all other areas have approved subdivision maps but are not yet constructed. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in impacts to riparian habitat or sensitive natural plant communities beyond what was already evaluated by EIR 411. Accordingly, no new or more severe significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

f) Impacts to federally protected wetlands were previously evaluated as part of EIR 411, which found that build-out of the Specific Plan would result in the direct removal of up to 0.12 acres of seasonal pools, 0.23 acres of riparian woodlands, and approximately 2,900 linear feet of dry creek bed. Addendum No. 1 further clarified that implementation of the proposed Project would result in impacts to 0.51 acre of waters of the United States, of which 0.46 acre comprises jurisdictional wetlands. In addition, Addendum No. 1 found that implementation of the proposed Project would result in impacts to 0.46 acre of California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) jurisdictional streambeds. These areas may be under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), the CDFG, and/or the Regional water Quality Control Board according to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 1600 of the California Department of Fish and Game Code. Potential significant impacts associated with removal of these areas were found by EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 to be less than significant because such impacts would be mitigated through the Wildlife Agency permit acquisition process (which also is required pursuant to Conditions of Approval associated with TR 30696). Since certification of EIR No. 411 and Addendum No. 1, development within TR 30696 has commenced, and mitigation for impacts to wetlands and riparian habitat is in progress. Although the areas proposed for revision as part of SP312A1 are located adjacent to a portion of this habitat, mitigation for impacts to this habitat will have been completed prior to the commencement of construction activities as part of TR 36418 and TR 32289M1. Areas proposed for disturbance by TR 36418 and TR 32289M1 would not result in any impacts to wetland or riparian resources. Thus, there are no components of the proposed Project that would result in impacts to wetlands beyond what was already disclosed by EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1; accordingly, no new significant impacts to wetlands would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

g) EIR 411 did not disclose the presence of any oak trees in the SP 312 area, nor any other tree species regulated by County ordinance or addressed by County policy. Since EIR 411 was certified, ornamental trees have been planted in the developed portions of the property to implement the Specific Plan's landscape design guidelines. Ornamental trees are not subject to any applicable County tree

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

preservation policies for the purpose of protecting biological resources. Accordingly, no impact would not occur, which is consistent with the finding of EIR 411.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

8. Historic Resources

a. Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Archaeological Monitoring Report.

Findings of Fact:

a) & b): Impacts to historic resources were evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. EIR 411 found that implementation of SP 312 would result in direct impacts to a single historical resource (identified as Site No. 3, Mac-3). This site consists of ruins of structures and some artifacts, some of which appeared to be greater than 50 years old and are regarded as important per the California Environmental Quality Act. This site is located inside project site at the southernmost portion and outside to the east, within areas that are either developed or areas that are currently under construction. Impacts to this resource were evaluated as less than significant following the incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures identified as part of EIR 411 would continue to apply to the proposed Project, and the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts to historical resources beyond what was already identified and mitigated to a level below significance as part of EIR 411. Addendum No. 1 did not identify any new impacts to historical resources, although it did impose mitigation measures requiring monitoring during ground disturbing activities. Additionally, no historical resources were identified during archaeological monitoring of areas under construction as part of Phase 1 of SP 312. Accordingly, no new impacts to historical resources would occur with implementation of the proposed Project.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

9. Archaeological Resources

a. Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Archaeological Monitoring Report.

Findings of Fact:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

a & b) Impacts to archaeological resources were evaluated as part of EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, and archaeological monitoring conducted in conjunction with Phase 1 of the Specific Plan area. EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 determined that the Project site contained only two (2) prehistoric sites. Site No. 1 (Mac-1) consists of a bedrock milling feature on a low granite boulder which includes two shallow bedrock mortars and three bedrock metates (slicks) and small chipped quartz stone. Site No. 1 is located in the southwest corner of Keller and Leon Roads (i.e., partially within the northeastern portion of the Specific Plan area, where no development has occurred to date). Site No. 2 (Mac-2) is a small campsite which exhibits seven bedrock milling features (slicks), rock art, a light scatter of chipped stone artifacts predominated by quartzite, three areas of fire-affected rock which may have been hearths, and a shallow midden. Site No. 2 is considered important per the California Environmental Quality Act. Site monitoring during construction of Phase 1 of the proposed Project determined that there were no previously unknown cultural resources within the Project area. Impacts to archaeological resources on-site were determined to be less than significant following the incorporation of mitigation measures as part of EIR 411. Mitigation measures identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 would continue to apply to the proposed Project, and there are no components of the proposed Project that could result in any new impacts to archaeological resources that were not already identified as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts to archaeological resources, and no new mitigation would be required.

c) Although impacts to human remains were not specifically addressed as part of EIR 411, no human remains were identified on-site during the past archaeological investigations conducted in support of EIR 411 or during site monitoring associated with the construction of Phase 1 of the proposed Project. Nonetheless, in the event that human remains are uncovered, the Project developer would be required to comply with California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, which requires notification of the County coroner and Native American Heritage Commission and specifies the procedures for disposition of the remains. Through mandatory compliance with state law, potential impacts to human remains would be precluded and would not occur.

d) Although impacts to religious or sacred uses were not explicitly addressed as part of EIR 411, cultural resources investigations conducted in association with EIR 411 did not identify any such uses on-site. Additionally, a majority of the SP 312 site already has been disturbed by mass grading activities. Accordingly, impacts would not occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

10. Paleontological Resources

a. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity", EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact:

a) Potential impacts to paleontological resources were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which determined that the potential for uncovering such resources on-site is very low and concluded that implementation of the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to paleontological resources. There are no components of the proposed Project that could result in any new impacts to paleontological resources. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

result in any new impacts to paleontological resources, and no mitigation would be required. Although Addendum No. 1 identified no impacts to paleontological resources, mitigation measures were imposed requiring archaeological monitoring during construction; however, this requirement already would be enforced as part of the mitigation for Issue 9, above, and is not necessary to reduce impacts to paleontological resources to below a level of significance.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project

11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?				
b. Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, Geologist Comments, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Geology/Soils Report Update; PSE Geotechnical Report; TR 30696 Geotechnical Report.

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) All potential impacts associated with Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones and County Fault Hazard Zones were addressed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. Site-specific geotechnical reports also have been prepared for Tracts 30694, 30695, 30696, 32289M1, 32290 and 36418, which conclude that the proposed Project site is suitable for development as proposed, assuming adherence to the recommendations contained each site-specific geotechnical report. As disclosed in EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, and the site-specific geotechnical reports, there are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake fault zones located on-site. The nearest faults to the proposed Project site are the Elsinore Fault (6.5 miles southwest of the proposed Project site) and the San Jacinto Fault Zone (14.4 miles northeast of the proposed Project site). As concluded in EIR 411, major earthquakes occurring on the Elsinore Canyon fault or other regional active faults located in the Southern California area could subject the site to moderate-to-severe ground shaking. However, EIR 411 concluded that while shaking is a geologic hazard common to the Southern California region, construction in accordance with the minimum standards of the Uniform Building Code, which requires sufficient calculated factors of safety to resist seismically induced failure, would minimize potential damage from seismic activity and reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance. Mitigation measures were recommended to ensure compliance with the site-specific geotechnical evaluation prepared in conjunction with EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. Mitigation measures specific in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. Additionally, an update to the soils engineering geology report was prepared for TR 32289M1 and TR 36418 by Leighton and Associates, Inc. ("Geology/Soils Report Update"). Based on current site conditions, a review of TR 32289M1 and TR 36418, and a review of previously-prepared documentation for the site, Leighton and Associates reconfirmed the findings of the previously-prepared reports and found that the tract maps, as designed, are acceptable from a geotechnical point of view, thereby indicating that the site would not be subject to geologic hazards, assuming compliance with the recommendations contained within the report. All recommendations contained within the Geology/Soils Report Update would be enforced by Riverside County as conditions of approval for TR 32289M1 and TR 36418. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in any fault hazard-related impacts beyond the limits of TR 32289M1

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

and TR 36418. Accordingly, no new impacts would occur with Project implementation, and new mitigation measures beyond those specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 would be required.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

12. Liquefaction Potential Zone

a. Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction", EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Geology/Soils Report Update; PSE Geotechnical Report; TR 30696 Geotechnical Report.

Findings of Fact:

a) Liquefaction and other seismic-related hazards were evaluated in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which found that the likelihood of liquefaction on the site is low due to the dense nature of the shallow granitic bedrock and concluded that liquefaction hazards would be less than significant, assuming compliance with the recommendations in the site-specific geotechnical reports. Additionally, the Geology/Soils Report Update concludes that the susceptibility to liquefaction and other related hazards would be "very low" within the development area. Furthermore, TR 36418 previously was mass graded in accordance with a County-approved site-specific geotechnical evaluation that addressed the potential for liquefaction hazards. All applicable recommendations contained within the Geology/Soils Report Update would be enforced by Riverside County as conditions of approval for TR 32289M1 and TR 36418. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in any liquefaction hazard-related impacts beyond the limits of TR 32289M1 and TR 36418; accordingly, no new impacts would occur with Project implementation, and no new mitigation measures would be required beyond those already specified by EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

13. Ground-shaking Zone

Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Geology/Soils Report Update; PSE Geotechnical Report; TR 30696 Geotechnical Report.

Findings of Fact: All potential impacts associated with seismic ground shaking were addressed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. Site-specific geotechnical reports also have been prepared for Tracts 30694, 30695, 30696, 32289, 32290 and 36418, which conclude that the proposed Project site is suitable for development as proposed, assuming adherence to the recommendations contained each site-specific geotechnical report.

Although TR 32289 has been revised as part of TR 32289M1 (i.e., to convert previously proposed half-acre lots to recreational and open space uses, to adjust the detention basin configuration, and to modify the internal configuration of residential lots), the Geology/Soils Report Update concludes that the

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

recommendations of the original PSE Geotechnical Report would continue to apply to the revised map. As disclosed in EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, and the site-specific geotechnical reports, major earthquakes occurring on regional active faults located in the Southern California area could subject the site to moderate-to-severe ground shaking. However, EIR 411 concludes that while shaking is a geologic hazard common to the Southern California region, construction in accordance with the minimum standards of the Uniform Building Code, which requires sufficient calculated factors of safety to resist seismically induced failure, would minimize potential damage from seismic activity and reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance. However, mitigation measures were recommended in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 to ensure compliance with the site-specific geotechnical evaluations prepared in conjunction with EIR 411 and/or implementing tract maps. Mitigation measures specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. Additionally, the Geology/Soils Report Update concludes that the seismic-related hazards within the development area of TR 32289M1 and TR 36418 are acceptable from a geotechnical point of view, assuming compliance with the recommendations contained in the Geology/Soils Report Update. All applicable recommendations contained within the Geology/Soils Report Update would be enforced by Riverside County as conditions of approval for TR 32289M1 and TR 36418. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in any seismic ground shaking-related impacts beyond the limits of TR 32289M1 and TR 36418; accordingly, no new impacts would occur with Project implementation; accordingly, no new new impacts due to strong seismic ground shaking would occur, mitigation measures beyond those specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 would not be required.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

14. Landslide Risk

a. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: On-site Inspection, General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope," EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Geology/Soils Report Update; PSE Geotechnical Report; TR 30696 Geotechnical Report.

Findings of Fact:

a) As concluded in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, the potential for soil settlement and landslides is remote due to the shallow depths of dense granitic bedrock and the relatively flat terrain, although portions of the site are subject to dynamic settlement hazards beneath Briggs Road due to the presence of saturated alluvium. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in landslide or soil instability hazards that are greater than what was evaluated in EIR 411 or Addendum No. 1. All slopes on-site would be constructed at a maximum 2:1 gradient, and would not exceed a height of 10 feet. The Geology/Soils Report Update also concludes that no evidence of landslides or other significant surficial failures occur within the boundaries of TR 32289M1 and TR 36418. As such, there would be no new impacts associated landslide risks or soil instability at the proposed Project site.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures beyond those identified in Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in Addendum No. 1.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

15. Ground Subsidence

a. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Geology/Soils Report Update; PSE Geotechnical Report; TR 30696 Geotechnical Report.

Findings of Fact:

a) EIR 411 concluded that impacts associated with ground subsidence would not occur. Addendum No. 1 determined that the Project site occurs within a Susceptible Subsidence Zone, and imposed mitigation requiring compliance with site-specific geotechnical reports to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Mitigation measures specified in Addendum No. 1 would continue to apply to the proposed Project; accordingly, no new mitigation measures beyond those specified in Addendum No. 1 would be required. No impacts associated with ground subsidence were identified as part of the Geology/Soils Report Update or the site-specific reports prepared for TR 30696 or TR 32289M1. There are no components of the proposed Project that could result in new impacts due to ground subsidence beyond those previously disclosed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1; accordingly, a significant impact would not occur and no new mitigation would be required beyond standard compliance with the site-specific geotechnical evaluations.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures beyond those identified in Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in Addendum No. 1.

16. Other Geologic Hazards

a. Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Geology/Soils Report Update; PSE Geotechnical Report; TR 30696 Geotechnical Report.

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed Project site is not located in close proximity to any known active volcanoes. Additionally, there are no conditions in the Project vicinity that could subject the site to hazards associated with seiches or mudflows. Accordingly, and consistent with the findings of EIR 411, significant impacts would not occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

17. Slopes

a. Change topography or ground surface relief features?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b. Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c. Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Source: Riv. Co. 800-Scale Slope Maps, Project Application Materials, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Geology/Soils Report Update; PSE Geotechnical Report; TR 30696 Geotechnical Report.

Findings of Fact:

a) through c): Impacts due to slopes were previously evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, both of which concluded that impacts would be less than significant. Portions of the proposed Project site have been subject to past grading activities and/or development (including areas within TR 36418), while remaining areas (including within TR 32289M1) were used for agricultural production in the past. Furthermore, grading proposed as part of SP 312 and TR 32289M1 and TR 36418 generally would retain the site's existing topographic character. As such, the proposed Project would not substantially alter the site's existing topography or ground surface features. All slopes proposed as part of TR 36418 and TR 32289M1 would be constructed with a maximum slope gradient of 2:1 and at a maximum height of ten feet. Within the areas still subject to development pursuant to SP 312, there are no existing subsurface disposal systems. As such, significant impacts would not occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

18. Soils

a. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Geology/Soils Report Update; PSE Geotechnical Report; TR 30696 Geotechnical Report.

Findings of Fact:

a) Impacts associated with soil erosion were previously evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. As concluded in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, impacts due to soil erosion and/or the loss of top soil would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. Moreover, development of TR 32289M1 and TR 36418 would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, which would further reduce the potential for soil erosion associated with development within these tracts. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil outside the boundaries of TR 32289M1 and TR 36418 that was not already previously evaluated, disclosed, and, where necessary, mitigated to a level below significance by EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. As such, Project-related impacts associated with soil erosion and the loss of topsoil are evaluated as less than significant.

b) As concluded in EIR 411, no impacts are anticipated as a result of high shrink/swell potential soils on-site. As concluded in the Geology/Soils Report Update, only very low to medium expansive soils occur within TR 32289M1 and TR 36418, and the Geology/Soils Report Update incorporates recommendations

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

to attenuate effects of expansive soils. All applicable recommendations contained within the Geology/Soils Report Update would be enforced by Riverside County as conditions of approval for TR 32289M1 and TR 36418. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in new or increased impacts associated with expansive soils. Accordingly, no new mitigation measures would be required.

c) The proposed Project would not involve the construction of septic systems on-site, as the Project would connect to a sanitary sewer system for treatment of Project wastewater. As such, significant impacts associated with septic systems would not occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

19. Erosion

a. Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

b. Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Source: U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Geology/Soils Report Update; PSE Geotechnical Report; TR 30696 Geotechnical Report.

