was reviewed by the Riverside County Fire Department for compliance with all applicable fire protection requirements. The proposed Project adheres to all other applicable policies of the Riverside County General Plan Safety Element and the Temescal Canyon and Elsinore Area Plans.

5. **Noise:** The proposed Project adheres to all applicable policies within the Riverside County General Plan Noise Element.

6. **Housing:** The Riverside County General Plan Housing Element does not contain any policies applicable to the proposed Project, but rather identifies programs and actions to achieve the County's goals with respect to housing. The proposed Project does, however, relate to the County General Plan Housing Element through the Project's proposed land uses. The Project proposes the same number of residential homes as previously approved by SP 327 in 2006 and SP 327A1 in 2014. Thus, the land uses proposed by the Project would not adversely impact the implementation of the County General Plan Housing Element's goals or policies.

7. **Air Quality:** The proposed Project is conditioned to control fugitive dust emissions during grading and construction activities and to reduce air pollutant emissions to the greatest feasible extent. The proposed Project is consistent with all other applicable Riverside County General Plan Air Quality Element.

B. **General Plan Area Plan(s)/Neighborhood Plan(s):** Temescal Canyon

C. **Foundation Component(s):** Community Development

D. **Land Use Designation(s):** MDR, MHDR, CR, OS-R, OS-MS/FMZ, OS-CH as reflected on the Land Use Plan for SP 327A1.

E. **Overlay(s), if any:** None

F. **Policy Area(s), if any:** East Temescal Hillside Policy Area, Temescal Wash Policy Area

G. **Adjacent and Surrounding Area Plan(s)/Neighborhood(s), Foundation Component(s), Land Use Designation(s), and Overlay(s) and Policy Area(s), if any:**

1. **Area Plan(s)/Neighborhood(s):** Temescal Canyon & Lake Mathews/Woodcrest to the North; Temescal Canyon & Elsinore to the south; Temescal Canyon to the west; Lake Mathews/Woodcrest & Elsinore to the east

2. **Foundation Component(s):** Community Development & Rural to the North; Community Development to the South; Community Development, Rural & Open Space to the west; Open Space to the east

3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Medium Density Residential, Medium High Density Residential, High Density Residential, Open Space-Recreation, Open Space-Conservation Habitat, and Public Facility as reflected on the Land Use Plan for SP 327A1 to the North; Rural Residential to the North; Light Industrial to the South; Light Industrial, Open Space-Water & Open Space-Conservation to the West; Open Space-Rural, Open Space-Conservation Habitat & Open Space-Water to the East

4. **Overlay(s):** None

5. **Policy Area(s):** El Sobrante Landfill Policy Area to the Northwest, Serrano Policy Area to the West, Warm Springs Policy Area to the East

H. Adopted Specific Plan Information

1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** Specific Plan No. 327 (Toscana)

2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** The proposed Project would affect Planning Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 15, 18, 19, 25A, 26B, 26C, 26E, 26F, and portions of 27 of SP 327.

I. Existing Zoning: Specific Plan (SP)

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: Same as existing

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Specific Plan (SP) and Residential Agriculture (R-A-5) to the North; Manufacturing Service Commercial (M-SC) to the South; Specific Plan (SP 353, Serrano Commerce Center) to the West; Natural Assets (N-A) & Watercourse, Watershed & Conservation Areas (W-1) to the East

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below (x) would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Recreation
☐ Agriculture & Forest Resources	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Transportation / Traffic
☐ Air Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Utilities / Service Systems
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Other:
☐ Cultural Resources	☒ Noise	☐ Other:
☐ Geology / Soils	☐ Population / Housing	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
☒ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Public Services	

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED
☐ I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED
☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, **NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED** because (a) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative

Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible.

☒ I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An **ADDENDUM** to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.

☐ I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a **SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.

☐ I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and **a SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any the following:(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or,(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

Signature	Date
Matt Straite	For Steve Weiss, Planning Director
Printed Name	

V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000-21178.1), this Initial Study has been prepared to analyze the proposed project to determine any potential new or more severe significant impacts upon the environment that were not previously disclosed in Final EIR No. 439 (EIR 439) that would result from construction and implementation of the Project as amended. In accordance with California Code of Regulations, Section 15063, this Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the Lead Agency, the County of Riverside, in consultation with other jurisdictional agencies, to determine whether a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report is required for the proposed project. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the decision-makers, affected agencies, and the public of potential new or more severe significant environmental impacts that were not previously disclosed in EIR 439 associated with the implementation of the proposed Project.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant New Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant New Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
AESTHETICS Would the project				
1. Scenic Resources a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.L "Aesthetic Resources;" SP 327A1; Addendum No. 1, Temescal Canyon Area Plan Figure 9, "Scenic Highways;" Elsinore Area Plan Figure 9, "Scenic Highways;" California Scenic Highway Program (Caltrans); Google Earth (accessed October 2, 2014); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is located approximately 0.2-mile north of Interstate 15 (I-15), which is designated as a State Eligible Scenic Highway by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Riverside County General Plan.

Potential aesthetic impacts to scenic highways were previously evaluated in EIR 439, Section VI.L "Aesthetic Resources," which found that impacts would be less than significant because development planned by SP 327 would be clustered in the central portion of the Project site and surrounded by extensive open space areas, thereby reducing the perceived scope and scale of the planned development as viewed from I-15. EIR 439 further concluded that aesthetic impacts to the I-15 corridor would be less than significant because of the presence of suburban, industrial, and mining development that exist in the corridor and the fact that landscaping would be provided throughout the project site, including along manufactured slope areas, to soften the appearance of planned development from I-15. Addendum No. 1 to EIR 439 (Addendum No. 1) concluded that SP 327A1 would have a similar aesthetic character as SP 327 and would not adversely affect public views within the I-15 corridor.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1 and would be required to comply with the Development Standards and Design Guidelines (Architecture and Landscaping) contained therein to ensure that development on the Project site is visually appealing. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts upon a scenic highway corridor than was previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

b) Potential impacts to scenic resources resulting from buildout of SP 327 were previously evaluated in EIR 439, Section VI.L "Aesthetic Resources" and Addendum No. 1. EIR 439 concluded that build out of SP 327 would result in less-than-significant impacts to scenic resources because planned development would be clustered in the central portion of the SP 327 property and would include extensive landscaped areas; these design features would buffer planned development from off-site public viewing areas and reduce the perceived scope and scale of development. Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would have a similar aesthetic character as SP 327 – SP 327A1 would include grading activities that would not substantially damage scenic resources and provide a natural appearance, and would also incorporate Development Standards and Design Guidelines (Architecture and Landscaping) to ensure development is visually attractive and not offensive. Further, SP 327A1 would have a smaller development footprint than SP 327; more of the property would be preserved as natural open space, including steep slopes.

The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1. The Project's limits of grading impact would be approximately 201.9 acres within the impact footprint of SP 327A1 and the Project would be required to comply with SP 327A1's Development Standards and Design Guidelines (Architecture and Landscaping) to ensure that development on the Project site is visually appealing. Because the Project would be consistent with approved SP 327A1, implementation of the Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts to scenic resources that was previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required. All measures identified in EIR 439 to mitigate aesthetic impacts continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

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

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.L "Aesthetic Resources;" SP 327A1; Addendum No. 1; Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution); Temescal Canyon Area Plan Figure 6, "Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy;" Elsinore Area Plan Figure 6, "Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy"

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is located within Zone B of the Mt. Palomar Observatory Nighttime Lighting Policy Area (County Ordinance No. 655). (Note: EIR 439 erroneously stated that the entire Project site was located more than 45 miles from the Mt. Palomar Observatory and, therefore, was not subject to the nighttime lighting restrictions established by Ordinance No. 655. This discrepancy was corrected in Addendum No. 1.) All development on the Project site would be regulated by Ordinance No. 655, which identifies requirements for outdoor lighting that minimize potential adverse effects on