Findings of Fact:

a) & b): All potential erosion impacts were addressed in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that such impacts would be reduced to a level below significance with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. In addition, a NPDES permit would be required for construction activities within TR 32289M1 and TR 36418, which would require that measures be incorporated to reduce the potential for substantial soil erosion from the site. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in increased erosion-related impacts beyond what was identified, disclosed, and mitigated to below a level of significance as part of EIR 411. Therefore, through mandatory compliance with the mitigation measures specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, and with compliance with the NPDES permit, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels and would not increase beyond the findings of EIR 411 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

20. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

a. Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?

Source: General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. 460, Sec. 14.2 & Ord. 484, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Geology/Soils Report Update; PSE Geotechnical Report; TR 30696 Geotechnical Report.

Findings of Fact:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

a) Wind erosion impacts were evaluated in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, both of which concluded that such impacts would not occur because the Project site is not located in a portion of the County subject to strong winds or blowsand-related hazards.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project

21. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Project Application Materials, CARB Scoping Plan, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, GHG Analysis; *CREED v. City of San Diego*

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) Although climate change impacts due to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were not specifically evaluated in EIR 411, the EIR analyzed air quality impacts associated with buildout of the approved project, inclusive of carbon dioxide (CO2) and other GHG emissions. EIR 411 also addressed vehicle emissions (both construction and operational) and operational emissions from energy consumption, which are the most common sources of greenhouse gas emissions.

As such, GHG emissions and the issue of global climate change (GCC) do not represent new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known at the time that the EIR 411 was certified. Information on the effect of GHG emissions on climate was known long before the Riverside County certified EIR 411. GCC and GHG emissions were identified as environmental issues since as early as 1978 when the U.S. Congress enacted the National Climate Program Act (Pub L 95-367, 92 Stat 601). In 1979, the National Research Council published "Carbon Dioxide and Climate: A Scientific Assessment," which concluded that climate change was an accelerating phenomenon partly due to human activity. Numerous studies conducted before and after the National Research Council report reached similar conclusions. Information also was widely published in a series of reports by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPPC) dating back to the 1990s, including IPPC's "2001 Third Assessment Report." California adopted legislation in 2002 requiring the California Air Resources Board to develop regulations limiting greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles. As such, information about GCC and GHG emissions was available with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time EIR 411 was certified in 2004. During the public review period and public hearings associated with EIR 411, no objections or concerns were raised regarding the EIR's analysis of GHG emissions, and no legal challenge was filed within the statute of limitations period established by Public Resources Code §21167(c). Pursuant to CEQA case law and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3), the issue of Project-related GHG emissions does not provide new information of substantial importance or substantial evidence of a new impact to the environment that was not or could not have been known at the time EIR 411 was certified; thus, minor additions are needed to make the previous EIR adequate to cover the actions that are currently proposed, which are documented herein, below and serves as an Addendum to the EIR.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

To evaluate whether the proposed Project would result in GHG impacts that were not examined in EIR 411, a GHG study was prepared for the proposed Project by Urban Crossroads, Inc., which is available for review at the Riverside County Planning Department located at 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA. Refer to the GHG Analysis for a more detailed discussion of GHGs, the regulatory context for GHG emissions, and for a description of the methodology used to calculate the proposed Project's GHG emissions.

Analysis of Project Impacts Pursuant to County Standard Operating Procedure

Currently (as of October 2012), the SCAQMD has not adopted significance thresholds for GHG emissions for residential development projects within the SCAQMD region. The Riverside County Planning Department relies on a draft Standard Operating Procedure (draft County SOP) for GHG analysis and CEQA compliance. According to the draft County SOP, for non-industrial projects and until such time as binding regulatory guidance or a more specific threshold is adopted by a relevant agency, a demonstration that the Project has reduced GHG emissions by 30 percent or more below a business-as-usual (BAU) standard suffices for demonstrating that the Project has a less than significant impact. The draft County SOP defines BAU as those emissions that would occur in year 2020 if the average baseline emissions during the 2002-2004 period were grown to 2020 levels without control. This is consistent with the methodology that the California Air Resources Board (CARB) used to estimate the GHG reductions the State of California would need to achieve in 2020 to meet 1990 levels. For purposes of Project-related analysis, BAU refers to emissions that would occur based on the approved SP 312, as described and analyzed in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, without taking credit for mandatory, regulatory emission controls that have been adopted since 2004 or mitigation measures (pursuant to the requirements of EIR No. 411) that would reduce emissions.

Consistent with SOP guidance, the analysis contained in the Greenhouse Gas Analysis compares the emissions from the land uses as originally evaluated in EIR 411 (BAU) to the emissions from the currently proposed Project. In summary, the total amount of Project-related GHG emissions for BAU without accounting for any regulatory developments since 20014 (when SP 312 was approved) that would reduce GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources combined, would total 42,299.57 MTCO₂e as shown on Table 2, *Business as Usual Greenhouse Gas Emissions*.

In comparison, the total amount of Project-related GHG emissions when accounting for applicable regulatory developments, project design features specified in SP 312A1, and applicable mitigation measures from EIR 411 that would apply to the reduction of GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources combined would total 29,444.38 MTCO₂e as shown on Table 3, *Proposed Land Use Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. This results in a 30.39% reduction from BAU; thus, with implementation of SP 312A1 and regulatory developments, the Project's GHG reduction would meet the reduction target of 30% (refer to Table 4, *Proposed Project to BAU GHG CO₂ Equivalent Emissions Comparison*) and impacts would be less than significant.

Analysis of Project Impacts Pursuant to CARB Scoping Plan and CAT Strategies

In addition, the CARB identified reduction measures to achieve the goals of AB 32 as set forth in the CARB Scoping Plan. Thus, projects that are consistent with design features, commitments and regulations adopted to implement the CARB Scoping Plan are also consistent with the 30% reduction below business as usual required by AB 32. CARB's Scoping Plan incorporates 39 "Recommended Actions" (qualitative measures) that are intended to meet the goal of AB 32. Of these 39 "Recommended Actions," only those that are related to transportation, electricity, natural gas, and green building design are applicable to the proposed Project. An analysis of the proposed Project's consistency with these applicable "Recommended Actions" is provided in Table 2-5 of the GHG Analysis, and is supported by a detailed analysis of each Recommended Actions (refer to Pages 22 through 30 of the GHG Analysis). This analysis concludes that

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

the proposed Project would be consistent with, or would otherwise not conflict with, any of the "Recommended Actions" incorporated into the CARB Scoping Plan.

Table 2 Business as Usual Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emission Source	Emissions (metric tons per year)			
	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	Total CO ₂ E
Annual construction-related emissions amortized over 30 years	239.914	0.018	--	239.93
Area Source Emissions	1,332.99	0.69	0.03	1,355.63
Energy	12,269.06	6.89	60.56	12,336.51
Mobile Sources	26,040.04	4.41	--	26,132.72
Waste	982.904	363.54	--	1,346.444
Water Usage	778.59	3.69	0.10	888.31
Total CO₂E (All Sources)		42,299.57		

Table 3 Proposed Land Use Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emission Source	Emissions (metric tons per year)			
	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	Total CO ₂ E
Annual construction-related emissions amortized over 30 years	239.914	0.018	0.00	239.93
Area Source Emissions	1,124.99	0.06	0.02	1,132.43
Energy	7,270.14	0.23	0.13	7,315.04
Mobile Sources	18,925.48	0.71	--	18,940.42
Waste	420.61	24.86	--	942.62
Water Usage	772.49	3.40	0.10	873.94
Total CO₂E (All Sources)		29,444.38		

Source: CalEEMod™ model output. See Appendix "A" to the GHG Analysis for detailed model outputs.
Note: Totals obtained from CalEEMod™ and may not total 100% due to rounding.

Table 4 Proposed Project to BAU GHG CO2 Equivalent Emissions Comparison

ANNUAL	
Land Use	Total CO2E
Business as Usual (BAU)	42,299.57
Proposed Land Use	29,444.38
DELTA (Proposed – BAU)	-12,855.19
% DELTA	-30.39%

The detailed discussion and analysis also evaluates the Project's consistency with the 2006 Climate Action Team (CAT) Report, which sets forth a number of emission reduction strategies. Although implementation of the CAT strategies would reduce GHG emissions to the extent possible, it is not possible to specifically

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

quantify the reduction in GHG that will result from implementation of CAT strategies and programs. However, a project that is consistent with CAT strategies is consistent with the strategies suggested to reduce California's emissions to the levels proposed by Executive Order S-3-05 and AB 32.

Conclusion

As such, an assessment of Project impacts based upon the County's SOP for GHG analyses and consistency with the CARB Scoping Plan and 2006 CAT Report supports the conclusion that the Project GHG emissions are not significant nor cumulatively considerable. Further, Project GHG emissions would be further reduced with implementation of the applicable mitigation measures (pursuant to requirements of EIR No. 411).

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

22. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: Project Application Materials, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1.

Findings of Fact:

a & b) As concluded in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, the proposed Project does not propose any future land uses that would permit hazardous materials, with exception of future commercial retail uses within Planning Area 4; however, Planning Area 4 has since been annexed into the City of Murrieta and would be removed from the Specific Plan as part of the proposed Project. Changes to the Project proposed as part of SP312A1 would not significantly alter allowable uses within the Specific Plan such that the potential for transporting, using, or disposing hazardous materials would increase, and the proposed Project would not increase the potential for reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, no impact would occur.

c) The proposed Project site is not identified as an emergency evacuation route in any emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. Therefore, no impact would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

d) A future school site is planned within Planning Area 24 of SP 312. Additionally, an existing elementary and middle school (Lisa J. Mails Elementary School and Dorothy McElhinney Middle School) occur immediately west of the Specific Plan boundary (and within one quarter mile of the proposed Project site). However, with approval of SP312A1, the proposed Project would consist only of residential, recreational, public facility (school), and open space land uses. Consistent with the findings of EIR 411, residential, recreational, public facility, and open space land uses would not involve the potential for handling, storing, or transporting hazardous materials or substances that could impact the existing or planned school sites. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

e) Although not explicitly addressed in EIR 411, and consistent with the findings of Addendum No. 1, the proposed Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5; accordingly, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

23. Airports

a. Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b. Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," GIS database, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact:

a) through d): Potential impacts to airports were addressed in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that the proposed Project would be fully compatible with the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in the introduction of a new incompatibility impact with this facility; in fact, the elimination of school uses within Planning Area 19 would reduce the potential for conflict with the French Valley Airport operations by eliminating a school site from the French Valley Airport Influence Area. Although the proposed Project would increase areas proposed for recreational use (i.e., within Planning Areas 15, 16, and 18A), the proposed Project was determined to be consistent with the French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on June 14, 2012, subject to compliance with conditions of approval imposed by the ALUC that would be enforced by Riverside County. As such, no impacts to airports would occur with implementation of the proposed Project, and impacts would not increase relative to what was evaluated in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
24. Hazardous Fire Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility," GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a) According to Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) Figure 11, and consistent with the findings of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, the proposed Project site is not identified as being within a hazardous fire area. As such, the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. A significant impact would not occur, nor would impacts due to hazardous fire areas increase beyond what was evaluated and disclosed in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project

25. Water Quality Impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Source: EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, SWAP Figure 10, Drainage Study for TR No. 36418, WQMP for TR 36418, Drainage Study for TR No. 32289M1, WQMP for TR 32289M1.

Findings of Fact:

a) Impact associated with hydrology and potential erosion and siltation effects were previously evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, both of which concluded that such impacts would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures identified as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. The proposed Project would not involve changes to the grading or drainage plan of Specific Plan No. 312, and would therefore not result in an increase in erosion or siltation hazards. Additionally, site-specific Drainage Reports have been prepared in association with TR No. 36418 and TR 32289M1, which demonstrate that development of Planning Areas 2B, 3B, 15, 16, 17A, 17B, 18A, 18B, and 19 would not result in an increase in runoff from the site that could alter drainage patterns or increased erosion on- or off-site. Accordingly, no new impacts would occur, and no new mitigation measures would be required beyond those already identified as part of EIR 411.

b) EIR 411 evaluated impacts to water quality that could result from construction and long-term build-out of the Specific Plan area, and found that such impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance through incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures identified in EIR 411 would continue to apply to the proposed Project, and would be enforced through the Project's conditions of approval. Furthermore, and pursuant to requirements of the RCFCWCD and RWQCB, site-specific water quality management plans (WQMPs) were prepared for TR 36418 and TR 32289M1. These site-specific WQMPs identify measures that will be undertaken to preclude significant water quality impacts, including the incorporation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) into the design for the site. The WQMPs have been reviewed and approved by the RCFCWCD. Compliance with the requirements of the site-specific WQMPs will be assured through standard County conditions of approval. All other areas of SP 312 already occur within approved tentative tract maps, which also were required to prepare and implement WQMPs and comply with the mitigation measures set forth in EIR 411. Accordingly, mandatory compliance with the site-specific WQMPs would ensure that an impact to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would not occur, and would further ensure that impacts to water quality would not increase beyond what was previously evaluated and mitigated to a level below significant as part of EIR 411.

c) The proposed Project does not include the use of wells on-site, and therefore would have no impact on groundwater levels due to groundwater extraction. Implementation of the proposed drainage system within TR 36418 and TR 32289M1 would allow for areas of infiltration of Project runoff. This proposed drainage system would be consistent with the drainage plan evaluated in EIR 411, which did not identify any significant impacts to groundwater supplies. The proposed drainage system design also would be compatible with existing and planned drainage improvements in other portions of the Specific Plan area that are not proposed for revision as part of the proposed Project. Therefore, no new impact to groundwater supplies would occur, and impacts would not increase relative to the findings of EIR 411.

d) TR No 36418 and TR 32289M1 were designed to comply with the drainage plan presented in SP 312, which was the subject of a Hydrology study that was included within Appendix H to EIR 411. EIR 411 includes an analysis of potential impacts to hydrology, and concludes that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures identified in EIR 411 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. Additionally, portions of the drainage system conceptually identified in SP 312 have been constructed, are under construction, or will be developed in the future in conjunction with approved tract maps. Furthermore, both the SP 312 drainage plan and the drainage studies prepared in association with TR 36418 and TR 32289M1 have been reviewed by the

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

RCFCWCD, which concluded that the proposed drainage plans would not exceed the capacity of existing or proposed stormwater drainage systems. Accordingly, no impact would occur, and impacts due to runoff would not increase relative to what was studied and mitigated to a level below significant as part of EIR 411.

e & f) EIR 411 evaluated potential flood hazards that may affect future development of the site, and concluded that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with incorporation of mitigation measures. Relevant mitigation measures from EIR 411 would continue to apply to the proposed Project, and would be enforced as part of the Project's conditions of approval. According to Figure 10 of the SWAP, *Flood Hazards*, only the southeastern portions of SP 312 are subject to flood hazards. However, this existing flood hazard area occurs wholly within Planning Area 1, has been preserved as natural open space as part of Final Map 30695. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in any new impacts associated with 100-year flood hazard areas; accordingly, impacts associated with flood hazards would not increase relative to the findings of EIR 411, and no new mitigation would be required.

g) There are no other conditions associated with the proposed Project that have the potential to adversely impact water quality, and no such conditions were identified as part of EIR 411. Refer also to the response to Issue 25.b). No impacts would occur.

h) EIR 411 included a full evaluation of physical impacts that could result from buildout of SP 312, including the operation of stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), and did not identify any impacts associated with such facilities. All development that has occurred within SP 312 to date, or that is proposed as part of existing approved tract maps, are in compliance with the overall drainage plan set forth in SP 312. The proposed Project does not propose any new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control BMPs, the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors). All detention and water quality basins proposed as part of the Project have been designed to meet the requirements of the RCFCWCD. As such, no impact would occur, and impacts would not increase as compared to what was evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

26. Floodplains

Degree of Suitability in 100-Year Floodplains. As indicated below, the appropriate Degree of Suitability has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	U - Generally Unsuitable <input type="checkbox"/>	R - Restricted <input type="checkbox"/>
a. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Source: General Plan Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," GIS database, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, SWAP Figure 10, Drainage Study for TR No. 36418, WQMP for TR 36418, Drainage Study for TR No. 32289M1, WQMP for TR 32289M1.

Findings of Fact:

a) SP 312 includes a conceptual grading plan (provided as Figure III.A-13), which was evaluated as part of a site-specific hydrology study (which was included within Appendix H to EIR 411). The hydrology study and analysis provided within EIR 411 determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed grading plan would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Addendum No. 1 determined that impacts associated with flood hazards would be reduced to less than significant levels through compliance with standard Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD) requirements. All construction that has occurred to date within SP 312 has occurred in conformance with the approved tract maps and their associated drainage plans. SP312A1 does not propose to change the conceptual grading plan, and TR No. 36418 and TR 32289M1 are consistent with the conceptual grading plan. Furthermore, site-specific drainage studies were prepared for TR No. 36418 and TR 32289M1, which demonstrate that development of Planning Areas 2B, 3B, 15, 16, 17A, 17B, 18A, 18B, and 19 would not result in substantial changes to drainage patterns that could result in impacts to streams or rivers would not occur, and also demonstrate that TR 36418 and TR 32289M1 would not result in flooding on- or off-site. Accordingly, there would be no new impacts associated with flooding on- or off-site, and no mitigation beyond what is already specified in EIR 411 would be required.

b) EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 did not identify any impacts associated with implementation of SP 312 that would result changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff. The proposed Project seeks to implement a portion of SP 312, and would be fully consistent with the drainage plan and grading standards contained within SP 312. Accordingly, there would be no new impacts to absorption rates or changes in the rate or amount of surface runoff.

c) EIR 411 evaluated potential flood hazards that may affect future development of the site, and concluded that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with incorporation of mitigation measures. Relevant mitigation measures from EIR 411 would continue to apply to the proposed Project, and would be enforced as part of the Project's conditions of approval. According to Figure 10 of the SWAP, *Flood Hazards*, the southeastern portions of SP 312 are subject to flood hazards. However, this portion of the Specific Plan has already been conserved as natural open space within Planning Area 1 as part of Final Map 30695, and no impacts to existing or future structures on-site would occur as a result of a dam failure. Accordingly, a new impact would not occur, and no new mitigation would be required.

d) According to the findings of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, there would be no substantial change in the rate or amount of runoff from the site with implementation of the proposed Project. All development that has occurred to date within SP 312, and all proposed development pursuant to approved tract maps, are consistent with the drainage plan identified as part of SP 312. The currently proposed Project also has been designed to retain the existing grading and drainage patterns as proposed by the approved SP 312. TR No. 36418 and TR 32289M1 also were evaluated as part of site-specific drainage studies, which demonstrate that the site would not substantially affect existing amounts of runoff that could in turn affect the amount of surface water in any water body. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in any changes in the amount of surface water in any water body beyond what was already evaluated and determined to be less than significant as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

27. Land Use

a. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b. Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: General Plan, GIS database, Project Application Materials, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Murrieta General Plan

Findings of Fact:

a) EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 did not identify any impacts associated with a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of the surrounding area. There have been no changes in the surrounding area since certification of EIR 411 and approval of Addendum No. 1 that could result in any new land use incompatibilities associated with the Project. Changes proposed as part of SP312A1 involve minor reconfigurations to the land uses within an approved specific plan and would not comprise a "substantial alteration" of the present or planned land use of the area. As such, no new or more severe impacts would occur.

b) EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 evaluated potential impacts due to the location of the site within the City of Murrieta Sphere of Influence, and concluded that SP 312 would be fully consistent with the City of Murrieta General Plan. Furthermore, the City of Murrieta General Plan does not identify any land use designations within its sphere, and instead defers to the County of Riverside. As the proposed Project would largely preserve the existing approved land uses within the Specific Plan Area, with exception of the elimination of a school site and addition of additional areas of open space and recreation, there are no components of the proposed Project that would adversely affect land uses within the City of Murrieta's Sphere of Influence. Accordingly, no new or more severe impacts to the City's Sphere or Influence would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

28. Planning

a. Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b. Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c. Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d. Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: General Plan Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS database, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Findings of Fact:

a, b, and c) The issue of land use compatibility was evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, and SP 312 was found to be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses and zoning. There have been no changes in the surrounding conditions that would lead to any new incompatibilities, except for the construction of an off-site school (as described below). There are no components of the proposed Project that would affect the conclusions of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 with respect to land use compatibility, as proposed revisions to SP 312 are largely intended to provide consistency with the existing General Plan Land Use designations and/or previously approved subdivision maps. The primary exception would be the conversion of Planning Areas 15, 16, and 18A from Low Density Residential to Open Space - Recreation land uses. However, such a conversion would serve to buffer future on-site residential uses from existing off-site low density residential uses and the Dorothy McElhinney Middle School, thereby improving land use compatibility as compared to the existing approved SP 312. In addition, the Project would convert Planning Area 19 from a proposed school site to allow for Medium High Density residential uses; however, such a conversion was anticipated in both the original SP 312 and EIR 411, and this conversion would not represent a new impact. Furthermore, the conversion of Planning Area 19 Medium High Density Residential uses would be compatible with adjacent areas proposed for development with Medium Density Residential or open space land uses. The remaining revisions proposed as part of SP 312 would not result in a substantial change in the site's planned land uses. Accordingly, no new or more severe impacts would occur.

d) EIR 411 evaluated the consistency of SP 312 with the General Plan that existed at that time, and found no impacts due to an inconsistency would result. Since that time, the County adopted a comprehensive update to its General Plan in 2003. The 2003 General Plan assumed buildout of SP 312 and did not identify any special policies applicable to the Project area. Addendum No. 1 evaluated consistency with the 2003 General Plan and did not identify any impacts due to an inconsistency. The Project proposes minor modifications to SP 312 to accommodate adjustments to the internal configuration of land uses within the plan. With approval of Amendment No. 1 to SP 312, there would be no inconsistencies with the approved Specific Plan. In addition, the proposed Project would be consistent with all other applicable policies of the 2003 General Plan. Accordingly, no new or increased impacts would occur.

e) No impacts associated with the physical disruption or division of an established community were identified as part of EIR 411 or Addendum No. 1. There have been no changes in the surrounding circumstances since certification of EIR 411 or approval of Addendum No. 1 that could result in new impacts due to the physical division or disruption of an established community. The proposed Project would not result in the physical disruption or division of any established communities. The proposed Project would represent the continuation of an existing development pattern (i.e., residential, recreational, and open space land uses) that would contribute to the establishment of a community in the area. No new or increased impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

29. Mineral Resources

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				
c. Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area", EIR No 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact:

a & b) No impacts to mineral resources were identified as part of EIR 411 or Addendum No. 1, and no mineral resources have been identified in the Project area since certification of EIR 411 or Addendum No. 1. According to General Plan Figure OS-5, the proposed Project site is not known to contain any mineral resources, and the Project site is not designated as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. Accordingly, new or more severe impacts to known mineral resources or locally-important mineral resource recovery sites would not occur.

c & d) No impacts due to the proximity of existing surface mines, proposed surface mines, or abandoned quarries or mines were identified as part of EIR 411 or Addendum No. 1, and no such facilities have been introduced in the Project area since certification of EIR 411 or Addendum No. 1. The proposed Project site is not located in close proximity to any existing surface mines, proposed surface mines, or abandoned quarries or mines. Accordingly, no new or increased impacts due to an incompatibility with such uses would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

NOISE Would the project result in

Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings

Where indicated below, the appropriate Noise Acceptability Rating(s) has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable

A - Generally Acceptable

B - Conditionally Acceptable

C - Generally Unacceptable

D - Land Use Discouraged

30. Airport Noise

a. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐

b. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐

Source: General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," EIR 411, Addendum No. 1; Draft 2011 French Valley Airport Compatibility Map

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is located within the northern portions of the Airport Influence Area for the French Valley Airport. Impacts associated with airport noise were previously evaluated as part of EIR 411, which found

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

that SP 312 only would be exposed to airport-related noise levels of up to 60 dBA CNEL (i.e., within the southern portions of SP 312), which is below the County's standard of 65 dBA CNEL. Addendum No. 1 concluded that portions of the Project site would be subject to periodic noise levels exceeding 65 dBA, but found that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures identified as part of Addendum No. 1 would continue to apply to the proposed Project, although the portion of the mitigation requiring a site-specific noise study due to airport noise would not apply because areas proposed for development within TR 36418 and TR 32289M1 occur outside of the 55 dBA CNEL. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in the exposure of residents or workers to excessive airport-related noise levels beyond what was previously evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411 and/or Addendum No. 1. Therefore, new or more severe impacts due to airport-related noise would not occur with implementation of the proposed Project.

b) The proposed Project site is not located within two miles of a private airstrip; therefore, a significant impact would not occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in Addendum No. 1.

31. Railroad Noise

NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", GIS database

Findings of Fact: Consistent with the findings of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, the Project site is not located within close proximity to any existing railroad corridors. No rail facilities have been constructed since certification of EIR 411 or Addendum No. 1; accordingly, there is no potential for the Project to expose people residing in the Project area to excessive railroad noise.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

32. Highway Noise

NA ☐ A ☐ B ☒ C ☐ D ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Source: TR No. 36418 Noise Analysis, TR 32289M1 Noise Analysis, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact: Impacts associated with Highway Noise were previously addressed as part of EIR 411, and mitigation measures identified in EIR 411 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. As concluded in EIR 411, noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures identified in EIR 411 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. As part of the required mitigation, site-specific noise studies are required prior to approval of each implementing tract.

As required by EIR 411, Addendum No. 1 included an analysis of highway-related noise impacts resulting from implementation of tracts 30694, 30695, and 30696 based on a site-specific noise study. Addendum No. 1 identified the need for mitigation involving the construction of noise barriers and specialized window and door treatments for lots with direct line-of-site to Briggs Road, Baxter Road, Leon Road, and Clinton Keith Road. Mitigation measures identified in Addendum No. 1 have been or will be implemented in association with development within tracts 30694, 30695, and 30696. Addendum No. 1 concluded that

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

highway-related noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of the required mitigation.

In compliance with the requirements of EIR 411, site-specific noise impact analyses have been prepared for TR No. 36418 and TR 32289M1, which determined that future exterior noise levels within the tracts would be impacted by traffic-related noise levels associated with adjacent roadways. Specifically, future unmitigated noise levels on-site within TR 36418 are projected to range from 65.6 dBA CNEL to 68.9 dBA CNEL for lots abutting adjacent roadways, while future unmitigated noise levels on-site within TR 32289M1 are projected to range from 65.2 dBA CNEL to 75.7 dBA CNEL for lots abutting adjacent roadways. The site-specific noise analyses determined that with construction of noise attenuation barriers along the tract boundaries with Prairie Sun Way, Rockrose Lane, Baxter Road, and Briggs Road, exterior noise impacts would be reduced to below the County's standard of 65 dBA CNEL. Additionally, because precise building materials are not known at this time, the site-specific noise impact analysis also indicates that future noise studies will be required in association with building permits in order to ensure that interior noise levels are reduced to below the County's interior noise level standard of 45 dBA CNEL. These impacts are evaluated as significant and mitigation would be required, although the interior and exterior highway-related noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the required mitigation.

Mitigation:

MM-1 (Condition of Approval 90.Planning.17 for TR 36418): Prior to the final building inspection within TR 36418, the developer shall construct at least a 5-foot tall noise barrier along the perimeter of all lots that abut Prairie Sun Way, Rockrose Lane, and/or Baxter Road. The noise barrier shall be located between the adjacent roadways and the exterior living areas. Where applicable, the barriers should wrap around the ends of the dwelling units to prevent flanking of noise into the Project site. The noise barriers shall consist of material that is at least 3.5 pounds per square foot of face area and shall have no decorative cutouts or other line-of-sight openings between shielded areas and the roadways. The required barrier may be constructed using any of the following materials:

- Masonry Block;
- Stucco veneer over wood framing (or foam core), or 1-inch thick tongue and groove wood of sufficient weight per square foot;
- Glass (1/4 inch thick), or other transparent material with sufficient weight per square foot;
- Earthen berm; or
- Any other material or combination of materials approved by the Office of Industrial Hygiene and the Director of Planning.

MM-2 (Condition of Approval 90.Planning.17 for TR 32289M1): Prior to the final building inspection within TR 32289M1, the developer shall construct at least a 6-foot tall noise barrier along the western perimeter of Lots 2-8, 18-19, 46-47, and 57-70; at least a 6.0-foot tall noise barrier along the northern perimeter of Lots 70-71, 86-87, 105, 122-123, and 140-141; at least a 6.0-foot tall noise barrier along the eastern perimeter of Lots 87-94; at least a 6.5-foot noise barrier along the western perimeter of Lot 1; and at least an 8.0-foot tall noise barrier along the western perimeter of Lots 177-179. The noise barriers shall be located between the adjacent roadways and the exterior living areas. Where applicable, the barriers should wrap around the ends of the dwelling units to prevent flanking of noise into the Project site. The noise barrier shall consist of material that is at least 4.0 pounds per square foot of face area and shall have no decorative cutouts or other line-of-sight openings between shielded areas and the roadways. The required barrier may be constructed using any of the following materials:

- Masonry Block;
- Stucco veneer over wood framing (or foam core), or 1-inch thick tongue and groove wood of sufficient weight per square foot;

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

- Glass (1/4 inch thick), or other transparent material with sufficient weight per square foot;
- Earthen berm; or
- Any other material or combination of materials approved by the Office of Industrial Hygiene and the Director of Planning.