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

observations at the Mt. Palomar observatory. In addition, the proposed Project would be required to comply with the design standards contained within SP 327A1 to minimize contributions to sky glow (refer to SP 327A1, Section IV.C.2, *Lighting*). Mandatory compliance with Ordinance No. 655 and implementation of the design measures within SP 327A1 related to outdoor lighting fixtures would ensure that the proposed Project would not contribute substantial amounts of light pollution (i.e., sky glow) which could interfere with nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory. Impacts would be less-than-significant.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not 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: EIR 439, Section VI.L "Aesthetic Resources;" SP 327A1; Addendum No. 1; Ord. No. 915 (Regulating Outdoor Lighting); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a & b) The Project site is undeveloped under existing conditions and is located south of existing rural residential properties. As a proposed residential community, lighting elements that would be installed for the Project would be of low intensity and residential in character – primarily consisting of lights installed on individual residential lots, lights installed in on-site parks, and street lights. Although the proposed Project would introduce new sources of artificial light on the Project site, the lighting would be no more intense than would have occurred under approved SP 327 (as amended by SP 327A1), and would not create unacceptable sources of light or more intense lighting levels than previously evaluated by EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1. Furthermore, the proposed Project would be required to comply with the lighting standards contained within SP 327A1 as well as County Ordinance No. 915. The Project's mandatory compliance with these standards would: 1) ensure that proposed development would be compatible with the low-light, rural setting of the surrounding area; 2) prevent substantial light or glare from falling on public streets or property adjoining the Project site; and 3) prevent "spillover" effects from the Project site that could interfere with day or nighttime views in the area. Implementation of the Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts to lighting than was previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required. All measures identified in EIR 439 to mitigate aesthetic impacts continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.I "Agricultural Resources;" Addendum No. 1; County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources;" Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS); Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program; Google Earth (accessed October 2, 2014); Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site does not contain any lands designated as "Prime Farmland," "Unique Farmland," or "Farmland of Statewide Importance" as mapped by the State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). As such, the Project has no potential to convert such lands to a non-agricultural use and no impact would occur. This conclusion is consistent with the information disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

b & c) As disclosed in EIR 439, Section VI.I "Agricultural Resources," the Project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not under active agricultural production. These circumstances have not changed since EIR 439 was certified in 2006. Also, as disclosed in EIR 439, the Project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract, nor is the site located within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve. As such, no direct impact to agricultural zoning, agricultural use, or Williamson Act contract status would occur with development of the property as proposed by the Project. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

The Project site is not located within 300-feet of agriculturally zoned properties. Furthermore, there are no properties in the vicinity of the Project site subject to a Williamson Act contract or Riverside County Agricultural Preserve. As such, the Project site would not conflict with off-site agricultural lands. The Project's impact would be less than significant, which is consistent with the conclusion of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

d) "Farmland" is defined in Section II (a) of Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines to mean "Prime Farmland," "Unique Farmland" or "Farmland of Statewide Importance." As described above in the response to Item 4(a), implementation of the Project would not result in the conversion of

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Farmland to non-agricultural use. No impact would occur. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not 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: EIR 439, Section VI.J "Biological Resources;" Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix A1 "Biological Resources Assessment" (Helix Environmental Planning, 2014); Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-3 "Parks, Forests and Recreation Areas;" RCLIS; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a, b & c) The Project site does not contain any forest land, 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 the conversion of forest resources to non-forest use, either directly or indirectly. No impact would occur. Although the specific topic of "Forest" was not evaluated in EIR 439, 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 of the Project would have no adverse effects on forests.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project				
6. Air Quality Impacts a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.E, "Air Quality;" Appendix E to EIR 439 "Air Quality Impact Analysis" (Urban Crossroads, 2004); Addendum No. 1; SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan; 1997 SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan; SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook; SCAQMD Rule 1113; California Building Standards Code; Google Earth (accessed October 2, 2014)

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). 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 South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is principally responsible for air pollution control in the SCAB. The SCAQMD works directly with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), county transportation commissions, local governments, and state and federal agencies to reduce emissions from stationary, mobile, and indirect sources to meet state and federal ambient air quality standards.

The SCAQMD has adopted a series of Air Quality Management Plans (AQMPs) to reduce air emissions in the Basin. When the CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP) for EIR 439 was advertised for public review (thereby establishing the environmental baseline for EIR 439), the SCAQMD's 1997 AQMP was applicable. Since that time, the SCAQMD adopted three (3) updates to the AQMP, including the 2012 AQMP on December 7, 2012, which is in effect at this time and is applicable to the Project for determining consistency with the AQMP. The 2012 AQMP incorporates the latest scientific and technological information and planning assumptions, including SCAG's *2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* and updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories. For purposes of evaluation and to determine whether the proposed Project would result in any new or more severe air quality impacts than disclosed in EIR 439, consistency with both the 1997 AQMP, which was applicable at the time EIR 439 was written, and the 2012 AQMP are discussed below.

EIR 439 concluded that because SP 327 would be consistent with the regional growth projections documented by Riverside County and SCAG, SP 327 would also be consistent with the 1997 SCAQMD AQMP. This rationale was applied because the 1997 SCAQMD AQMP relied on the County's General Plan and SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) as the basis for its growth assumptions. Applying the same rationale, Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would not conflict with the 1997 SCAQMD AQMP because the land plan for SP 327A1 would be consistent with

the regional growth projections contained within the 1997 SCAQMD AQMP – SP 327A1 did not change the planned number of dwelling units from SP 327 (i.e., 1,443 units) and reduced the overall development intensity of the project by eliminating a commercial retail site planned by SP 327. The Project would implement SP 327A1 and would not alter the location, distribution, or intensity of development on the subject property beyond what is shown on the approved land plan for SP 327A1 (which was deemed to be consistent with the original land plan for SP 327). Accordingly, the Project would not result in a new or more severe conflict with the regional growth projections contained within the 1997 SCAQMD AQMP. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Under existing conditions, the 2012 SCAQMD AQMP is the applicable air quality plan for the Project area. This AQMP is based on the assumptions provided by both the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the Southern California Association of Governments in the latest available EMFAC model for the most recent motor vehicle and demographics information, respectively. The proposed Project's consistency with the 2012 AQMP is discussed below. Criteria for determining consistency with the 2012 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.*

  Consistency Criterion No. 1 refers to violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). EIR 439 included an analysis of impacts to air quality and found that short-term construction and long-term mobile source emissions associated with SP 327 would result in direct and cumulative impacts to regional air quality and that operational impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, even following the incorporation of identified mitigation measures. Addendum No. 1 determined that SP 327A1's daily construction-related air quality impacts would be the same or similar to those disclosed in EIR 439. Addendum No. 1 also determined that SP 327A1's long-term operational mobile source emissions would be substantially lower than those disclosed in EIR 439 because SP 327A1 would generate 3,434 fewer vehicle trip ends per day under long-term operational conditions than SP 327. Accordingly, Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would not increase 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 439.

  The Project would implement the land plan for SP 327A1. Accordingly, implementation of 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 beyond what was already identified and disclosed as part of EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1. 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 2012 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 and may result in increased stationary area source or mobile source emissions that exceed projections contained within the AQMP. As concluded in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 would not substantially exceed assumptions in the AQMP and would be consistent with Consistency Criterion No. 2. The Project would implement SP 327A1; no changes to the approved Specific Plan would occur as a result of the Project. As such, the Project would not substantially exceed assumptions in the AQMP and the Project would be consistent with Consistency Criterion No. 2.

For the reasons stated above, 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, delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP, or exceed the growth assumptions in the AQMP. Accordingly implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP to a greater degree than SP 327 or SP 327A1, and would not result in new or substantially increased impacts that were not previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

b & c) EIR 439 concluded SP 327 would result in significant direct and cumulatively considerable regional air quality impacts from short-term construction and long-term operational activities. EIR 439 identified mitigation measures to reduce SP 327's air quality effect; however, EIR 439 concluded SP 327's long-term direct and cumulative air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable even after the incorporation of specified mitigation measures. Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would not create any additional air quality violations beyond those previously identified in EIR 439, and would, in fact, reduce the severity of air quality impacts as compared to SP 327 due a reduction in planned development intensity on-site and the application of more stringent, mandatory building and air quality regulations (although long-term direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable as disclosed in EIR 439 and in the Statement of Overriding Considerations that supported certification of EIR 439).