MM-3 (Condition of Approval 80.Planning.21 for TR 36418): Prior to the issuance of building permits within TR 36418, the Project applicant or developer shall prepare a Final Noise Study to evaluate proposed on-site structures and as necessary to determine whether the interiors of all perimeter structures would achieve the County's interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL. In the event that interior noise levels are projected to exceed the required standard, then additional measures shall be incorporated into the building plans to reduce the interior noise levels to below 45 dBA CNEL. Such measures shall be as specified in the Final Noise Study, and may include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Standard dual-glazed windows shall have a Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 26 or higher;
- A "windows closed" means of mechanical ventilation (e.g., air conditioning) shall be provided;
- Window and door assemblies shall be free of cut outs and openings and shall be well fitted and sealed with weather stripping;
- Exterior walls shall have a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 46; and
- Roofs/ceilings shall utilize a minimum 1/2-inch plywood sheathing that is well sealed to form a continuous barrier with minimum R-19 batt insulation in the joist cavities.

MM-4 (Condition of Approval 80.Planning.21 for TR 32289M1): Prior to the issuance of building permits for Lots 1-8, 18-19, 46-47, 57-71, 86-94, 105, 122-123, 140-141, or 177-179 within TR 32289M1, the Project applicant or developer shall prepare a Final Noise Study to evaluate proposed on-site structures and as necessary to determine whether the interiors of all perimeter structures would achieve the County's interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL. In the event that interior noise levels are projected to exceed the required standard, then additional measures shall be incorporated into the building plans to reduce the interior noise levels to below 45 dBA CNEL. Such measures shall be as specified in the Final Noise Study, and may include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Standard dual-glazed windows shall have a Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 26 or higher for lots 3-8, 18-19, 46-47, 57-71, 86-94, 105, 122-123, and 140-141;
- Upgrade dual-glazed windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 32 or higher for lots 1-2 and 177-179;
- A "windows closed" means of mechanical ventilation (e.g., air conditioning);
- Window and door assemblies shall be free of cut outs and openings and shall be well fitted and sealed with weather stripping;
- Exterior walls shall have a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 46. Typical walls with this rating will have 2x4 studs or greater, 16" o.c. with R-13 insulation, a minimum 7/8" exterior surface of cement plaster and a minimum interior surface of 1/2" gypsum board; and
- Roofs/ceilings shall utilize a minimum 1/2-inch plywood sheathing that is well sealed to form a continuous barrier with minimum R-19 batt insulation in the joist cavities.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be the responsibility of the County of Riverside Planning Department and the County of Riverside Department of Industrial Hygiene.

33. Other Noise

NA ☒

A ☐

B ☐

C ☐

D ☐

☐

☐

☐

☒

Source: EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Findings of Fact: Aside from noise associated with adjacent roadways and the French Valley Airport, which are addressed above, there are no other sources of noise within the Project vicinity that could subject future sensitive receptors to noise levels that exceed the County's exterior noise level standard of 65 dBA CNEL, and no such sources of noise were identified in EIR 411. As indicated in Addendum No. 1, noise impacts during near-term construction could occur if grading or construction activities occur in close proximity to developed/occupied noise sensitive land uses. Addendum No. 1 concluded that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures identified by Addendum No. 1 have been or will be enforced as part of tracts 30694, 30695, and 30696. Construction activities within TR 36418 and 32289M1 would not occur adjacent to existing noise sensitive uses, as these areas are buffered from surrounding uses by existing roads, existing and proposed open space, and the proposed park sites within Planning Areas 16 and 18A. There are no conditions associated with the proposed Project that would result in new or increased construction-related noise impacts beyond what was previously identified in EIR 411 and/or Addendum No. 1. Accordingly, impacts from other noise sources would not occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in Addendum No. 1.

34. Noise Effects on or by the Project

a. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

c. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

d. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: General Plan, Table N-1 ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure"); TR No. 36418 Noise Analysis, TR No. 32289M1 Noise Analysis, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact:

a), b) & c) EIR 411 evaluated the potential for residential land uses within the Project area to result in, or be affected by, substantial adverse noise effects. As previously discussed in EIR 411, residential uses within the Project area have the potential to be exposed to significant, unmitigated noise levels. To ensure that future residential land uses were not exposed to substantial noise levels, EIR 411 required as mitigation the preparation of site-specific noise impact analyses in association with future tentative tract maps in order to evaluate current site noise conditions and to identify additional, site-specific mitigation measures (e.g., construction techniques, design considerations) that would reduce noise levels to acceptable levels. These measures have been implemented by the proposed Project; please refer to the discussion and analysis provided above for Issue 32. Addendum No. 1 determined that implementation of TRs 30694, 30695, and 30696 would have a less than significant impact on ambient noise levels.

EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 also evaluated potential noise impacts during construction. EIR 411 found that earth-moving activities would produce noise levels ranging up to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. Impacts associated with construction-related noise were evaluated as potentially significant as part of EIR

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

411 and Addendum No. 1, but would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 would continue to apply to the proposed Project; accordingly, near-term construction-related noise would be less than significant with implementation of the mitigation measures specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

Long-term operational noise impacts also were evaluated as part of EIR 411. Project-related traffic noise off-site, which would be the primary source of noise associated with SP 312, was determined to be less than significant since it would not contribute more than 3.0 dBA CNEL to any road segment, indicating that Project contributions to the noise environment on affected roadways would not represent a perceptible change to the existing noise environment. The currently proposed Project would result in a net reduction in the number of residential units allowed on-site and would therefore result in a decrease in traffic-related noise off-site; therefore, the proposed Project would not increase noise impacts off-site beyond what was already discussed as part of EIR 411. No mitigation would be required for transportation-related off-site noise impacts.

There are no other components of the proposed Project that could result in significant noise impacts on- or off-site (refer also to the discussion of Issue 32, above).

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

35. Housing

a. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b. Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d. Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

f. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, General Plan Housing Element, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact:

a & c) The proposed Project seeks minor modifications to an existing approved specific plan. Within the areas proposed for amendment, there are no existing homes that would be displaced by the proposed development. Implementation of TR 36418 would result in the development of 50 residential units on-site, while TR 32289M1 would result in the development of 179 residential lots. Accordingly, and consistent with the findings of both EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, the proposed Project would not displace any

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

existing housing and would not result in the need to construct replacement housing elsewhere. The proposed Project also would not displace any people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

b) EIR 411 included an extensive analysis demonstrating that SP 312 was consistent with the Housing Element of the County's General Plan that was in effect at the time SP 312 was approved. In 2003, and subsequent to the original approval of SP 312, the County of Riverside updated its Housing Element. Addendum No. 1, which was approved following the 2003 Housing Element Update, determined that the Project would not result in an increase in demand for affordable housing. There have been no changes since approval of Addendum No. 1 that would result in the need for affordable housing beyond what is already identified in the General Plan Housing Element. The proposed Project seeks minor modifications to an existing approved specific plan, and proposes the reconfiguration of several planning areas. The proposed Project would expand the range of housing available within SP 312 with the introduction of 50 medium high density residential dwelling units within Planning Area 19. The proposed Project would accommodate a need for additional housing, and would not result in an increase in demand for affordable housing. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

d) According to the Riverside County GIS database, and consistent with the findings of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, the proposed Project site is not located within or near any County Redevelopment Project Areas. Accordingly, the Project would have no effect on such areas.

e) EIR 411 included an extensive analysis demonstrating that SP 312 was consistent with the Land Use Element of the County's General Plan that was in effect at the time SP 312 was approved. In 2003, and subsequent to the original approval of SP 312, the County of Riverside updated its General Plan Land Use Element. Addendum No. 1, which was approved following the 2003 General Plan Update, determined that the Project would not result in a substantial population increase. The regional population projections rely, in part, on General Plan and zoning designations (including Specific Plans), which have not substantively changed since approval of SP 312 or Addendum No. 1. Changes proposed as part of SP312A1 would result in a slight decrease in the number of units approved on-site, from 1,793 (as allowed pursuant to Substantial Conformance No. 1 to SP 312) to 1,671 units (as currently proposed by the Project). Since regional and local population projections rely, in part, on land uses proposed as part of the County's General Plan, and since the County's General Plan assumes the development of land uses in accordance with approved specific plans, implementation of the proposed Project would result in a slight reduction in the future population on-site as compared to the existing approved specific plan. Accordingly, a significant impact would not occur.

f) EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 did not identify any significant impacts specifically associated with substantial population growth. The proposed Project seeks minor changes to the internal configurations of land uses within an approved specific plan. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in a substantial inducement to population growth. A large portion of the specific plan area is already built out, including backbone infrastructure (e.g., roads and utilities) in the southern portions of the Specific Plan area. The proposed Project would involve the extension of roads and infrastructure as necessary to accommodate development within the specific plan area, and such roads and infrastructure would not result in substantial population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly. Accordingly, impacts associated with population inducement would not occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

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

36. Fire Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: General Plan Safety Element, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact: Impacts associated with fire protection services were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which found that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels through the incorporation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures identified as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. Additionally, the proposed Project would result in a net reduction of 421 units as compared to what was evaluated in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, thereby resulting in a reduced impact on fire protection services as compared to what was evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. Accordingly, significant impacts associated with fire protection services would not occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

37. Sheriff Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: General Plan, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact: Impacts to sheriff protection services were previously evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which found that, with mitigation, such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. The proposed Project either already has or would be required to comply with the mitigation measures identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 as conditions of Project approval. Additionally, the proposed Project would result in a net reduction of 421 units as compared to what was evaluated in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, thereby resulting in a reduced impact on sheriff protection services as compared to what was evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. Accordingly, there would be no new impacts to sheriff protection services associated with the proposed Project, and such impacts would not be significant following incorporation of the mitigation measures specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

38. Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: GIS database, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1.

Findings of Fact: Impacts to school services were evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with mandatory payment of fees as specified by state law. EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 assumed that SP 312 would be developed with up to 1,793 dwelling units, while the proposed Project includes only a maximum of 1,671 dwelling units. As such, the proposed Project would result in a reduction in the number of

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

students generated on-site by approximately 7% as compared to what was ultimately approved pursuant to EIR 411. Additionally, although the proposed Project would change Planning Area 19 from school to MHDR land uses, the Project area is adequately served by elementary and middle schools, as the Lisa J. Mails Elementary School and the Dorothy McElhinney Middle School both have been constructed since the original approval of SP 312, and these schools are located adjacent to the Specific Plan boundaries. Furthermore, a school site would be accommodated on-site within Planning Area 24. Therefore, since the proposed Project would result in an overall reduction in demand for school services as compared to what was evaluated in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, the Project area already is adequately served by elementary and middle school facilities, and due to mandatory payment of state-mandated school impact fees, impacts to school services would not occur and would not increase beyond the impacts previously identified and disclosed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures are required beyond payment of state-mandated school impact fees.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

39. Libraries

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: General Plan, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact: Impacts to library services were evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation in the form of development impact fees (DIF) pursuant to County ordinance No. 659. Fees paid pursuant to Ordinance No. 659 would be used by the County, in part, to acquire necessary library facilities to accommodate growth within the County. In addition, implementation of the proposed Project would reduce the total number of dwelling units within the plan as compared to what was ultimately approved pursuant to EIR 411 (from 1,793 to 1,671 units), which would result in a reduction in the demand for library services as compared to what was evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. Accordingly, with compliance with the mitigation measure from EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 requiring the payment of DIF fees, impacts to library services would not occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1.

40. Health Services

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: General Plan, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact: Impacts to health services were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that implementation of the proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse effect on health services within the County. Due to the reduction in the number of dwelling units proposed as part of the Project, there would be no increase in demand for health care services with implementation of the proposed Project. Accordingly, a significant impact to health services would not occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
41. Parks and Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications), Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees), Parks & Open Space Department Review, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, 2010 Valley-Wide Master Plan.

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) Impacts associated with recreational facilities were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 411, which concluded that such impacts would not be significant. Implementation of the proposed Project would result in a substantial increase in the amount of park acreage accommodated on-site, from 17.1 acres under the existing approved SP 312 to 33.3 acres of active parkland under the proposed Project (including active recreational facilities within Planning Areas 8, 16 and 18A, 22 and 34, in addition to a 3.7-acre community recreation center in Planning Area 11). Based on population generation rates included in the Valley-Wide Parks and Recreation District Master Plan (2010), buildout of SP312A1 would generate a future population of approximately 5,347 persons. Riverside County has adopted a standard of 5.0 acres of active parkland for each 1,000 residents generated by the Project, which would result in a total demand for 26.7 acres of active parkland. As indicated above, the proposed Project would accommodate a total of 33.3 acres of active parkland. Impacts associated with buildout of the Specific Plan area, including proposed parks, were fully evaluated as part of EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, and in this Initial Study, and all impacts would be reduced to the maximum feasible extent through mitigation. Moreover, the provision of 33.3 acres of parkland on-site would ensure that the recreation needs of future Project residents are accommodated on-site, thereby ensuring that future Project residents would not substantially contribute to the physical deterioration of existing neighborhood or regional parks in the vicinity. Therefore, significant impacts would not occur, and impacts would be reduced as compared to what was evaluated in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. No new mitigation would be required.

c) The proposed project site is located within the boundaries of County Service Area No. 103 (CSA 103), which was established for the maintenance of street lighting. CSA 103 has not established park fees. The proposed Project site is, however, located within the Valley-Wide Recreation and Park District; however, no park fees would be required since the proposed Project would accommodate adequate recreational areas on-site (as discussed above under Issue 41.a). Accordingly, and consistent with the findings of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, a significant impact would not occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

42. Recreational Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Project application materials, SWAP Figure 8

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Findings of Fact: Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) Figure 8, *Southwest Area Plan Trails and Bikeway System*, depicts planned recreational trails within the Project area as part of the currently adopted General Plan, which include a Regional Trail designation that traverses Planning Area 1, and a Class I Bike Path along Leon Road. Revisions proposed as part of SP312A1 would retain the existing planned Regional Trail within Planning Area 1, while a Class I Bike Facility already has been constructed along the eastern alignment of Leon Road. Accordingly, the proposed Project would be consistent with the planned trail designations as applied to the Project site by the SWAP. It should be noted that at the time that EIR 411 was certified by Riverside County, the Project area was not subject to the SWAP Trails and Bikeway System plan, and EIR 411 did not evaluate impacts due to trail facilities. Addendum No. 1 included an analysis of impacts to trails, and concluded that SP 312 would be consistent with the Trails and Bikeway System plan with mandatory compliance to Conditions of Approval imposed on TRs 30694, 30695, and 30696 (i.e., Conditions 30.PARKS.01, 60.PLANNING.26, and 80.PLANNING.24). Therefore, because SP312A1 is required to construct trail alignments consistent with SWAP Figure 8 and because an existing Class I Bike Trail already has been constructed along Leon Road, a significant impact associated with recreational trails would not occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

43. Circulation

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

f) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

g) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

h) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

i) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

such facilities?