The proposed Project would implement the land uses planned by SP 327A1. The mitigation measures identified in EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1 to reflect land use design changes that resulted from SP 327A1) would continue to apply to the proposed Project, and would be enforced by Riverside County as part of the Project's conditions of approval. Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with the building and air quality regulations specified in Addendum No. 1 (including, but not limited to, the California Building Standards Code, California Code of Regulations Title 24). Accordingly, the proposed Project would not directly cause or cumulatively contribute to any new air quality violation or an increase in the severity of any existing or projected air quality violation beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1. The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable direct and cumulative air quality impact during long-term operation as disclosed in EIR 439 and in the Statement of Overriding Considerations that supported certification of EIR 439.

d) The proposed Project is a master-planned residential community and would not involve the construction of point source air pollutant emitters. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors located within one mile of the Project site to substantial point source emissions. Furthermore, the proposed Project would be required to comply with the mitigation measures imposed by EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1 to reflect land use design changes that resulted from SP 327A1) to minimize air pollutant emissions during short-term construction

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

activities and long-term operation. No impact would occur. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

e) EIR 439 did not disclose the existence of any sources of substantial point source emissions within one (1) mile of the Project site. No such emission sources have been established within one (1) mile of the Project site since EIR 439 was certified. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in the construction of a sensitive receptor within one (1) mile of an emitter of substantial point source air pollution, which is consistent with the conclusion of EIR 439 and Addendum No.1.

f) The Project proposes to develop the subject property with residential land uses, parks, roads, and water quality/detention facilities. These land uses are not typically associated with the generation of objectionable odors. Although odor emissions could occur during short-term construction activities – from construction equipment exhaust, application of asphalt, and the application of architectural coatings – such odors would be no greater than disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, and mandatory compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings), would minimize odors associated with Project construction activities. Further, potential odors from construction activities would not affect a substantial number of people and would be short-term and intermittent in nature, ceasing upon completion of construction. Short-term odor impacts associated with Project construction would be less than significant. This conclusion is consistent with the information disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: EIR 439 identified mitigation measures that would minimize the air quality impact of SP 327 to the maximum feasible extent. The mitigation measures identified by EIR 439 were modified by Addendum No. 1 to reflect land use design changes that resulted from SP 327A1. These mitigation measures (as modified by Addendum No. 1) would continue to apply to the proposed Project. No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1) are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1).

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.J, "Biological Resources;" EIR 439 Appendices G-1 through G-22; Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix A1 "Biological Resources Assessment" (Helix Environmental Planning, 2014); Addendum No. 1 Appendix A2 "MSHCP Consistency Analysis" (Helix Environmental Planning, 2014); Addendum No. 1 Appendix A3 "Oak Tree Impacts and Mitigation for the Toscana Project" (Helix Environmental Planning, 2014); Western Riverside County MSHCP

Findings of Fact:

a) The Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) is the regional habitat conservation plan (HCP) that applies to all properties in Western Riverside County, including the proposed Project site. The MSHCP identifies conservation criteria for portions of the County that are identified for conservation as part of the MSHCP. To ensure consistency with the (then-pending) MSHCP during the planning of SP 327, the property was the subject of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) executed between the County and the SP 327 property owner, which was signed on June 10, 2003. The MOU cites commitments of the SP 327 property owner and the County and includes a map showing 510.0 acres of open space conservation on the Project site. The MOU is appended to certified EIR 439 as Appendix G-10. Section 3.3.1 of the MSHCP and approved Joint Project Review 06 03 27 01 for SP 327 determined that approved SP 327 would be consistent with the MSHCP criteria and its guidelines so long as development is consistent with the MOU. To date, approximately 70 acres of the Specific Plan area have been dedicated to the Western Riverside County RCA.

An MSHCP Consistency Report was prepared by Helix Environmental Planning to evaluate SP 327A1 for consistency with the conservation requirements of the MSHCP (Addendum No. 1 Appendix A2). The MSHCP Consistency Report for SP 327A1 was reviewed and approved by the County Environmental Programs Department and the Western Riverside County RCA. The Report, the findings of which were disclosed in Addendum No. 1, determined that SP 327A1 was consistent with, and exceeded, the conservation criteria specified in the MOU because SP 327A1 resulted in a lesser extent of overall biological impact than would have occurred from implementation of SP 327. Specifically, SP 327A1 reduced the permanent disturbance area within the Specific Plan Area by approximately 32 acres, which reduced direct effects to sensitive biological resources, minimized

potential edge effects to the MSHCP Conservation Area, and improved the overall MSHCP Conservation Area design by providing better connected open space areas. Accordingly, Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 was consistent with the MSHCP, and would not result in any new or more severe impact that was not disclosed in EIR 439.

The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1. The Project's limits of grading impact would be approximately 201.9 acres of the impact footprint identified for SP 327A1 (and what was evaluated in the MSHCP Consistency Report for SP 327A1) and the Project would be required to comply with the property's MOU. Because the County determined SP 327A1 was consistent with the MSHCP, the proposed Project – as an implementing action of SP 327A1 – also would be consistent with the MSHCP. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in a new or more severe conflict with the MSHCP that was not previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

b & c) As disclosed in EIR 439, two sensitive plant species, Coulter's matilija poppy and many stemmed dudleya, are present within the Specific Plan area. EIR 439 further disclosed that implementation of SP 327 would impact both of these species, but that impacts would be less than significant because the impacts would be consistent with the MSHCP's conservation requirements and would not threaten the regional viability of the species. Addendum No. 1 determined that, like SP 327, SP 327A1 would impact both the Coulter's matilija poppy and many stemmed dudleya. However, as disclosed in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1's impacts to both species would be less than what was previously reported in EIR 439. The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1 and its limits of grading impact would be an approximately 201.9-acre portion of the impact footprint identified for SP 327A1. Therefore, the Project would have no potential to result in impacts to the Coulter's matilija poppy or many stemmed dudleya that were not previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

EIR 439 disclosed that the SP 327 would result in the loss of habitat for a number of special-status wildlife species, including listed and non-listed species, but impacts to many of these species and their habitat are Covered Species identified in the MSHCP and, as such, any impacts would be fully mitigated through mandatory compliance with the MSHCP and the property's MOU. EIR 439 also disclosed that SP 327 had the potential to impact one special-status species not covered by the MSHCP (least Bell's vireo) but that impacts would be less-than-significant as a result of mandatory compliance with the MSHCP and the property's MOU. Because SP 327A1 has a smaller physical disturbance area than SP 327 and, like SP 327, is required to comply with the MSHCP and the property's MOU, Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would not result in any new or more severe impacts to special-status wildlife species than disclosed in EIR 439. The Project would implement a portion of the SP 327A1 and its limit of grading impact would be approximately 201.9 acres of the impact footprint identified for SP 327A1. Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with the property's MOU. Therefore, the Project would have no potential to result in impacts to special-status animal species that were not previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

d) EIR 439 concluded that the previously-approved SP 327 project would result in a less than significant impact to regional wildlife movement because development would be concentrated in the center of the property. Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would actually improve wildlife movement and better facilitate open space connectivity as compared to SP 327 because SP 327A1 would reduce the Specific Plan's overall development footprint. The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1; the Project's limits of grading impact would be approximately 201.9 acres of the impact footprint identified for SP 327A1. Therefore, there is no potential for the Project to adversely affect wildlife movement to a greater degree than previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

e & f) As disclosed in EIR 439, the Specific Plan area contains natural upland and riparian/riverine habitats, including resources under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). EIR 439 determined that impacts to the natural upland and riparian/riverine habitats, including areas under the jurisdiction of the USACE, CDFW, and the RWQCB, would be significant but that impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the application of required mitigation.

Addendum No. 1 determined that implementation of SP 327A1 would result in reduced impacts to natural biological habitats, including areas under the jurisdiction of the USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB, than SP 327 due to the preservation of approximately 32 additional acres of natural habitat that otherwise would have been impacted by SP 327. Although SP 327A1 would result in reduced impacts as compared to SP 327, Addendum No. 1 concluded that impacts would be considered significant and the mitigation measures identified in EIR 439 would continue to apply (with modifications to reflect land use design changes that resulted from SP 327A1, current best practices for biological resources, and current, applicable federal, State, and County of Riverside regulations). With application of the mitigation imposed by EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1), SP 327A1's impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1. The Project's limits of grading impact would be approximately 201.9 acres of the impact footprint identified for SP 327A1, and the Project would be required to comply with the applicable mitigation imposed by EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1). As such, implementation of the Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts to natural biological habitats, including areas under the jurisdiction of the USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB, than previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

g) The proposed Project site contains oak trees that are regulated by the County. As disclosed in EIR 439, development associated with SP 327 would impact 65 oak trees. SP 327A1 reduced the Specific Plan's development footprint by approximately 32 acres, which resulted in an approximately 54 percent decrease in impacts to oak trees as compared to impact levels previously disclosed in EIR 439. (Impacts would be reduced from 65 oak trees as reported in EIR 439 to 35 oak trees as reported in Addendum No. 1.) Accordingly, Addendum No. 1 concluded that implementation of SP 327A1 would not result in more severe impacts to oak trees than previously discussed in EIR 439.

The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1. The Project's limits of grading impact would be approximately 201.9 acres of the impact footprint identified for SP 327A1; therefore, there is no potential for the Project to result in more severe impacts to oak trees than previously disclosed in Addendum No. 1. Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with mitigation requirements of EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1 to reflect land use design changes that resulted from SP 327A1). Based on the foregoing, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new significant or more severe impact to oak trees than previously discussed in EIR 439.