Source: CMP, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Trip Generation Assessment, Focused Traffic Analysis

Findings of Fact:

a) Revisions proposed as part of the proposed Project would result in the elimination of a school site on 10.0 acres, and an overall reduction in dwelling units allowed on-site. Specifically, SP312A1 would allow for a maximum of 1,671 units on-site, as compared to the 1,793 units that are allowed pursuant to the approved Specific Plan No. 312 Substantial Conformance No. 1, and as compared to the 1,793 dwelling units that were ultimately approved pursuant to EIR 411. Based on a Trip Generation Assessment prepared by Urban Crossroads, and based on current area conditions, the proposed Project would generate approximately 20,316 average daily trips, while the existing approved Specific Plan (and associated approved implementing tract maps) would generate approximately 21,790 average daily trips. Therefore, the proposed Project's 20,316 average daily trips would represent a substantial reduction compared to the 23,919 average daily trips that were evaluated as part of EIR 411 and the 21,790 trips that would occur per the existing approved Specific Plan. It should be noted that the traffic impact analysis prepared in association with EIR 411 assumed a total of 2,135 dwelling units, whereas only 1,793 dwelling units ultimately were approved pursuant to SP 312. Nonetheless, the proposed Project's 20,316 average daily trips still would represent a substantial reduction in traffic as compared to the traffic that would have been generated under the original SP 312 (i.e., 21,790 average daily trips). Impacts associated with buildout of SP 312 were fully evaluated in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that, with mitigation, impacts to transportation/traffic would be reduced to less than significant levels. Mitigation Measures identified in EIR 411 and Addendum no. 1 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. Additionally, a Focused Traffic Analysis prepared by Urban Crossroads demonstrates that the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts beyond what was previously evaluated as part of EIR 411, although the updated analysis (based on current conditions) does demonstrate that a new northbound right-turn overlap is warranted at the intersection of Winchester (SR-79) at Benton Road. Accordingly, since the proposed Project would result in an overall reduction in traffic generated on-site, and because the proposed Project would be subject to the mitigation measures specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 and the new requirement to construct the northbound right-turn overlap is warranted at the intersection of Winchester (SR-79) at Benton Road, the proposed Project would not result in a significant impact due to a conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Additional mitigation measures beyond those already specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 would not be required.

b) The only CMP-designated roadway in the Project vicinity is I-215. The CMP roadway system has been designed to adequately convey traffic volumes generated by ultimate buildout of the land uses identified by the County's General Plan land use map. The existing French Valley Specific Plan is consistent with the County General Plan land use map, and provides for the ultimate build-out of residential, commercial retail, recreational, open space and public facility land uses. The proposed Project seeks to re-arrange the placement of residential, recreational, public facility, and open space land uses on-site, while eliminating commercial retail uses from the Specific Plan. The proposed Project would not increase the maximum development intensity allowed within SP 312. As such, the proposed Project would be consistent with the County General Plan, and, therefore, would be consistent with the long-term growth projections included in the CMP. Therefore, and consistent with the findings of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, the Project's long-term impacts related to established levels of service for CMP designated roads or highways would be less than significant. The proposed Project would be consistent with the applicable congestion management plan, and would not result in new impacts that were not previously identified in EIR 411 or Addendum no. 1.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

c) & d) Although portions of SP 312 are located within the Airport Influence Area for the French Valley Airport, land uses proposed on-site would not conflict with airport operations. Impacts to airports were previously evaluated as part of EIR 411, which identified significant, but mitigable, impacts to airport facilities. Mitigation measures identified in EIR 411 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. Furthermore, because the proposed Project would eliminate school uses from Planning Area 19 (which is located within the Airport Influence Area for the French Valley Airport), impacts would be reduced as compared to what was evaluated and disclosed in EIR 411. Although the proposed Project would increase areas proposed for recreational use (i.e., within Planning Areas 15, 16, and 18A), the proposed Project was determined to be consistent with the French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan by the Riverside County ALUC on June 14, 2012, subject to compliance with conditions of approval imposed by the ALUC that would be enforced by Riverside County. Accordingly, no new mitigation measures would be required.

e) The proposed Project would introduce residential and recreational land uses within a master-planned community that includes residential, recreational, public facility, and open space land uses. Accordingly, the proposed Project would be compatible with surrounding land uses, and would not result in increased traffic-related hazards associated with incompatible uses; accordingly, a significant impact would not occur.

Proposed circulation improvements are identified on TR 36418 and TR 32289M1. All proposed circulation improvements, as well as the improvements identified by or constructed pursuant to previously approved tract maps, have been designed to conform to the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 461, *Road Improvement Standards and Specifications*. The provisions of Ordinance No. 461 identify required improvements as well as design parameters that each circulation improvement must adhere to in order to maximize public safety and minimize congestion that may result from substandard road construction. As a component of applications for the proposed Project, the County Transportation Department has reviewed the proposed circulation improvements identified in TR 36418 and TR 32289M1 in relationship to the approved circulation plan for the French Valley Specific Plan, and has concluded that all proposed roadway improvements are consistent with the requirements of Ordinance No. 461. Therefore, and consistent with the findings of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, because all roadway improvements would be designed to County standards and because no conflict is anticipated between Project-related motor vehicle use and adjacent land uses, a less than significant impact would occur.

f) Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the establishment of several new on-site (internal) public roads (in addition to roadways previously constructed within the Specific Plan Area), which would require maintenance. However, the maintenance of on-site roadways is not anticipated to cause a financial burden for the County that would interfere with the County's ability to maintain other County facilities such that an environmental impact would result. Maintenance of on-site roads would largely be funded through property taxes associated with the development. There is no component of the proposed Project that would require altered maintenance of roadways by the County. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant and implementation of the Project would not result in new impacts that were not previously identified in EIR 411 or Addendum No. 1.

g) The proposed Project is not anticipated to affect any roadways in the vicinity of the site during construction. The only roadway that provides access to vicinity land uses under existing conditions is Baxter Road, which would not be affected by development of the proposed Project. All other construction activities associated with TR No. 36418 and TR 32289M1 would occur within the tract map boundaries. Additionally, all other areas of the Specific Plan area have been subdivided as part of previously-approved tentative tract maps, and the proposed Project would not interfere with access to any of these approved tracts. As such, and consistent with the findings of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, implementation of the proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse effect upon circulation during Project construction, and a significant impact would not occur.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

h) The proposed Project would be required to comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, which regulates access road provisions. The requirement to provide adequate paved access to the Project area would be required as a condition of Project approval. Additionally, the proposed Project would not affect any roadways that provide emergency access under existing conditions, including in existing developed areas of SP 312. Furthermore, construction of improvements to Prairie Sun Way and Rockrose Lane would provide for secondary access to future homes within Planning Areas 12 and 13, thereby improving emergency access within the local area. With required adherence to County requirements for emergency access, impacts would be less than significant.

i) The proposed Project would accommodate a regional trail (which traverses Planning Area 1), sidewalks, and on-site community trails. The Project site is not currently served by the Regional Transportation Agency (RTA); therefore, the Project is not required to provide transit support facilities. Accordingly, and consistent with the findings of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, implementation of the Project would not result in conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation, and a significant impact would not occur.

Mitigation:

MM-5 (Condition of Approval 10.Trans.001 for TR 36418 and TR 32289M1): Prior to the final building inspection within TR 36418 or TR 32289M1, the developer shall install a northbound right-turn overlap is warranted at the intersection of Winchester (SR-79) at Benton Road.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be the responsibility of the County of Riverside Planning Department and the County of Riverside Transportation Department

44. Bike Trails

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Project application materials, SWAP Figure 8.

Findings of Fact: Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) Figure 8, *Southwest Area Plan Trails and Bikeway System*, depicts recreational trails within the Project area as planned by the currently approved General Plan, which includes a Class I Bike Path along Leon Road. This Class I Bike Facility already has been constructed along the eastern alignment of Leon Road, and the proposed Project would have no impact on this existing bike trail facility. It should be noted that at the time that EIR 411 was certified by Riverside County, the Project area was not subject to the SWAP Trails and Bikeway System plan, and EIR 411 did not evaluate impacts due to bike trail facilities. Addendum No. 1 included an analysis of impacts to bike trails, and concluded that SP 312 would be consistent with the Trails and Bikeway System plan with mandatory compliance to Conditions of Approval imposed on TRs 30694, 30695, and 30696 (i.e., Conditions 10.PLANNING.08, 50.PLANNING.09, 50.PLANNING.10, 60.PLANNING.05, and 100.PLANNING.08). Therefore, because SP312A1 would not conflict with the bike trail alignments consistent with SWAP Figure 8 and because an existing Class I Bike Trail already has been constructed along Leon Road, a significant impact associated with bike trails would not occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

45. Water

a. Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?				
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Project application materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) Impacts associated with the Project's demand for water treatment facilities and water supply were evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that such impacts would be less than significant (assuming mandatory compliance with conditions of approval requiring the construction of water infrastructure to serve the proposed Project). The proposed Project would involve the elimination of 10.0 acres of elementary school uses, and would result in an overall reduction in dwelling units allowed on-site by 421 units as compared to the project that was evaluated as part of EIR 411. Utilizing the same calculations provided in EIR 411, the proposed Project would result in a demand for approximately 1,226,260 gallons per day (gpd) of potable water, as compared to 1,500,760 gpd as identified in EIR 411. Therefore, since the proposed Project would result in an overall decrease in demand for potable water, the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact to water supply and water treatment facilities. No mitigation would be required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

46. Sewer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?				
b. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Project application materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) Impacts associated with the Project's demand for sewer treatment facilities and wastewater treatment capacity were evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that such impacts would be less than significant (assuming mandatory compliance with conditions of approval requiring the construction of water infrastructure to serve the proposed Project). The proposed Project would involve the elimination of 10.0 acres of elementary school uses, and would result in an overall reduction in dwelling units allowed on-site by 421 units as compared to the project that was evaluated as part of EIR 411. Utilizing the same calculations provided in EIR 411, the proposed Project would result in a demand for approximately 626,570 gpd of wastewater treatment, which is substantially less than the 754,490 gpd that was disclosed in EIR 411. Accordingly, since the proposed Project would result in an overall decrease in demand for wastewater treatment capacity, the proposed Project's impacts to

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

wastewater treatment capacity and facilities would be reduced as compared to what was disclosed in EIR 411; therefore, a significant impact would not occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

47. Solid Waste

a. Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b. Does the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: General Plan, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1, Project application materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) Impacts to solid waste services were evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels through incorporation of mitigation measures and/or mandatory compliance with the Project's conditions of approval. Mitigation measures identified in EIR 411 and conditions of approval associated with prior approvals would continue to apply to the proposed Project. SP312A1 proposes a slight reduction in the number of dwelling units allowed on-site, from 1,793 units (as approved pursuant to EIR 411) to 1,671 units, and also proposes to eliminate elementary school uses from Planning Area 19. This reduction in intensity on-site would result in a concomitant decrease in the demand for solid waste services as compared to the impacts evaluated in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new or increased impacts to solid waste services.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1

48. Utilities

Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

a) Electricity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan, EIR 411, Project application materials.

Findings of Fact:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

a) through g) Impacts to utilities were evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of standard conditions of approval. Additionally, major utilities needed to serve the Specific Plan area already have been constructed. Conditions of approval imposed on SP 312 and the implementing tract maps would continue to apply to the proposed Project, if applicable. In addition, the Project proposes a slight reduction in dwelling units as compared to what was ultimately approved pursuant to EIR 411, from 1,793 to 1,671 dwelling units, which would result in a slight reduction in the Project's demand for utilities. Accordingly, with implantation of the proposed Project, significant impacts to utilities would not occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond the conditions of approval identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1

49. Energy Conservation

a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: EIR 411, Project application materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) Impacts to energy resources were evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that significant impacts would not occur. In addition, the Project proposes a slight reduction in dwelling units as compared to what was ultimately approved pursuant to EIR 411, from 1,793 to 1,671 dwelling units, resulting in a concomitant reduction in demand for energy resources. Therefore, with incorporation of the mitigation measures specified in EIR 411, impacts to energy resources would not occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

50. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1.

Findings of Fact: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
51. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects and probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials, EIR 411, Addendum No. 1

Findings of Fact: Cumulative impacts were evaluated as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that such impacts would not occur with implementation of the mitigation measures specified in EIR 411 and/or Addendum No. 1. The Project proposes a slight reduction in intensity as compared to the existing approved specific plan, and would therefore result in a slight reduction in cumulative effects as compared to the impacts evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in new impacts to the environment that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 411 and Addendum No. 1

52. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Staff review, project application

Findings of Fact: The proposed project would not result in environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration as per California Code of Regulations, Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

- French Valley Specific Plan EIR (EIR 411), June 5, 2001 (SCH No. 1999041068).
- Addendum No. 1 to EIR 411 (Addendum No. 1) for Tentative Tract Map No. 30694, 30695, and 30696 (Spencer's Crossing), approved July 14, 2004

Location Where Earlier Analyses, if used, are available for review:

Location: County of Riverside Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
Riverside, CA 92505

VII. AUTHORITIES CITED

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Authorities cited: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21083.05; References: California Government Code Section 65088.4; Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095 and 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

VII. REFERENCES

The following documents were referred to as information sources during the preparation of this document.

Cited As:

2010 Valley-Wide Master Plan	<i>Valley-Wide Recreation & Park District Master Plan</i> . Valley-Wide Recreation & Park District, 2010.
Addendum No. 1	<i>Addendum No. 1 to EIR 411 for Tentative Tract Map No. 30694, 30695, and 30696 (Spencer's Crossing)</i> . Approved July 14, 2004.
Archaeological Monitoring Report	<i>Archaeological Monitoring for the Spencer's Crossing Phase 1 Project, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California</i> . SWCA Environmental Consultants, August 2007.
Biological Assessment	<i>Biological Assessment for the French Valley Development (File #199916574), Riverside County, CA</i> . Vandermost Consulting Services, Inc., May 5, 2004.
CARB Scoping Plan	<i>Climate Change Scoping Plan</i> . California Air Resources Board, December 2008.
CMP	<i>2010 Riverside County Congestion Management Program</i> . Riverside County Transportation Commission, March 10, 2010.
<i>CREED v. City of San Diego</i>	<i>CREED v. City of San Diego</i> (2011), Super. Ct. No. 37-2009-00085307-CU-MC-CTL.
Draft 2011 French Valley Airport Compatibility Map	<i>Draft French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Initial Study, and Negative Declaration</i> . Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, October 2011. (Also available for review at: http://www.rcaluc.org/plan_french_valley2011.asp)
Drainage Study for TR No. 32289M1	<i>Preliminary Technical Drainage Study, Tentative Tract Map 32289, Minor Revision 1</i> . RBF Consulting, October 5, 2012
Drainage Study for TR No. 36418	<i>Preliminary Drainage Report, Tract 36418, French Valley</i> . Thielmann Engineers, July 1, 2012.
EIR 411	<i>French Valley Specific Plan EIR</i> (EIR 411, SCH No. 1999041068). Certified June 5, 2001.
Focused Burrowing Owl Survey	<i>Results of Nesting Season Focused Protocol Surveys for the Western Burrowing Owl (Athene cunicularia hypugaea) for the 608-Acre Spencer's Crossing Specific</i>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<i>Plan Property.</i> Glenn Lukos Associates, March 24, 2005.				
Focused Traffic Analysis	<i>JN: 08225 Spencer's Crossing (e-mail to County Transportation Department) and associated exhibits.</i> Urban Crossroads, July 16, 2012.				
General Plan	<i>County of Riverside General Plan.</i> Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency, October 2003.				
General Plan EIR	<i>County of Riverside General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report,</i> Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency, October 2003.				
Geology/Soils Report Update	<i>Update Soils Engineering and Engineering Geology Report, Tract 32289 and 36418, Spencer's Crossing, Riverside County, California, BGR 110024.</i> Leighton and Associates, Inc., July 20, 2012.				
GHG Analysis	<i>French Valley Specific Plan No. 312 Amendment #1 Greenhouse Gas Analysis.</i> Urban Crossroads, September 25, 2012.				
GIS Database	Riverside County Land Information System (accessed December 7, 2011). http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rcdis/index.html				
Murrieta General Plan	<i>Murrieta General Plan 2035.</i> City of Murrieta, California, February 2011. Available on-line at: http://www.murrieta.org/cityhall/cd/planning/docs/general.asp				
Ord. No. 460	Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, Subdivision Regulations. June 3, 2010.				
Ord. No. 484	Riverside County Ordinance No. 484, An Ordinance of the County of Riverside Amending Ordinance No. 484 for the Control of Blowing Sand. March 14, 2000.				
Ord. No. 625	Riverside County Ordinance No. 625, Right-to-Farm Ordinance. March 18, 1986 (Amended November 8, 1994).				
Ord. No. 655	Riverside County Ordinance No. 655, Regulating Light Pollution.				
Ord. No. 659	Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, Establishing a Development Impact Fee Program. July 21, 2009.				
PSE Geotechnical Report	<i>Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Tentative Tract No. 32289, Spencer's Crossing Project, French Valley Area, Riverside County, California.</i> Pacific Soils Engineering, Inc., September 20, 2004.				
SCAQMD AQMP	<i>Final 2007 Air Quality Management Plan.</i> South Coast Air Quality Management District, June 2007.				
SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook	<i>CEQA Air Quality Handbook.</i> South Coast Air Quality Management District. April 1993, with November 1993 Update.				
SWAP	<i>Southwest Area Plan.</i> Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency, October 2003.				
TR 30696	<i>As-Graded Report of Rough Grading Lot 100, Tract 30696-4, Spencer's</i>				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Geotechnical Report	<i>Crossing Subdivision, Riverside County, California.</i> Leighton and Associates, Inc., August 30, 2007.				
TR No. 32289M1 Noise Analysis	<i>Spencer's Crossing (TTM No. 32289) Preliminary Noise Study.</i> Urban Crossroads, August 3, 2012.				
TR No. 36418 Noise Analysis	<i>PA 19 – French Valley Specific Plan Amendment #1 Preliminary Noise Study.</i> Urban Crossroads, August 7, 2012.				
Trip Generation Assessment	<i>French Valley Specific Plan Trip Generation Assessment.</i> Urban Crossroads, July 25, 2011.				
U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys	<i>Soil Survey, Western Riverside Area California.</i> United States Department of Agriculture, 1971.				
WQMP for TR 32289M1	<i>Project Specific Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Spencer's Crossing, Tract No. 32289.</i> RBF Consulting, October 5, 2012.				
WQMP for TR 36418	<i>Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan for Tr. 36418.</i> Thielmann Engineers, July 13, 2012.				
WRC-MSHCP	Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan. Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency, October 2003.				

File: EA_Template_CLEAN_5-12-10.doc

Revised: 6/21/2013 11:42 AM

French Valley Specific Plan (SP 312)
List of Assessor's Parcel Numbers

480602039,	480602030,	480501003,	480602047,	480561018,	480602021,	480600006,
480510007,	480580008,	480561030,	480602019,	480602049,	480602026,	480602002,
480490027,	480561017,	480602037,	480602024,	480510002,	480602046,	480560032,
480501002,	480561004,	480560024,	480561014,	480561020,	480580009,	480561034,
480561003,	480491002,	480521007,	480602055,	480020011,	480561031,	480561015,
480490004,	480020018,	480502018,	480490011,	480490018,	480510005,	480560002,
480510019,	480510008,	480502019,	480561029,	480502022,	480510004,	480561005,
480510010,	480510021,	480510012,	480602057,	480490006,	480501006,	480560004,
480510011,	480523006,	480490019,	480511019,	480602059,	480490012,	480510001,
480490016,	480511009,	480590007,	480561028,	480561013,	480561012,	480512002,
480561011,	480561033,	480561010,	480490013,	480561016,	480512015,	480520003,
480490002,	480560021,	480511039,	480520002,	480560006,	480501009,	480512007,
480020010,	480561026,	480512008,	480511036,	480602023,	480491008,	480560005,
480511002,	480610039,	480500011,	480560025,	480511003,	480500003,	480610040,
480511024,	480501008,	480560031,	480020014,	480602025,	480512003,	480520005,
480602001,	480491003,	480601005,	480510006,	480601003,	480602027,	480601009,
480502013,	480511033,	480511020,	480602018,	480511031,	480560010,	480561007,
480521004,	480612022,	480560026,	480561025,	480511001,	480502006,	480511032,
480610027,	480560023,	480612001,	480510003,	480490003,	480500012,	480521005,
480602003,	480501001,	480500009,	480490023,	480560029,	480502011,	480020025,
480560003,	480521003,	480502007,	480602068,	480490030,	480601006,	480510020,
480511021,	480490017,	480500010,	480490022,	480490008,	480502009,	480490024,
480521002,	480602015,	480500001,	480560022,	480490009,	480511008,	480521001,
480490026,	480490025,	480490031,	480502020,	480602020,	480501007,	480502012,
480600001,	480491011,	480502008,	480602040,	480602031,	480512014,	480560020,
480512013,	480601004,	480602016,	480502010,	480502021,	480500002,	480511025,
480490021,	480602022,	480602033,	480490007,	480601002,	480601012,	480510009,
480512010,	480512001,	480602004,	480602034,	480560008,	480600004,	480602038,
480523009,	480602035,	480601008,	480602013,	480500013,	480490005,	480612012,
480600002,	480610048,	480561008,	480611019,	480580011,	480602012,	480602007,
480490020,	480602048,	480612016,	480502017,	480602014,	480090038,	480602053,
480602017,	480511022,	480602042,	480602050,	480510018,	480602052,	480491014,
480522004,	480602058,	480502023,	480512009,	480602051,	480511010,	480581020,
480502024,	480602005,	480570008,	480610050,	480521006,	480511034,	480090063,
480580033,	480600003,	480591004,	480611014,	480610006,	480580035,	480602061,
480610001,	480612011,	480602006,	480602041,	480090030,	480612009,	480581017,
480601013,	480560007,	480511011,	480611005,	480602060,	480611012,	480602036,
480612017,	480581004,	480611007,	480602044,	480590021,	480572004,	480090064,
480611022,	480511035,	480602011,	480512011,	480602032,	480581005,	480611018,
480602009,	480523007,	480612019,	480580019,	480581006,	480561032,	480610009,
480611017,	480561002,	480611020,	480572003,	480490010,	480602045,	480090060,
480602056,	480560009,	480090043,	480580001,	480572014,	480580034,	480611016,
480572011,	480610007,	480600005,	480602010,	480570003,	480590006,	480612006,
480570002,	480611024,	480612010,	480610011,	480610008,	480612005,	480611006,
480611009,	480611004,	480610004,	480020013,	480501004,	480602054,	480602043,
480502025,	480602008,	480572006,	480523017,	480580002,	480580024,	480561019,

480581021, 480612021, 480570001, 480610002, 480580017, 480581013, 480610030,
480511026, 480610024, 480581026, 480581003, 480581009, 480612018, 480610033,
480611013, 480560016, 480612020, 480610047, 480610049, 480610005, 480610041,
480611025, 480611015, 480610010, 480602062, 480561024, 480590014, 480611003,
480590018, 480610022, 480590012, 480602067, 480610020, 480523003, 480591022,
480610038, 480590020, 480610012, 480611002, 480572017, 480523005, 480581001,
480612002, 480570016, 480610014, 480090025, 480590019, 480523013, 480580026,
480610035, 480612008, 480580020, 480611008, 480611021, 480611011, 480602064,
480612007, 480610032, 480582008, 480612013, 480590011, 480580036, 480581008,
480611010, 480612003, 480610019, 480580022, 480523020, 480523015, 480582004,
480610017, 480581002, 480591021, 480611023, 480591014, 480580003, 480580025,
480570015, 480582005, 480590010, 480590017, 480611026, 480561022, 480591003,
480572002, 480580031, 480572012, 480560019, 480591020, 480581044, 480511015,
480591019, 480581040, 480591015, 480580027, 480572016, 480590002, 480572015,
480572013, 480610042, 480611001, 480580010, 480602065, 480591006, 480591012,
480590009, 480580021, 480561035, 480561023, 480610036, 480610031, 480523010,
480610034, 480580014, 480591013, 480510014, 480590008, 480590003, 480510015,
480580029, 480491013, 480580012, 480610026, 480560012, 480612004, 480582007,
480523011, 480590022, 480523004, 480581031, 480581035, 480581018, 480590025,
480511043, 480590023, 480570007, 480581027, 480580023, 480581007, 480610013,
480611027, 480511014, 480572005, 480590004, 480610021, 480491009, 480501010,
480581010, 480511016, 480572009, 480523016, 480491010, 480560011, 480512005,
480591007, 480590026, 480581039, 480490028, 480581014, 480580015, 480602063,
480581022, 480590013, 480510016, 480490029, 480581043, 480610016, 480491012,
480511005, 480511018, 480511017, 480511006, 480580018, 480511042, 480590015,
480581045, 480491004, 480560013, 480512004, 480560015, 480580006, 480572010,
480570014, 480581036, 480591018, 480602066, 480580004, 480560018, 480491005,
480500005, 480610018, 480560030, 480560014, 480570006, 480590024, 480610025,
480560028, 480502002, 480511028, 480491007, 480590005, 480590016, 480580013,
480570004, 480581015, 480502005, 480502004, 480502014, 480501005, 480502015,
480582006, 480581019, 480490001, 480610037, 480581016, 480502003, 480570005,
480610023, 480580016, 480491015, 480522003, 480500004, 480511013, 480500008,
480523014, 480500006, 480521008, 480523019, 480522001, 480523001, 480560017,
480502016, 480511007, 480010026, 480511012, 480502001, 480510013, 480511004,
480523002, 480512012, 480010025, 480510017, 480500007, 480522002, 480512006,
480612015, 480560027, 480523012, 480612014, 480491006, 480581011, 480590001,
480502027, 480561001, 480511044, 480561009, 480512016, 480502026, 480561006,
480561021, 480511030, 480590027, 480491001, 480511041, 480580005, 480581029,
480520004, 480580028, 480610003, 480523008, 480511040, 480523018, 480581023,
480580007, 480570013, 480591009, 480582009, 480581037, 480581025, 480591011,
480572019, 480591010, 480090045, 480571003, 480582001, 480581024, 480581038,
480571002, 480572018, 480511038, 480570012, 480572008, 480580032, 480581012,
480591005, 480581028, 480581046, 480572007, 480581030, 480570011, 480580030,
480561027, 480511037, 480591001, 480520001, 480090033, 480591008, 480523021,
480570010, 480582002, 480560001, 480570009, 480582003, 480560033, 480591002,
480571001, 480591023, 480591016, 480610044, 480511029, 963450014, 480572001,
480600008, 480581033, 480601007, 480090049, 480601011, 480600009, 480581034,
480600007, 480601010, 480581042, 480610029, 480591024, 480570018, 480601014,
480591017, 480610028, 480610045, 480602028, 480602029, 480570017, 480581032,

480581041, 480511023, 480010018, 480020021, 480010024, 480610015, 480090047,
480610046, 480601001, 480010023, 480020009, 480610051, 480010017, 480020023,
480610043, 963450016, 963450018, 963450017, 963450015, 480100077, 480100070,
480100068, 480100074, 480100065, 480100071, 480100065, 480100058, 480100059,
480100069, 480100056, 480100073, 480100067, 480100057, 480490015, 480490014,
480511027,

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 1

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

EVERY DEPARTMENT

10. EVERY. 2 SPA - Replace all previous

RECOMMND

This Specific Plan Amendment is intended to replace the original SPECIFIC PLAN, and all amendments and substantial conformances to the SPECIFIC PLAN. All future developments within the SPECIFIC PLAN, whether or not they have a direct correlation to this Amendment, will inherit these conditions. The original SPECIFIC PLAN and all previous amendments and substantial conformances to the SPECIFIC PLAN will be electronically "locked" so that all future land development applications comply with the following conditions:

10. EVERY. 3 SP - SP Document

RECOMMND

Specific Plan No. 312A1 shall include the following:

a. Specific Plan Document, which shall include:

1. Board of Supervisors Specific Plan Resolution including the Mitigation Reporting/Monitoring Program
2. Conditions of Approval.
3. Specific Plan Zoning Ordinance.
4. Land Use Plan in both 8 1/2" x 11" black-and-white and 11" x 17" color formats.
5. Specific Plan text.
6. Descriptions of each Planning Area in both graphical and narrative formats.

b. Final Environmental Impact Report No. 411 Document, which must include, but not be limited to, the following items:

1. Mitigation Monitoring/Reporting Program.
2. Draft EIR
3. Comments received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.
4. A list of person, organizations and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.
5. Responses of the County to significant environmental point raised in the review and consultation process.
6. Technical Appendices (on CD)
7. All addenda

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 2

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 3 SP - SP Document (cont.) RECOMMND

If any specific plan conditions of approval differ from the specific plan text or exhibits, the specific plan conditions of approval shall take precedence.

10. EVERY. 4 SP - Definitions RECOMMND

The words identified in the following list that appear in all capitals in the attached conditions of Specific Plan No. 312A1 shall be henceforth defined as follows:

SPECIFIC PLAN = Specific Plan No. 312, Amendment No. 1.

CHANGE OF ZONE = Change of Zone No. 7769.

EIR = Environmental Impact Report No. 411 and all addenda.

10. EVERY. 5 SP - Ordinance Requirements RECOMMND

The development of the property shall be in accordance with the mandatory requirements of all Riverside County ordinances including Ordinance Nos. 348 and 460 and state laws; and shall conform substantially with the adopted SPECIFIC PLAN as filed in the office of the Riverside County Planning Department, unless otherwise amended.

10. EVERY. 6 SP - Limits of SP DOCUMENT RECOMMND

No portion of the SPECIFIC PLAN which purports or proposes to change, waive or modify any ordinance or other legal requirement for the development shall be considered to be part of the adopted specific plan. Notwithstanding o above, the design guidelines and development standards of the SPECIFIC PLAN or hillside development and grading shall apply in place of more general County guidelines and standards.

10. EVERY. 7 SP - HOLD HARMLESS RECOMMND

The applicant/permittee or any successor-in-interest shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County of Riverside or its agents, officers, and employees (COUNTY) from the following:

(a) any claim, action, or proceeding against the COUNTY to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 3

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 7

SP - HOLD HARMLESS (cont.)

RECOMMND

COUNTY, its advisory agencies, appeal boards, or legislative body concerning the SPECIFIC PLAN; and,

(b) any claim, action or proceeding against the COUNTY to attack, set aside, void or annul any other decision made by the COUNTY concerning the SPECIFIC PLAN, including, but not limited to, decisions made in response to California Public Records Act requests.

The COUNTY shall promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense. If the COUNTY fails to promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding or fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant/permittee shall not, thereafter, be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the COUNTY.