The County does not have any other biological protection ordinance applicable to the proposed Project.

Mitigation: EIR 439 identified mitigation measures that would minimize the impact of SP 327 on biological resources to less-than-significant levels. The mitigation measures identified by EIR 439 were modified by Addendum No. 1 to reflect land use design changes that resulted from SP 327A1,

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

current best practices for biological resources, and current, applicable federal, State, and County of Riverside regulations, and would continue to apply to the proposed Project. No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1) are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1).

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project				
8. Historic Resources a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.K, "Cultural Resources;" EIR 439 Appendix H-1, "An Archaeology Assessment of the Temescal Hills" (Christopher Drover, 2001); EIR 439 Appendix H-2, "An Archaeological Assessment of the Temescal Valley Project" (Christopher Drover, 1990); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix B "Phase 1 Cultural Resources Assessment" (Christopher Drover, 2012); Addendum No. 1 Appendix L2 "A Phase II Cultural Resource Evaluation Report for RIV-8137 at the Toscana Project" (Brian F. Smith and Associates, 2014); On-Site Inspection; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a & b) EIR 439 concluded the Specific Plan area did not contain any historic resource sites. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, subsequent to certification of EIR 439, two (2) previously unrecorded historical sites were discovered within the Specific Plan area during a cultural resources assessment not related to SP 327 (Valley-Ivy Glen Transmission Line project). One site was recorded in the southwestern portion of the Specific Plan area and comprised a small scatter of historic refuse (CA-RIV-8118H), and one site was recorded in the south-central portion of the Specific Plan area and comprised the remnants of a concrete standpipe (CA-RIV-8137H).

Addendum No.1 concluded that although two historical resource sites were identified during field work within the Specific Plan area that were not disclosed in EIR 439, the conclusions of EIR 439 remained accurate because neither CA-RIV-8118H nor CA-RIV-8137H qualified as a significant resource. CA-RIV-8118H is comprised of random artifacts (e.g., glass bottle fragments, metal cans, ceramic plate fragments) that are characteristic of a roadside trash scatter and lack any historic association, while CA-RIV-8137H is a badly deteriorated concrete standpipe and has no associated historic deposits. Both historic sites would be disturbed by SP 327A1 (CA-RIV-8118H would be disturbed by on-site biological mitigation activities and CA-RIV-8137H would be impacted by construction of an access road). However, because neither of these historic sites qualify as a significant historic resource, Addendum No. 1 concluded that impacts would be less than significant and would not be more severe than previously disclosed in EIR 439.

Of the two historic resources located within the Specific Plan area, only CA-RIV-8137H is located within the Project site. The Project would implement SP 327A1 and would, therefore, impact CA-RIV-8137H. However, because this site is not a significant historic resource, implementation of the Project would not result in impacts to any historical site designated as a significant historic resource. The proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified impact as previously analyzed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

9. Archaeological Resources a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.K, "Cultural Resources;" EIR 439 Appendix H-1, "An Archaeology Assessment of the Temescal Hills" (Christopher Drover, 2001); EIR 439 Appendix H-2, "An Archaeological Assessment of the Temescal Valley Project" (Christopher Drover, 1990); Addendum No. 1 Appendix B "Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment" (Drover Consulting Archaeology, 2012); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a & b) EIR 439 disclosed that one (1) prehistoric archaeological site (CA-RIV-1089) is located within the Specific Plan area. As documented in EIR 439, this site comprises a bedrock mortar milling station and associated lithic scatter. No testing was conducted to determine the significance of CA-RIV-1089; therefore, EIR 439 assumed the site to be unique and significant. However, because CA-RIV-1089 is located in an area that was planned as undisturbed open space by SP 327, EIR 439 concluded that direct impacts to this prehistoric archaeological resource would be less than significant. Although direct impacts to CA-RIV-1089 were determined to be less than significant, EIR 439 included mitigation to ensure that no substantial adverse effects to CA-RIV-1089 would occur.

Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would not result in any new or more severe impact to archaeological resources beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439. As with SP 327, SP 327A1 would preserve CA-RIV-1089 within an undeveloped open space area. Additionally, SP 327A1 would be required to comply with the mitigation requirements of EIR 439 to provide archaeological monitoring during grading activities to ensure that any previously undiscovered archaeological resources that may be unearthed during grading activities on the Project site would be properly identified and treated.

The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1. The Project's grading footprint would be approximately 201.9 acres of the impact footprint identified for SP 327A1, and the Project would be required to comply with the mitigation requirements of EIR 439 to avoid potential adverse impacts to archaeological resources. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified impact as previously analyzed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

c) Neither EIR 439 nor Addendum No. 1 disclosed the presence of human remains on the Project site and no human remains have been identified on the Project site during past archaeological

investigations and other field work. Nonetheless, EIR 439 provided mitigation in the event that previously undiscovered human remains are uncovered during Project-related construction activities. The mitigation from EIR 439 would continue to apply to the proposed Project and would require the Project developer to comply with California Health and Safety Code §7050.5, which states that, if human remains are discovered, earthwork and other construction activities in the affected area shall cease immediately and cannot resume until the Riverside County Coroner is notified and has made the necessary findings as to the origin of the remains. Further, pursuant to California Public Resources Code §5097.98(b), the remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made by the Coroner. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be of Native American origin, the California Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission must then immediately notify the "most likely descendant(s)" of the discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then engage in consultations and make recommendations concerning the treatment of the remains within 48 hours of receiving notification, as provided in Public Resources Code §5097.98. With mandatory compliance with State law and mitigation from EIR 439, any adverse impacts to human remains, if discovered, would be avoided. Therefore, the Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts to human remains beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

d) The Project site does not contain any known existing religious or sacred uses; therefore, EIR 439 did not disclose any impacts associated with such uses. As discussed above in the response to Item 9(b), EIR 439 included mitigation to provide archaeological monitoring during grading activities to ensure that any archaeological resources (including religious or sacred uses) that may be unearthed during grading activities on the Project site would be properly identified and treated. This requirement would continue to apply to the proposed Project and would be incorporated as part of the County's conditions of approval for the Project. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant and the proposed Project would not result in the potential for any new or more severe impacts to archaeological resources beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

10. Paleontological Resources a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.K, "Cultural Resources;" EIR 439 Appendix H-3, "A Paleontological Survey and Assessment of the Temescal Valley Property near Alberhill" (Heritage Resources, 1990); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix J, "Paleontological Resource and Monitoring Assessment, Toscana Specific Plan project area" (Brian F. Smith and Associates, 2014); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Potential impacts to paleontological resources were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 439, which determined that based on the subject property's geologic setting, there was the potential to uncover paleontological resources during excavations within portions of the Specific Plan area. Mitigation

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

included in EIR 439 required SP 327 to implement a paleontological monitoring program to ensure that potential impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

A Paleontological Resources and Monitoring Assessment report was prepared in support of SP 327A1 by Brian F. Smith and Associates. As documented in Addendum No. 1, Brian F. Smith and Associates concluded the likelihood of finding fossilferous materials within the Specific Plan area during excavation and/or mass grading activities is very low due to the lack of known fossil deposits in the local area and the composition of the soils within the Specific Plan area (which are rocky and lack the sedimentary accumulation necessary for fossil deposits). Accordingly, Addendum No. 1 concluded that implementation of SP 327A1 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, and that the mitigation imposed by EIR 439 was unnecessary.

Based on the findings of Addendum No.1, there is no potential for the Project to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource because the geologic properties on-site are not conducive to the creation of fossils. No mitigation is required. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not result in a new or more severe impact to paleontological resources than disclosed in EIR 439.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project				
11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.A, "Geology and Seismicity;" EIR 439 Appendix B-1 "Geotechnical Feasibility Investigation" (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2001); EIR 439 Appendix B-3 "Seismic Survey" (E.R. Browne & Associates, 1989); EIR 439 Appendix B-5, "Fault Hazard Investigation" (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2004); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix C1, "Fault Hazard Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013); Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions); RCLIS

Findings of Fact:

a & b) As disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, the Specific Plan area is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or a County-designated Fault Hazard Zone. The Specific Plan area does contain two (2) conjectured fault segments; however, as concluded in EIR 439 and affirmed in a fault hazard letter prepared in support of Addendum No. 1, these faults are not active. Therefore, both EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1 concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan would have no potential to expose people or structures to potential adverse effects resulting from a fault hazard zone, and there is no potential for fault rupture within the Specific Plan area.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

The Project site was evaluated for geologic hazards, including hazards related to seismic faulting, by Advanced Geotechnical Systems (*Appendix A1* to this EIR Addendum). The hazard assessment included a detailed trenching evaluation of the on-site conjectured fault segments. Based on the observations gathered in the field, Advanced Geotechnical Systems determined the on-site faults to be pre-Holocene in age and concluded that movement along the faults is highly unlikely – the faults could be classified as "not active." Accordingly, the Project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects resulting from a fault hazard zone, and there is no potential for fault rupture on the Project site. The Project would not result in new or increased impacts associated with seismic faulting hazards beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required. All measures identified in EIR 439 to mitigate SP 327's impact to geology and soils continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

12. Liquefaction Potential Zone a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.A, "Geology and Seismicity;" EIR 439 Appendix B-1 "Geotechnical Feasibility Investigation" (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2001); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix C1, "Geotechnical Feasibility Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013) and "Fault Hazard Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013); Temescal Canyon Area Plan Figure 12 "Seismic Hazards;" Elsinore Area Plan Figure 12 "Seismic Hazards;" Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions)

Findings of Fact:

a) EIR 439 evaluated the potential of seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, on the Project site, and concluded that the likelihood of such ground failure on the site is low due to the geologic characteristics of underlying bedrock and soils, with the exception of areas within the Temescal Wash. To preclude potential impacts associated with seismic ground failure, SP 327 was conditioned to follow the earthwork and grading recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Feasibility Investigation prepared by T.H.E. Soils Co. (EIR 439 Appendix B-1) to ensure manufactured slopes supporting the bridge crossings over the Temescal Wash could withstand seismic-related ground shaking.

As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, Advanced Geotechnical Solutions reviewed the geotechnical reports and materials prepared in support on EIR 439 and affirmed the findings and recommendations contained therein as adequate and appropriate for SP 327A1. Accordingly, Addendum No. 1 concluded that implementation of the Project would not result in new or increased impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439.

Advanced Geotechnical Solutions performed a detailed evaluation of the Project site's underlying soils in support of proposed TR 36593 (refer to *Appendix A1* to this EIR Addendum). The analysis performed by Advanced Geotechnical Solutions confirmed the information previously disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, that soils subject to liquefaction are present within the Temescal Wash.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

The Project is required to be designed and constructed in accordance with the latest applicable seismic safety standards, including the standard requirements of the California Building Code and the County Building Code. Furthermore, the site-specific grading and construction recommendations contained in the Project's geotechnical report have been incorporated into the Project's grading plan design to reduce the risk of seismic-related ground failure due to liquefaction. The County also has made the site-specific grading and construction recommendations conditions of Project approval to assure their implementation (Conditions of Approval 10.BS Grade.002 and 60.BS Grade.004). Accordingly, with mandatory compliance to applicable building codes and the Project's conditions of approval, potential impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure would be less than significant. The Project would not result in new or more severe seismic-related ground failure impacts beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

13. Ground-shaking Zone a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.A, "Geology and Seismicity;" EIR 439 Appendix B-1 "Geotechnical Feasibility Investigation" (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2001); EIR 439 Appendix B-3 "Seismic Survey" (E.R. Browne & Associates, 1989); EIR 439 Appendix B-5, "Fault Hazard Investigation" (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2004); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix C1 "Fault Hazard Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013); County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones;" California Building Standards Code; Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions)

Findings of Fact:

a) As disclosed in EIR 439, the Southern California region is seismically active and development within the Specific Plan area likely would be exposed to strong seismic ground shaking over the life of the Specific Plan. The nearest active fault to the Specific Plan area is the located approximately 1.0 mile to the south (Glen Ivy Fault within the Elsinore Fault zone). EIR 439 indicated that proposed development within the Specific Plan area would be required to comply with the recommendations within the geotechnical report prepared for SP 327, the Uniform Building Code (which has since been superseded by the California Building Code, which is based on the International Building Code), and applicable County Ordinances to reduce potential ground-shaking impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Addendum No. 1 concluded that implementation of SP 327A1 would be subject to similar ground-shaking effects as disclosed in EIR 439 because the design, earthwork and grading requirements assumed in EIR 439 would continue to apply to SP 327A1 and those requirements would be adequate and appropriate for SP 327A1.

Because the Southern California region is seismically active, the Project site is expected to experience moderate to severe ground shaking during the lifetime of the Project. This risk is not considered substantially different than that of other similar properties in the Southern California area or different than what was assumed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1. As a mandatory condition of Project approval, the Project would be required to construct proposed structures in accordance with

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

the California Building Code and applicable County Ordinances (as disclosed in EIR 439). The California Building Code is designed to ensure that buildings and other structures resist collapse and substantial adverse effects associated with strong seismic ground shaking. Accordingly, with mandatory compliance to the California Building Code and applicable County Ordinances, ground shaking impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required. All measures identified in EIR 439 to mitigate SP 327's impact to geology and soils continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.A, "Geology and Seismicity;" EIR 439 Appendix B-1 "Geotechnical Feasibility Investigation" (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2001); EIR 439 Appendix B-3 "Seismic Survey" (E.R. Browne & Associates, 1989); EIR 439 Appendix B-5, "Fault Hazard Investigation" (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2004); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix C1 "Geotechnical Feasibility Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013) and "Fault Hazard Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013); County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones;" California Building Standards Code; Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions)

Findings of Fact:

a) EIR 439 concluded that with the incorporation of the design recommendations of the geotechnical investigation prepared for SP 327, the Specific Plan area would not contain unstable geologic units or soils and also would not be subject to landslides, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards.

As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, there are no components of SP 327A1 that would result in landslide or soil instability hazards that are greater than what was disclosed in EIR 439. Further, as disclosed in Addendum No. 1, the site-specific earthwork and grading recommendations for SP 327 (as described in EIR 439) would continue to apply to SP 327A1 to ensure that substantial adverse effects associated with unstable soils do not occur.

Advanced Geotechnical Solutions performed a detailed evaluation of the Project site's underlying soils in support of proposed TR 36593 (refer to *Appendix A1* to this EIR Addendum). The analysis performed by Advanced Geotechnical Solutions confirmed the information previously disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, that soils underlying the Project site would be stable and not subject to landslides, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards with compliance with the site-specific grading and construction recommendations contained in the Project's geotechnical report (which have been incorporated into the Project design and made County conditions of Project approval (Conditions of Approval 10.BS Grade.002 and 60.BS Grade.004)). Accordingly, with mandatory compliance to the Project's conditions of approval, potential impacts associated with unstable soils, landslides, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards would not occur. The Project would not result in new or more

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

severe seismic-related ground failure impacts beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

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 439, Section VI.A, "Geology and Seismicity;" EIR 439 Appendix B-1 "Geotechnical Feasibility Investigation" (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2001); EIR 439 Appendix B-3 "Seismic Survey" (E.R. Browne & Associates, 1989); EIR 439 Appendix B-5, "Fault Hazard Investigation" (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2004); Addendum No. 1 Appendix C1, "Geotechnical Feasibility Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013) and "Fault Hazard Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013); County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones;" California Building Standards Code; Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions)

Findings of Fact:

a) As disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, the likelihood of ground subsidence within the Specific Plan area is low, with the exception of the areas within the Temescal Wash. Application of site-specific geotechnical recommendations prepared for SP 327, as discussed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, as well as mandatory compliance of applicable building codes would preclude any hazards related to ground subsidence.

Based on the results of a geotechnical investigation of the Project site, Advanced Geotechnical Solutions determined that the likelihood of ground subsidence is very low due to the presence of dense geologic materials underlying the subject property. Also, the Project's design incorporates the site-specific grading and construction recommendations contained in the Project's geotechnical report – which the County has made conditions of Project approval to assure their implementation – to further reduce the potential for ground settlement on the Project site (Conditions of Approval 10.BS Grade.002 and 60.BS Grade.004). Accordingly, the Project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and impacts would be less than significant. The Project would not result in new or more severe ground-subsidence-related impacts beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Accordingly, with mandatory compliance to the Project's conditions of approval, potential impacts associated with unstable soils, landslides, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards would not occur. The Project would not result in new or more severe seismic-related ground failure impacts beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
16. Other Geologic Hazards a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.A, "Geology and Seismicity;" Addendum No. 1; Google Earth (accessed October 3, 2014); Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions)

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is not located in close proximity to any known active volcanoes. Additionally, as disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, there are no conditions in the vicinity of the Project site that could subject the site to hazards associated with seiches or mudflows. Consistent with the information disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.B, "Soils, Slopes, and Erosion;" EIR 439 Appendix B-1 "Geotechnical Feasibility Investigation" (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2001); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix C1, "Geotechnical Feasibility Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013) and "Fault Hazard Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013); Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions); Supplemental Geotechnical Analysis (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) EIR 439 disclosed that grading activities associated with SP 327 would alter the Project site's natural topography, but would preserve the overall topographic character of the site to the extent feasible by clustering development in the central portion of the subject property and engineering manufactured slopes to blend with the natural topographic contours. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 would develop 32 less acres than the originally approved land plan for SP 327 and would, therefore, reduce changes to the Specific Plan area's topography and ground surface relief features.