The obligations imposed by this condition include, but are not limited to, the following: the applicant/permittee shall pay all legal services expenses the COUNTY incurs in connection with any such claim, action or proceeding, whether it incurs such expenses directly, whether it is ordered by a court to pay such expenses, or whether it incurs such expenses by providing legal services through its Office of County Counsel.

10. EVERY. 8

SPA - Amendment Description

RECOMMND

This Specific Plan Amendment No. 1 to the FRENCH VALLEY Specific Plan (Specific Plan No. 312, SP312A1) amends the Specific Plan's land use plan to accomplish the following:

a) modify Planning Areas 2B, 3B, 15, 16, 17A, 17B, 18A, 18B, and 19 to reflect changes proposed by two tentative tract maps (TR 36418 and TR 32289M1); b) create a new planning area, Planning Area 34, adjacent to Keller Road; c) in all other planning areas, adjust the planning area boundaries, range of residential lot sizes, and/or number of permitted residential lots to bring the Specific Plan into full consistency with previously approved subdivision maps; and d) modify the Specific Plan's boundary to remove a 2.1-acre area that was annexed into the City of Murrieta in 2007 (LAFCO Action 2007-35-3). In addition, SP312A1 modifies the nomenclature used for land use designations throughout the Specific Plan to be consistent with nomenclature used in the adopted Riverside County General

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 4

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 8

SPA - Amendment Description (cont.)

RECOMMND

Plan.

Overall, SP312A1 decreases the total acreage within the Specific Plan boundaries by 2.1 acres from 607.8 to 605.7; decrease the residential acreage within the Specific Plan area from 456.7 to 448.4 acres; and reduce the total number of residential dwelling units permitted within the community from 1,793 to 1,671, as compared to approved Substantial Conformance No. 1. SP312A1 also proposes to reduce the acreage reserved for schools from 20.4 acres to 10.4 acres, increase the acreage reserved for parks from 17.1 acres to 37 acres, and reduce the area designated for stormwater drainage and detention facilities from 50.8 acres to 48.8 acres.

Specifically, SP312A1 provides the following modifications to the Specific Plan's approved land use plan (based on approved Substantial Conformance No. 1):

Proposed SP312A1 Changes Associated with Proposed TR 32289M1

-The authorized number of dwelling units and land use designation for Planning Area 15 are modified to reflect proposed TR32289M1. The number of dwelling units allowed within Planning Area 15 would be reduced from four (4) to zero (0) and the land use designation for this planning area would be changed from "Low Residential" to "Open Space-Recreation." SP312A1 proposes that Planning Area 15 may be developed with a pedestrian pathway, landscaping, and/or water quality detention basin. The acreage for Planning Area 15 is unchanged from the approved Substantial Conformance No. 1.

-The land use designation for Planning Area 16 is changed from "Low Density" residential uses to "Open Space - Recreation" to reflect a subdivision map processed concurrently with SP312A1 (TR 32289M1). SP312A1 provides for the development of a park in this planning area. The acreage for Planning Area 16 is unchanged from the approved Substantial Conformance No. 1.

-The land use designation for Planning Area 18A is changed from "Low Density" residential uses to "Open Space - Recreation" to reflect a subdivision map processed concurrently with SP312A1 (TR 32289M1). SP312A1 provides for the development of a park in this planning area. In

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 5

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 8 SPA - Amendment Description (cont.) (cont.) RECOMMND

addition, the acreage for Planning Area 18A would be reduced from 12.8 acres to 12.4 acres.

-The number of dwelling units in Planning Area 18B is reduced from 34 to 32 to reflect a subdivision map processed concurrently with SP312A1 (TR 32289M1). In addition, the land use designation for this planning area would be changed from "Medium Residential" to "Medium Density Residential" to reflect the County General Plan nomenclature. The minimum residential lot size to Planning Area 18B is unchanged from the approved Substantial Conformance No. 1.

Proposed SP312A1 Changes Associated with Proposed TR 36418

-The land use for Planning Area 19 is changed from public facility (school) uses to residential land uses. Planning Area 19 provides for the target development of 50 dwelling units on minimum 5,000 s.f. lots at a maximum density of 5.0 dwelling units per acre. The land use designation for this area is "Medium-High Density Residential." The acreage for Planning Area 19 is unchanged from the approved Substantial Conformance No. 1.

In addition, SP312A1 changes to the Specific Plan's land use plan to reflect approved subdivision maps, Substantial Conformance No. 1 to Specific Plan No. 312 (approved March 21, 2006), and/or current County General Plan nomenclature.

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

10.BS GRADE. 1 SP-GSP-1 ORD. NOT SUPERSEDED RECOMMND

Anything to the contrary, proposed by this Specific Plan, shall not supersede the following: All grading shall conform to the California Building code, County General Plan, Ordinance 457 and all other relevant laws, rules and regulations governing grading in Riverside County.

10.BS GRADE. 2 SP-GSP-2 GEO/SOIL TO BE OBEYED RECOMMND

All grading shall be performed in accordance with the recommendations of the included -County approved- geotechnical/soils reports for this Specific Plan.

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 6

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.BS GRADE. 3

SP-ALL CLEARNC'S REQ'D B-4 PMT

RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of a grading permit, all certifications affecting grading shall have written clearances. This includes, but is not limited to, additional environmental assessments, erosion control plans, geotechnical/soils reports, and departmental clearances.

E HEALTH DEPARTMENT

10.E HEALTH. 1

SP#312 A1 - COMMENTS

RECOMMND

All tracts and parcel maps subject to Specific Plan#312 Amendment#1 (SP#312 A1) shall be required to obtain Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) potable water and sanitary sewer service. It shall be the responsibility of the developer to ensure that all requirements to obtain water and sewer service are met with EMWD as well as all other applicable agencies.

Any existing septic systems and/or wells shall be properly removed/abandoned under permit with the Department of Environmental Health (DEH). Moreover, all planning cases subject to SP#312 A1 shall be required to submit an Environmental Assessment Phase 1 Study to DEH for review and acceptance.

The use of reclaimed water shall be utilized wherever appropriate for irrigation to reduce overall water demand on EMWD's potable water supply.

As a requirement of the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991, all projects subject to SP#312 A1 shall provide adequate areas for collection and loading recyclable materials in public facilities, commercial/retail projects, business areas, and single family residential areas, where solid waste is collected and loaded in a location which serves five or more units.

10.E HEALTH. 2

INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE-NOISE STUDY

RECOMMND

Noise Consultant: Urban Crossroads
41 Corporate Park, Suite 300
Irvine, CA 92606

Noise Study: "PA 19- French Valley Specific Plan
Amendment #1, Preliminary Noise Study,
County of Riverside, California"
dated Aug 7, 2012 JN: 08009-03

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 7

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.E HEALTH. 2

INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE-NOISE STUDY (cont.)

RECOMMND

Based on the County of Riverside, Industrial Hygiene Program's review of the aforementioned Noise Study, SP#312 A1 shall comply with the recommendations set forth under the Industrial Hygiene Program's response letter dated September 22, 2012 c/o Steve Hinde, REHS, CIH (RivCo Industrial Hygienist).

For further information, please contact the Industrial Hygiene Program at (951) 955-8980.

FLOOD RI DEPARTMENT

10.FLOOD RI. 2

SP FLOOD HAZARD RPT 1/31/13

RECOMMND

This is a proposal is to revise the Land Use Plan by reclassifying designations in some Planning Areas and reconfigure some Planning Area boundaries. Additionally, the Amendment proposed to rename all Planning Area Land Use Designations to be consistent with the current General Plan nomenclature and reduce the total unit count from 1,793 to 1,671. The site is located in French Valley area, east of Briggs Road, west of Highway 79 and Leon Road, and south of Keller Road. This development is associated with SP312 and TR32289M1. This development is being processed concurrently with TR32289M1, TR36418, and CZ7769 which are affected by the amendment.

The District review is predominantly focuses on TR32289M1 and TR36418 since the SP amendments are based on these tracts and the remaining tracts have been conditioned and/or developed.

TR32289M1 and TR36418 drain south to an adjacent natural watercourse which is within the State Department of Water Resources (DWR) awareness floodplain which is adopted into the Country's Floodplain Management Ordinance 458. Portions of the easterly boundary appear to be within the floodplain. The floodplain limits shall be delineated and the tracts shall be designed to avoid encroachment into the floodplain, thus manufactured fill slopes and lots shall be kept clear of the floodplain.

The proponent of the project must be aware of the following:

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 8

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.FLOOD RI. 2

SP FLOOD HAZARD RPT 1/31/13 (cont.)

RECOMMND

a) If any watercourse is to remain natural, it should be mapped as a 100 year floodplain. No encroachment into the floodplain should be allowed.

b) Proposed drainage systems must be designed to collect the 100-year offsite and onsite storm runoff and convey it to an adequate outlet.

c) The District would make detailed recommendations at the time individual developments proposals are received by the District.

The SP discusses, in general terms, a few regional BMPs to serve the entire project. However, a project specific WQMP addressing water quality impacts shall accompany each development proposal at the time the proposal is submitted to the County. Projects shall comply with construction and post-construction water quality requirements in effect at the time.

The project is located within the limits of the Murrieta Creek/Warm Springs Valley Area Drainage Plan (ADP) for which drainage fees have been adopted by the Board of Supervisors. These fees will be included in the conditions of approval once development proposal(s) are submitted to the County for processing.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

10.PLANNING. 1

SP - GEOLOGIC STUDY

RECOMMND

PRIOR TO SCHEDULING OF ANY IMPLEMENTING PROJECT FOR A PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION, THE FOLLOWING REPORT SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE COUNTY GEOLOGIST.

A geologic/geotechnical investigation report. The investigation shall address geologic hazards including, but not necessarily limited to, slope stability, rock fall hazards, landslide hazards, surface fault rupture, fissures, liquefaction potential, collapsible and/or expansive soils, hydroconsolidation, subsidence, wind and water erosion, debris flows, seiche, tsunami, and groundshaking potential. For completeness and direct correlation to the proposed project, the consultant shall be provided the most recent copy of the project case

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 1

SP - GEOLOGIC STUDY (cont.)

RECOMMND

exhibit (tract map, parcel map, plot plan, CUP, etc.) for incorporation into the consultant's report. Furthermore, the consultant shall plot all appropriate geologic and geotechnical data on this case exhibit and include it as an appendix/figure/plate in their report. The geologic/geotechnical investigation report shall be reviewed and approved by the County Engineering Geologist prior to scheduling this case for a public hearing.

Note: acquisition of a County geologic report (GEO) number and submittal of review fees is required (DBF estimate is \$2063.46 for the 607.8-acre proposed project). All reports (2 wet-signed original copies), Planning Geologic Report application (case sub-type GEO3) and deposit base fee payment should be submitted, in person by the applicant or his/her representative, at one of the County's two main offices (Riverside, Palm Desert). These items should be submitted at the Land Use counter. Reports and payment should not be given to the Planner or County Geologist directly.

The applicant and their consultant should also be aware that County Ordinance 457.98 requires a grading permit for any exploratory excavations consisting of 1000 cubic yards or greater in any one location of one acre or more. This applies to all trenching, borings and any access road clearing/construction that may be necessary.

10.PLANNING. 2

SP - LOW PALEO

RECOMMND

According to the County's General Plan, this site has been mapped as having a "Low Potential" for paleontological resources. This category encompasses lands for which previous field surveys and documentation demonstrates a low potential for containing significant paleontological resources subject to adverse impacts. As such, this project is not anticipated to require any direct mitigation for paleontological resources. However, should fossil remains be encountered during site development:

1.All site earthmoving shall be ceased in the area of where the fossil remains are encountered. Earthmoving activities may be diverted to other areas of the site.

2.The owner of the property shall be immediately notified of the fossil discovery who will in turn immediately notify

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 2

SP - LOW PALEO (cont.)

RECOMMND

the County Geologist of the discovery.

3.The applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist approved by the County of Riverside.

4.The paleontologist shall determine the significance of the encountered fossil remains.

5.Paleontological monitoring of earthmoving activities will continue thereafter on an as-needed basis by the paleontologist during all earthmoving activities that may expose sensitive strata. Earthmoving activities in areas of the project area where previously undisturbed strata will be buried but not otherwise disturbed will not be monitored. The supervising paleontologist will have the authority to reduce monitoring once he/she determines the probability of encountering any additional fossils has dropped below an acceptable level.

6.If fossil remains are encountered by earthmoving activities when the paleontologist is not onsite, these activities will be diverted around the fossil site and the paleontologist called to the site immediately to recover the remains.

7.Any recovered fossil remains will be prepared to the point of identification and identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible by knowledgeable paleontologists. The remains then will be curated (assigned and labeled with museum* repository fossil specimen numbers and corresponding fossil site numbers, as appropriate; places in specimen trays and, if necessary, vials with completed specimen data cards) and catalogued, an associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data will be archived (specimen and site numbers and corresponding data entered into appropriate museum repository catalogs and computerized data bases) at the museum repository by a laboratory technician. The remains will then be accessioned into the museum repository fossil collection, where they will be permanently stored, maintained, and, along with associated specimen and site data, made available for future study by qualified scientific investigators. * Per the County of Riverside "SABER Policy", paleontological fossils found in the County of Riverside should, by preference, be directed to the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet.

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 11

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 2 SP - LOW PALEO (cont.) (cont.)

RECOMMND

8.The property owner and/or applicant on whose land the paleontological fossils are discovered shall provide appropriate funding for monitoring, reporting, delivery and curating the fossils at the institution where the fossils will be placed, and will provide confirmation to the County that such funding has been paid to the institution.

10.PLANNING. 3 SP - MAINTAIN AREAS & PHASES

RECOMMND

All planning area and phase numbers shall be maintained throughout the life of the SPECIFIC PLAN, unless changed through the approval of a specific plan amendment or specific plan substantial conformance accompanied by a revision to the complete SPECIFIC PLAN document.

10.PLANNING. 4 SP - NO P.A. DENSITY TRANSPER

RECOMMND

Density transfers between Planning Areas within the SPECIFIC PLAN shall not be permitted, except through the Specific Plan Amendment process.

10.PLANNING. 5 SP - ALUC LETTER

RECOMMND

Thhe following requirements come from a letter by the ALUC Dated June 28, 2012.

- Any outdoor lighting that is installed shall be hooded or shielded so as to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky, and shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 655, as applicable. Lights must be downward facing.

- The following uses shall be prohibited:

a.Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.

b.Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 12

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 5

SP - ALUC LETTER (cont.)

RECOMMND

straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.

c.Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area, including landscaping utilizing water features, aquaculture, livestock operations, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, artificial marshes, landfills, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, incinerators, fly ash disposal, and wastewater management facilities.

d.Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

e.Children's schools, hospitals, and nursing homes.

- A specific notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants, and shall be recorded as a deed notice. See project file or ALUC for a copy of said notice.

4.Any ground-level or aboveground water retention or detention basin or facilities shall be designed so as to provide for a detention period for the design storm that does not exceed 48 hours and to remain totally dry between rainfalls. Vegetation in and around such facilities that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be incompatible with airport operations shall not be utilized in project landscaping. Trees shall be spaced so as to prevent large expanses of contiguous canopy, when mature.