The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1. The Project's grading plan represents approximately 201.9 acres of the grading plan identified for SP327A1. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in any new impacts to the subject property's natural topography or ground surface relief features or increase the severity of such impacts, as previously disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

b) As evaluated in EIR 439, approved SP 327 planned to construct slopes with gradients greater than 2:1 or heights higher than 10 feet on the subject property. SP 327 was conditioned to comply with the recommendations of the geotechnical report for SP 327 (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2001), applicable building codes, and Riverside County ordinances during the engineering design and construction of slopes with gradients greater than 2:1 or heights higher than 10 feet. In addition, SP 327 was conditioned to provide Riverside County with a slope stability report prior to the issuance of grading permits that demonstrates that all manufactured slopes with gradients steeper than 2:1 or heights higher than 10 feet meet minimum safety regulations.

As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 also included manufactured slopes with heights greater than 10 feet or gradients steeper than 2:1, and the conditions of approval applied to SP 327 to minimize potential hazards associated with steep slopes (as disclosed in EIR 439) also would be applied to SP 327A1. Addendum No. 1 concluded that implementation of SP 327A1 would result in less-than-significant impacts associated with steep slopes, and would be consistent with the information presented in EIR 439.

The proposed Project would include manufactured slopes higher than 10 feet (with manufactured slopes up to 130 feet in height) and slopes steeper than 2:1 (the steepest slope would be constructed at a gradient of 1.5:1). The stability of proposed manufactured slopes were evaluated by Advanced Geotechnical Solutions in the Project's *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation* (*Appendix A1* to this EIR Addendum) and *Supplemental Geotechnical Analysis* (*Appendix A2* to this EIR Addendum). As part of these analyses, Advanced Geotechnical Solutions concluded that the manufactured slopes proposed by the Project would be stable with implementation of site-specific grading and construction recommendations (including recommendations on slope design, minimum soil compaction standards, and construction materials), which are similar in character to the recommendations applied to SP 327 and originally disclosed in EIR 439. These site-specific geotechnical recommendations have been incorporated into the Project design and have been made conditions of Project approval to assure their implementation (Conditions of Approval 10.BS Grade.002 and 60.BS Grade.004). With mandatory compliance to the Project's conditions of approval, potential hazards associated with manufactured slopes would not occur. The Project would not result in new or more severe impacts related to manufactured slopes beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

c) As disclosed in EIR 439, one (1) septic system is located within the Specific Plan area. However, this septic system is not located within the Project site. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems. Implementation of the Project would not result in any impacts that were not previously disclosed in EIR 439, nor would the Project increase the severity of impacts previously disclosed in EIR 439.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

18. Soils a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.B, "Soils, Slopes, and Erosion;" EIR 439 Appendix B-1 "Geotechnical Feasibility Investigation" (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2001); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix C1, "Geotechnical Feasibility Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013) and "Fault Hazard Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013); Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) EIR 439 disclosed that temporary soil erosion would occur during development of SP 327, but that impacts associated with soil erosion and/or the loss of top soil would be less than significant with mandatory compliance with State and local regulations concerning water quality. Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would not increase the severity of erosion-related impacts disclosed in EIR 439 because SP 327A1 would have a similar grading footprint and earthwork quantities as SP 327.

The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1; therefore, the Project's grading plan (including earthwork quantities) represents an approximately 201.9-acre portion of the grading plan identified for SP 327A1. Furthermore, the proposed Project would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, which would require the implementation of a site-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program during construction to minimize the potential for temporary soil erosion. Accordingly, there are no components of the Project that would result in new erosion-related impacts or increase the severity of erosion-related impacts above the levels disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

b) EIR 439 disclosed that the Project site does not contain soils with the potential for expansion. EIR 439 concluded that impacts would be less than significant, and the incorporation of required conditions of approval (i.e., compliance with State and local building codes) would further minimize on-site risks associated with expansive soils. A site-specific geotechnical investigation prepared for the Project confirmed the findings of EIR 439 (see *Appendix A1* to this EIR Addendum). The Project's mandatory compliance with the site-specific geotechnical recommendations, which have been incorporated into the Project's design and made conditions of Project approval to assure their implementation (Conditions of Approval 10.BS Grade.002 and 60.BS Grade.004), would ensure that significant impacts associated with expansive soils would not occur. The Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to expansive soils beyond what was disclosed in EIR 439.

c) Septic systems were not discussed in EIR 439 because SP 327 did not plan for the use of such systems. Similarly, the proposed Project would install domestic sewer service facilities and does not propose the use of septic systems. As such, and consistent with the information disclosed in EIR 439, no impact associated with septic systems would occur because the Project does not propose the use of septic systems.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required. All measures identified in EIR 439 to mitigate SP 327's impact to geology and soils continue to apply to the proposed Project.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

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: EIR 439, Section VI.B, "Soils, Slopes, and Erosion;" EIR 439, Section VI.C, "Hydrology, Flooding & Drainage;" Addendum No. 1; Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan (Proactive Engineering Consultants West, 2013); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a & b) All potential short- and long-term erosion impacts associated with developing the Project as planned by SP 327 were addressed in EIR 439. As concluded by EIR 439, erosion-related impacts on the Project site would be less than significant with the incorporation of mandatory conditions of approval requiring compliance with NPDES program (including the conditions that would be issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board to further reduce the potential for substantial erosion from the Project site) and applicable Riverside County ordinances. There are no components of the Project that would increase short- and/or long-term erosion impacts beyond those disclosed in EIR 439, and the proposed Project would be conditioned similar to approved SP 327 to incorporate design features to minimize water-borne erosion and siltation. A Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) was prepared for the proposed Project (see *Appendix B* to this EIR Addendum), and describes that first flush runoff from developed portions of the Project site would be routed to infiltration basins. The infiltration basins are designed to treat stormwater flows for water quality purposes, including through the removal of silt and sediment. The Preliminary WQMP also identifies other Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the Project that would minimize impacts associated with erosion. Compliance with the Preliminary WQMP is required as a condition of Project approval (Condition of Approval 60.BS Grade.011). Therefore, through mandatory compliance with conditions of approval and compliance with the NPDES program (including the conditions issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board), the Project would result in less than significant erosion-related impacts. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required. All measures identified in EIR 439 to mitigate SP 327's impact to geology and soils continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

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: EIR 439, Section VI.B, "Soils, Slopes, and Erosion;" Addendum No. 1; Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map;" Project Application Materials

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Findings of Fact:

a) EIR 439 concluded that although the Project site is located within an area designated by the County as having "Moderate" wind erosion potential, wind erosion impacts associated with development on the property would be less than significant because on-site soils are not prone to blowsand hazards and the site is not subjected to unusually strong winds. EIR 439 did disclose that temporary short-term construction activities could increase the potential for wind erosion; however, mandatory compliance with County and SCAQMD requirements would ensure that areas disturbed by grading are re-vegetated to preclude wind erosion. The Project would be required to comply with applicable County and SCAQMD requirements to preclude wind erosion impacts on the Project site, including but not limited to SCAQMD Rule 403. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would result in no new or more severe wind erosion or blowsand impacts beyond what was disclosed as part of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required. All measures identified in EIR 439 to mitigate SP 327's impact to geology and soils continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

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

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.E "Air Quality" and Section VII.A "Circulation and Traffic;" EIR 439, Appendix E "Air Quality Analysis" (Urban Crossroads); EIR 439 Appendix I "Temescal Hills Specific Plan Traffic Impact Analysis" (Urban Crossroads, 2004); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix D, "Toscana Specific Plan Amendment No. 1 Greenhouse Gas Analysis" (Urban Crossroads, 2014); *CREED v. City of San Diego* (2011); Greenhouse Gas Reduction Memorandum (Urban Crossroads, 2014)

Findings of Fact:

a & b) Although climate change impacts due to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were not specifically evaluated in EIR 439, the EIR analyzed air quality impacts associated with buildout of the approved project, inclusive of carbon dioxide (CO2) and other GHG emissions. EIR 439 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 439 was certified. Information on the effect of GHG emissions on climate was known long before the Riverside County certified EIR 439. 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 439 was certified in 2006. During the public review period and public hearings associated with EIR 439, 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 439 was certified.

Addendum No. 1 made minor revisions to EIR 439 to adequately address GHG emissions associated with SP 327A1. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 would generate approximately 25,703.08 metric tons of CO2 equivalent (MTCO2e) per year, or approximately 24.6% less annual GHG emissions than the land uses originally planned by SP 327 and evaluated in EIR 439. (Addendum No. 1 referred to the GHG that would have occurred with implementation of the original SP 327 as "business as usual," BAU.) Because SP 327A1 would not achieve the County's reduction target of 25% below BAU (based on the County's Draft Standard Operating Procedure, SOP), Addendum No. 1 added a new mitigation measure (MM AQ-13) to require SP 327A1's implementing projects to reduce annual GHG emissions on a project-wide basis to no more than 25,577 MTCO2e per year, which equates to a 126 MTCO2e reduction compared to the GHG emissions estimated for SP 327A1.

A memorandum was prepared by Urban Crossroads to demonstrate compliance with MM AQ-13 from Addendum No. 1, and is included as *Appendix G* to this Addendum No. 2. As calculated in *Appendix G*, to reduce water consumption and the associated energy-usage, the Project would be designed to: 1) reduce outdoor water use by 30%, consistent with Riverside County Ordinance No. 859; 2) reduce indoor water use by 20% consistent with Division 4.3 of the 2013 California Green Building Standards Code Residential Mandatory Measures; 3) use U.S. EPA Certified WaterSense labeled or equivalent faucets, high-efficiency toilets (HETs); and 4) use water-conserving shower heads. These features are imposed as mitigation measures, below. With implementation of these measures, Urban Crossroads calculates that greenhouse gas emissions would be reduced by an additional 288.90 MTCO2e per year, which is more than twice the amount required by MM AQ-13 in Addendum No. 1. Refer to *Appendix G* for calculations.

The Project would also directly or indirectly comply with a number of mandatory government regulations that would further reduce GHG emissions, including the regulations listed below, that would assist in the reduction of GHG emissions:

- Regional GHG Emissions Reduction Targets/Sustainable Communities Strategies (SB 375)
- Pavely Fuel Efficiency Standards (AB1493). Establishes fuel efficiency ratings for new vehicles.

- Title 24 California Code of Regulations (California Building Code). Establishes energy efficiency requirements for new construction. Title 24 will become even more stringent beginning January 1, 2014.
- Title 20 California Code of Regulations (Appliance Energy Efficiency Standards). Establishes energy efficiency requirements for appliances.
- Title 17 California Code of Regulations (Low Carbon Fuel Standard). Requires carbon content of fuel sold in California to be 10% less by 2020.
- California Water Conservation in Landscaping Act of 2006 (AB1881). Requires local agencies to adopt the Department of Water Resources updated Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance or equivalent to ensure efficient landscapes in new development and reduced water waste in existing landscapes.
- Statewide Retail Provider Emissions Performance Standards (SB 1368). Requires energy generators to achieve performance standards for GHG emissions.
- Renewable Portfolio Standards (SB 1078). Requires electric corporations to increase the amount of energy obtained from eligible renewable energy resources to 20 percent by 2010 and 33 percent by 2020.

The Project's compliance with required mitigation and the above-listed plans, policies, and regulations that have been adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs and that are applicable to the proposed Project would ensure that the Project would conflict with the State's ability to achieve the GHG emissions reduction targets defined in AB 32, which is the State's primary GHG emissions regulation. Accordingly, the Project would not generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment and would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to GHG emissions beyond those previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: All mitigation measures from EIR 439 shall continue to apply to the Project. In addition to the mitigation measures from EIR 439, the additional mitigation measure listed below shall apply to achieve the GHG emissions reduction mandate of Mitigation Measure AQ-13 from EIR 439.

AQ-14: (Condition of Approval 80.Planning.037) Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the County of Riverside Building and Safety Department demonstrating that residential development incorporates the following measures to reduce water consumption and the associated energy-usage:

a. All residences shall be designed in conformance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 859.2 and shall achieve an outdoor water demand of no more than seventy percent (70%) of its reference evapotranspiration.
b. All residences shall be designed in conformance with Division 4.3 of the 2013 California Green Building Standards Code (Residential Mandatory Measures).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in the revised Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for Addendum No. 2 to EIR 439.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
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: EIR 439, Section VI.G, "Toxic Substances;" EIR 439 Appendix F "Hazardous Materials/Environmental Database Report" (EDR, 2003); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix E, "Phase I Environmental Assessment Report, Toscana" (McAlister GeoScience, 2013); Addendum No. 1 Appendix C2, "Rock Blasting Analysis" (Revey Associates, 2013); Google Earth (accessed October 6, 2014); EnviroStor Database (accessed October 6, 2014); GeoTracker Database (accessed October 6, 2014); California Water Resources Control Board List of Solid Waste Disposal Sites (accessed October 6, 2014), California Water Resources Control Board List of Active Cease and Desist Orders and Cleanup Abatement Orders (accessed October 6, 2014); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a & b) As concluded in EIR 439, SP 327 would not develop land uses within the Specific Plan area that would permit hazardous materials storage. EIR 439 documented man-made features on the site that had the potential to pose a health and safety hazard to the public or contain hazardous materials, including: a ranch house, a storage building, barn, three mobile homes, the foundations for two buildings, a septic system, and several wells and above-ground storage tanks. EIR 439 concluded that removal of these man-made features, as required to implement SP 327, would result in a less-than-significant impact related to hazards and hazardous materials because the construction contractor would be required to ensure mediation of the site in accordance with applicable federal, State, and local standards. EIR 439 also disclosed that blasting would occur on the property during construction activities, but that mandatory compliance with applicable federal, State, and local standards would preclude a significant impact. As such, EIR 439 did not include mitigation measures for toxic substances, as mandatory regulatory requirements would adequately address all potential hazards and hazardous materials concerns.

EIR 439 did not include a site-specific Environmental Site Assessment of existing property conditions, so a site assessment was conducted by McAlister GeoScience in 2013 in support of SP 327A1, the findings of which was documented in Addendum No. 1. During the site assessment in 2013, McAlister GeoScience observed all of the man-made features previously described in EIR 439. Based on the estimated age of the man-made features within the Specific Plan area, McAlister GeoScience concluded it was likely that Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM), lead-based paint (LBP), and/or polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB)-containing were present on the property. However, Addendum No. 1 concluded the removal and disposal of these hazardous materials, if present, would not represent a significant impact because all remediation activities would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations, which would ensure that construction-related demolition activities would not expose construction workers or nearby sensitive receptors to significant health risks. Addendum No. 1 also concluded that blasting activities during construction would not pose a substantial hazardous materials impact because all blasting activities would be required to adhere to the recommended practices contained in the project-specific Blasting Analysis (Addendum No. 1 Appendix C2) as well as applicable federal, State, and local regulations. This finding was consistent with EIR 439. Lastly, Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1, like SP 327, would not include land uses that would store, transport, or dispose of hazardous materials. Accordingly, Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would not result in any new or more severe impacts associated with hazards or hazardous materials beyond what was associated with the previously approved project as disclosed in EIR 439.

The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1. The land uses proposed by the Project are identical to those planned by SP 327A1, and would not include any land uses that would store, transport, or dispose of hazardous materials. Several building foundations, storage tanks, and groundwater wells are located within the Project area, and would need to be removed in order to implement the Project. As disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, removal of these man-made features from the Project site would not expose the public to substantial adverse effects related to hazards and hazardous materials because the construction contractor would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations related to the handling, removal, and disposal of hazardous materials, and the capping of wells. Accordingly, the Project would not increase the potential for reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

c) EIR 439 did not identify the Project site as an emergency evacuation route in any emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. No evacuation routes have been identified on or near the Project site since EIR 439 was certified in 2006; therefore, there has been no change in circumstance. Accordingly, the Project would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. This conclusion is consistent with the finding of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

d) As disclosed in EIR 439, the Project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school site is located approximately 0.5-mile from the Project site (Todd Elementary School). Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed Project to emit or handle hazardous substances within 1/4-mile of an existing or planned school, because no such school sites exist. No impact would occur. This conclusion is consistent with the finding of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

e) As originally disclosed in EIR 439 and confirmed by a review of databases compiled by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the California State Water Resources Control Board, and the California Environmental Protection Agency, the proposed Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Accordingly, the Project would not be located on a hazardous materials site and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No impact would occur. Implementation of the Project would not result in a new or more severe impact than previously disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not 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: EIR 439, Section V, "General Plan Consistency Analysis;" EIR 439, Section VII.A, "Circulation and Traffic;" Addendum No. 1; Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations;" RCLIS; Google Earth (accessed October 6, 2014)