In the event that the requirements of this condition cannot be met, the permittee shall work with the Riverside County Economic Development Agency - Aviation Division and a qualified bird strike/wildlife hazard management consultant to prepare a Wildlife Hazard Management Plan that is acceptable to both the airport operator and the United States Department of Agriculture Wildlife Services agency.

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 13

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

TRANS DEPARTMENT

10.TRANS. 1

SP - SP312A1/TS CONDITIONS

RECOMMND

The Transportation Department has reviewed the traffic study submitted by Robert Kahn, John Kain & Associates for the referenced project. The study has been prepared in accordance with County-approved guidelines. We generally concur with the findings relative to traffic impacts.

The study indicates that it is possible to achieve a Level of Service 'D' for the following intersections (some of which will require additional construction and/or payment of fees for fair share mitigation for mitigation at the time of development):

I-215 Fwy SB Ramps (NS)/Scott Road (EW)
I-215 Fwy SB Ramps (NS)/Clinton Keith Road (EW)
I-215 Fwy NB Ramps (NS)/Scott Road (EW)
I-215 Fwy NB Ramps (NS)/Clinton Keith Road (EW)
Antelope Road (NS)/Scott Road (EW)
Antelope Road (NS)/Clinton Keith Road (EW)
Menifee Road (NS)/Scott Road (EW)
Meadowlark Road (NS)/Clinton Keith Road (EW)
Los Alamos Road (NS)/Clinton Keith Road (EW)
Briggs Road (NS)/Scott Road (EW)
Briggs Road (NS)/Keller Road (EW)
Briggs Road (NS)/Baxter Road (EW)
Briggs Road (NS)/Leon Road (EW)
Leon Road (NS)/Scott Road (EW)
Leon Road (NS)/Keller Road (EW)
Leon Road (NS)/Baxter Road (EW)
Leon Road (NS)/Clinton Keith Road (EW)
Auld Road (NS)/Clinton Keith Road (EW)
Winchester Road - SR-79 (NS)/Scott Road (EW)
Winchester Road - SR-79 (NS)/Keller Road (EW)
Winchester Road - SR-79 (NS)/Baxter Road (EW)
Winchester Road - SR-79 (NS)/Thompson Road (EW)
Winchester Road - SR-79 (NS)/Benton Road (EW)
Winchester Road - SR-79 (NS)/Auld Road (EW)

The General Plan circulation policies relative to the southwest Area Community Plan (SWAP) require a minimum of Level of Service 'D'. As such, the proposed project is consistent with this General Plan policy.

The associated conditions of approval incorporate mitigation measures identified in the traffic study which

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 14

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.TRANS. 1 SP - SP312A1/TS CONDITIONS (cont.)

RECOMMND

are necessary to achieve or maintain the required level of service.

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

FLOOD RI DEPARTMENT

20.FLOOD RI. 1 SP ADDITIONAL REVISIONS REQD

RECOMMND

Within 60 days or prior to the County approval of the final SPECIFIC PLAN document (as required by 20.PLANNING.2), additional edits are required to be incorporated. The SP document shall be edited based on Exhibit W submitted to planning.

It is the District's opinion that these items can be incorporated into the Draft SP prior to release for public review and thus are not issuing a denial for the project at this time. If these changes have not been included in the Draft SP during the public review process, corrections will be issued.

PARKS DEPARTMENT

20.PARKS. 1 SP - REVISED TRAIL EXHIBITS

RECOMMND

Within 30 days of adoption of the SPECIFIC PLAN, the following modifications shall be incorporated into the final SPECIFIC PLAN document:

Revise Figure III.A-3 and Figure III.B-10 exhibits with the Decomposed Granite Trail proposed in PA 18 to be 4' to 7' wide to meet minimum Regional Park and Open-Space District standards.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

20.PLANNING. 1 SP - 90 DAYS TO PROTEST

RECOMMND

The applicant has ninety (90) days from the date of the approval of these conditions to protest, in accordance with the procedures set forth in Government Code Section 66020, the imposition of any and all fees, dedications, reservations, and/or exactions imposed on this project as a result of the approval or conditional approval of this project.

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 15

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

20.PLANNING. 2

SP - SUBMIT FINAL DOCUMENTS

RECOMMND

Within 60 days of the adoption of the project by the Board of Supervisors and prior to closing the DBF accounts for the project, Four (4) hard copies and Fifteen (15) copies on CD of the final SPECIFIC PLAN and EIR documents (SP/EIR) documents shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review, approval and distribution. The documents shall include all the items listed in the condition titled "SP - Documents". The final SP/EIR documents shall be distributed in the following fashion:

One hard copy to the Planning Counter Services Division,

One hard copy to the Planning Department Library,

One hard copy to the Desert Office,

One hard copy to the Planning Department Project Manager,

Digital versions (CD) to the following:

Building and Safety Department 1 copy

Department of Environmental Health 1 copy

Fire Department 1 copy

Flood Control and Water Conservation District 1 copy

Transportation Department 1 copy

Executive Office - CSA Administrator 1 copy

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors 1 copy

Any park provider if not the CSA 1 copy

Any and all remaining documents shall be kept with the Planning Department in Riverside, or as otherwise determined by the Planning Director.

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 16

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

EPD DEPARTMENT

30.EPD. 1 EPD - BUR OWL PRECONSTRUCTION

RECOMMND

Within 30 days prior to issuance of any grading permit within SP00312A1 a preconstruction survey for burrowing owls must be conducted by a qualified biologist holding an MOU with Riverside County and findings submitted to EPD for review.

30.EPD. 2 EPD - NESTING BIRD SURVEY

RECOMMND

If any grading withint he area of SP00312A1 is to occur during the nesting season (Feb 1-Aug 31) a nesting bird survey must be conducted within 30 days prior to ground disturbance by a qualified biologist holding an MOU with Riverside County and findings submitted to EPD for review.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

30.PLANNING. 1 SP - PHASE IV CULTURAL REPORT

RECOMMND

Prior to approval of any implementing project, the following condition shall be placed on that project:

"PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT FINAL: the developer/holder shall prompt the Project Cultural Resources Professional to submit two (2) wet-signed copies of a Phase IV Cultural Resources Monitoring Report that complies with the Riverside County Planning Department's requirements for such reports for all ground disturbing activities associated with this grading permit. The report shall also include evidence of the required cultural/historical sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grade meeting. The County Archaeologist shall review the report to determine adequate mitigation compliance was met. Upon determining the report and mitigation is adequate, the County Archaeologist shall clear this condition."

30.PLANNING. 2 SP - INADVERTANT ARCHAEO FIND

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 17

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 2

SP - INADVERTANT ARCHAEO FIND (cont.)

RECOMMND

The developer/permit holder or any successor in interest shall comply with the following for the life of this permit:

If during ground disturbance activities, cultural resources* are discovered that were not assessed by the archaeological report(s) and/or environmental assessment conducted prior to project approval, the following procedures shall be followed:

1.All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resource shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the project archaeologist**, the Native American tribal representative (or other appropriate ethnic/cultural group representative), and the County Archaeologist to discuss the significance of the find.

2.At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed and after consultation with the Native American tribal (or other appropriate ethnic/cultural group representative) and the archaeologist, a decision is made, with the concurrence of the County Archaeologist, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc) for the cultural resource.

3.Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to the appropriate mitigation measures.

* A cultural resources site is defined, for this condition, as being three or more artifacts in close association with each other, but may include fewer artifacts if the area of the find is determined to be of significance due to its sacred or cultural importance.

** If not already employed by the project developer, a County approved archaeologist shall be employed by the project developer to assess the value/importance of the cultural resource.

30.PLANNING. 3

SP - TRIBAL MONITORING

RECOMMND

As a result of tribal consultation with the Temecula Band of Luiseno Mission Indians (Pechanga) and the

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 18

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30. PLANNING. 3

SP - TRIBAL MONITORING (cont.)

RECOMMND

Soboba Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, tribal observation during mass or rough grading is requested by the tribes. A tribal observation agreement was required for the original specific plan approval for this project and that requirement is recognized for this amendment. The Soboba Band requests to be allowed access to observe only.

Prior to the approval of any implementing project, the developer/permit holder shall enter into an agreement with and retain a monitor designated by the Temecula Band of Luiseno Mission Indians (Pechanga). This group shall be known as the Tribal Observer for this project. The Agreement shall address tribal coordination protocols, the treatment and ultimate disposition of cultural resources which may include repatriation and/or curation in a Riverside County approved curation facility.

The Tribal Observer from the Temecula Band of Luiseno Mission Indians (Pechanga) and from the Soboba Band of Luiseno Mission Indians shall be allowed on-site during all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of each portion of the project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading, trenching, stockpiling of materials, rock crushing, structure demolition and etc., that are subject to archaeological monitoring by the Project Archaeologist. The Pechanga Tribal Observer shall have the limited authority to temporarily divert, redirect or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and potential recovery of cultural resources in coordination with the Project Archaeologist.

The developer/permit holder shall submit a fully executed copy of the tribal observation agreements to the Riverside County Planning Department to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Planning Department shall clear this condition.

NOTE:

1) The Project Archaeologist is responsible for implementing mitigation using standard professional practices for cultural resources archaeology, and shall coordinate with the County, the Tribes, and developer/permit holder throughout the process.

2) Tribal observation does not replace any required Cultural

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 19

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 3

SP - TRIBAL MONITORING (cont.) (cont.)

RECOMMND

Resources monitoring, but rather serves to facilitate tribal consultation for the Tribe's interests only.

3) This agreement shall not modify any approved condition of approval or mitigation measure.

4) The developer/permit holder shall not be required to further pursue any agreement for special interest monitoring of this project if after 60 days from the initial attempt to secure an agreement the developer/permit holder, through demonstrable good faith effort, has been unable to secure said agreement from the SI Monitors. A good faith effort shall consist of no less than 3 written attempts from the developer/permit holder to the tribe to secure the required special interest monitoring agreement and appropriate e-mail and telephone contact attempts. Documentation of the effort made to secure the agreement shall be submitted to the County Archaeologist for review and consideration.

5) Should repatriation be preferred, it shall not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been submitted to the Riverside County Archaeologist. Should curation be preferred, the developer/permit holder is responsible for all costs.

30.PLANNING. 3

SP - IF HUMAN REMAINS FOUND

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"IF HUMAN REMAINS ARE FOUND ON THIS SITE:

The developer/permit holder or any successor in interest shall comply with the following codes for the life of this project:

Pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if human remains are encountered, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 (b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and their disposition has been made.

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 20

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 3

SP - IF HUMAN REMAINS FOUND (cont.)

RECOMMND

If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within the period specified by law. Subsequently, the Native American heritage Commission shall identify the "Most Likely Descendant". The Most Likely Descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation with the property owner and the County Archaeologist concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Human remains from other ethnic/cultural groups with recognized historical associations to the project area shall also be subject to consultation between appropriate representatives from that group and the County Archaeologist."

30.PLANNING. 4

SP - ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS: the applicant/developer shall retain and enter into a monitoring and mitigation service contract with a qualified Archaeologist for professional services relative to review of grading plans, preparation of a monitoring plan for all areas of disturbance that may impact previously undisturbed deposits (if any), and monitoring of site grading for areas of previously undisturbed deposits.

The applicant/developer shall submit a fully executed copy of the contract for archaeological monitoring and mitigation services to the County Archaeologist to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Planning Department shall clear this condition.

Note: The project Archaeologist is responsible for implementing CEQA-based mitigation using standard professional practices for cultural resources archaeology. The project Archaeologist shall coordinate with the County, applicant/developer and any required tribal or other special interest group monitor throughout the process as appropriate.

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 21

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 4 SP - ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING (cont.) RECOMMND

This condition shall not modify any approved condition of approval or mitigation measure."

30.PLANNING. 5 SP - M/M PROGRAM (GENERAL) RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"The EIR prepared for the SPECIFIC PLAN imposes specific mitigation measures and monitoring requirements on the project. Certain conditions of the SPECIFIC PLAN and this implementing project constitute reporting/monitoring requirements for certain mitigation measures."

30.PLANNING. 6 SP - NON-IMPLEMENTING MAPS RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"A land division filed for the purposes of phasing or financing shall not be considered an implementing development application for the purposes of the Planning Department's conditions of approval.

Should this project be an application for phasing or financing, all of the other conditions in this implementing project with a prefix of "SP" will be considered as NOT APPLICABLE, and this condition shall be considered as MET. Should this project not be an application for phasing or financing, this condition shall be considered as NOT APPLICABLE."

30.PLANNING. 7 SP - DURATION OF SP VALIDITY RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"The SPECIFIC PLAN that this project is a part of has a life span of twenty (20) years from the date of the adoption of the resolution adopting the SPECIFIC PLAN.

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 22

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 7

SP - DURATION OF SP VALIDITY (cont.)

RECOMMND

Should the SPECIFIC PLAN not be substantially built out in that period of time, the project proponent shall file a specific plan amendment to be processed concurrently with this implementing proposal. (For the purposes of this condition, substantial buildout shall be defined as [eighty percent (80%) of the maximum amount of dwelling units allowed by the SPECIFIC PLAN as most recently amended.] [the issuance of the 1500th building permit.]) The specific plan amendment will update the entire specific plan document to reflect current development requirements. The County may begin revocation hearings if this requirement is not met.

This condition shall be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if the implementing project has been filed within the above listed parameters, and shall be considered as MET if the specific plan amendment has been filed."

30.PLANNING. 9

SP - PROJECT LOCATION EXHIBIT

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"The applicant shall provide to the Planning Department an 8 1/2" x 11" exhibit showing where in the SPECIFIC PLAN this project is located. The exhibit shall also show all prior implementing projects within the SPECIFIC PLAN that have already been approved.

This condition shall be considered MET once the applicant provides the Planning Department with the required information. This condition may not be DEFERRED."

30.PLANNING. 10

SP - ACOUSTICAL STUDY REQD

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"PRIOR TO PROJECT APPROVAL, an acoustical study shall be submitted to the Planning Department and the Department of Environmental Health - Industrial Hygiene Division for review and approval.

07/16/13
07:32

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 23

SPECIFIC PLAN Case #: SP00312A1

Parcel: 480-090-078

30. PRIOR TO ANY PROJECT APPROVAL

30.PLANNING. 10 SP - ACOUSTICAL STUDY REQD (cont.)

RECOMMND

This condition shall be considered MET if the relevant study has been approved by the Planning Department and the Department of Environmental Health-Industrial Hygiene Division. This condition may be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if the Planning Department determines that the required study is not necessary.

The submittal of this study mandates that a CEQA determination of an Addendum to a previously adopted EIR be made, at a minimum."

30.PLANNING. 12 SP - ARCHAEO STUDY REQD

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"PRIOR TO PROJECT APPROVAL, a archaeological study shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval.

his condition shall be considered MET if the relevant study has been approved by the Planning Department. This condition may be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if the Planning Department determines that the required study is not necessary.

The submittal of this study mandates that a CEQA determination of an Addendum to a previously adopted EIR be made, at a minimum."

30.PLANNING. 13 SP - BIOLOGICAL STUDY REQD

RECOMMND

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project:

"PRIOR TO PROJECT APPROVAL, a biological study shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval.

This condition shall be considered MET if the relevant study has been approved by the Planning Department. This