Findings of Fact:

a, b, c & d) Potential impacts to public airports were addressed in EIR 439, which concluded that such impacts would not occur because the Project site is not located within close proximity to any public or private airports and is not under the purview of any airport master plan. No public airports or private airstrips have been constructed in the vicinity of the Project site since EIR 439 was certified in 2006. Accordingly, the Project has no potential to create an inconsistency with any airport master plan; would not require review by an Airport Land Use Commission; and would not be subject to safety hazards associated with the routine operation of public or private airports in the nearby area. This conclusion is consistent with the information disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
24. Hazardous Fire Area 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: EIR 439, Section VII.C, "Fire Protection Services and Fire Hazards;" Addendum No. 1; Conceptual Fire Protection Plan (Firewise 2000, 2014); Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility;" Temescal Canyon Area Plan Figure 11 "Wildfire Susceptibility;" Elsinore Area Plan Figure 11 "Wildfire Susceptibility;" RCLIS; Fire Protection Plan (Firewise 2000, 2014); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) As reported in EIR 439, the Specific Plan area is located within a high fire hazard area and a fuel modification program consistent with County requirements, including Ordinance No. 787 (Uniform Fire Code), would be required by implementing development to protect future on-site residents from wildland fire hazards. SP 327A1 provides area of fuel modification in accordance with County standards (including defensible space planning at locations where residential areas would interface with areas of natural vegetation), but Addendum No. 1 anticipated that fuel modification areas would be refined by the fire protection plans(s) that would be required to accompany implementing development proposals (i.e., tentative tract maps) based on the precise location of future homes pursuant to Ordinance No. 787 and the conditions of approval for SP 327 (SP 327 Condition of Approval 10.Fire 006).

A Fire Protection Plan has been prepared for the proposed Project and approved by the Riverside County Fire Department (refer to *Appendix C* of this EIR Addendum). The Fire Protection Plan identifies the specific locations of fuel modification areas on the Project site and establishes requirements for allowable, fire-resistant plant materials, plant spacing, irrigation, and maintenance (e.g., pruning, thinning) at locations where development would interface with areas of natural vegetation. The Fire Protection Plan has been incorporated into the Project's design, and a condition of approval has been placed on the Project to ensure development on-site complies with the Fire Protection Plan (Condition of Approval 50.Fire.003). Mandatory compliance with the Fire Protection Plan would ensure that wild land fire hazards affecting the Project site would be less than significant. Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant fire hazard impacts on the Project site than previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project				
25. Water Quality Impacts 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.C, "Hydrology, Flooding and Drainage;" EIR 439, Section VI.F, "Water Resources;" EIR 439 Appendix C-1 "Hydrology Report for Temescal Hills" (Trans-Pacific Consultants, 2002); EIR 439 Appendix C-2 "Bridge Hydraulics for Two Proposed Bridges on Temescal Wash" (Howard H. Chang Consultants); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix F, "Toscana Specific Plan Preliminary Drainage Study" (Proactive Engineering, 2013); Addendum No. 1 Appendix G, "Bridge Hydraulics Letter Update" (Webb, 2013); Addendum No. 1 Appendix K, "Groundwater Impacts Memorandum" (Thomas Harder & Co. 2014); Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan (Proactive Engineering Consultants, 2013); Preliminary Drainage Study (Proactive Engineering Consultants, 2013); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) EIR 439 concluded that implementation of SP 327 would not result in a significant adverse effect to the existing drainage pattern within the Specific Plan area. Similarly, Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would result in less-than-significant impacts to the area's existing drainage pattern, and that no new or more severe significant impacts than previously disclosed in EIR 439 would occur.

As discussed in detail in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 is designed to maximize the preservation of the natural drainage courses that traverse the subject property – more than more than half of the Specific Plan area would be preserved within open space areas. Storm water flows originating from off-site areas, excluding flows in Temescal Wash, would be captured by one of two proposed underground storm drain systems planned by SP 327A1, which would discharge to the natural drainage course northwest of the Specific Plan area and the Temescal Wash. Stormwater runoff flows to all outfalls

tributary to Spanish Hills and downstream of developed portions of the Specific Plan would be reduced by SP 327A1 to 50 percent of the peak 100-year storm flow rate pursuant to the conditions of approval applied to SP 327. Stormwater flows originating from developed portions of the Specific Plan area would be captured via SP 327A1's planned system of storm drains installed beneath on-site roadways. First flush storm water flows (all flows with the exception of flows from very large storm events) originating from developed areas on-site would be routed to water quality treatment facilities distributed throughout the Specific Plan area for water quality treatment. From the water quality treatment facilities, storm water flows would either infiltrate into the ground or be discharged in close proximity to historic flow locations within on-site open space areas. Runoff in excess of first flush flows would bypass the water quality treatment facilities and would be discharged in close proximity to historic flow locations within on-site open space areas (and would then, ultimately, leave the Specific Plan area). Water quality treatment of runoff flows in excess of first flush flows would not be necessary, as first flush flows capture the majority of water-borne pollutants (including silt and sediment). SP 327A1 plans for the majority of on-site runoff (runoff originating within the Specific Plan area) to be directly conveyed to Temescal Wash. Because the runoff would be directly conveyed to a major watercourse, the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's increased runoff criteria does not apply. SP 327A1 would reduce flow velocities at outlet points with the construction of rip-rap outlet structures and/or energy dissipating structures, thereby minimizing the potential for erosion. With the construction of SP 327A1's planned storm water drainage system, development would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Specific Plan in any way that could result in substantial on- or off-site erosion and, as such, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1, including a portion of its planned storm water drainage system. Because the Project would not construct the entire SP 327A1 storm water drainage system (the Project comprises the first of three development phases for SP 327A1), the Project includes several interim storm water drainage facilities to capture and convey storm water runoff. These interim facilities would be replaced by permanent facilities upon buildout of the subsequent phases of SP 327A1. A Preliminary Drainage Study was prepared for the Project and demonstrates that the performance of the permanent and interim storm water drainage facilities proposed by the Project would be consistent with the planned SP 327A1 storm water drainage system (refer to *Appendix D* of this EIR Addendum). Therefore, the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the subject property in any way that could result in substantial on- or off-site erosion. The Project's impact would be less than significant. The proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant erosion impacts associated with drainage pattern alteration than previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

b) EIR 439 concluded that buildout of SP 327 would result in less-than-significant impacts to water quality because mandatory compliance with conditions of approval requiring compliance with the NPDES program (including the conditions would be issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board) and applicable Riverside County ordinances would minimize the potential for water-borne pollution to be discharged from the Specific Plan area.

The conditions imposed on SP 327 would continue to apply to the proposed Project. Specifically, the Project would be required to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) during construction-related activities (pursuant to the requirements of the NPDES program) and a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) during long-term operation. The SWPPP would specify the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be required during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are prevented, minimized, and/or otherwise

appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property. The WQMP is a post-construction management program that ensures the on-going protection of the watershed basin by requiring structural and programmatic controls to minimize, prevent, and/or otherwise appropriately treat storm water runoff flows before they are discharged from the site. A Preliminary WQMP for the Project is provided as *Appendix B* to this EIR Addendum. This site-specific Preliminary WQMP identifies measures that would be undertaken on the Project site to preclude significant water quality impacts, including the incorporation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) into the design for the site. Mandatory compliance with the SWPPP and WQMP, as assured through a County conditions of approval applied to the Project, would ensure that implementing residential development would not violate any water quality standard during short-term construction or long-term operational activities (Condition of Approval 50.Flood RI.009). Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant and no new or more severe significant impact would occur beyond those already identified as part of EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

c) The Project does not propose to use groundwater wells for landscape irrigation or as a potable water source, and therefore would have no impact on groundwater levels due to groundwater extraction. The Project would implement the land uses planned by SP 327A1. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 would not result in any adverse change to the natural water balance of the aquifer system in the area and would not substantially reduce groundwater recharge in the area. As such, and consistent with the information disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, no substantial depletion of the groundwater supplies would occur with implementation of the proposed Project and impacts would be less than significant.

d) Refer to responses 25(a) and (b), above.

e) The proposed Project would not construct housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. The Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

f) The proposed Project would not install structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would increase flood hazards for downstream properties by redirecting or impeding flood flows. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required. The Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than disclosed by EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

g) The proposed Project would not degrade water quality in ways not previously mentioned above in response 25(b), above, or as previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1. Furthermore, when EIR 439 was certified in 2006, the unincorporated areas of Riverside County were regulated by the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems Permit (MS4 Permit) - Order No. R8-2002-0011. The primary purpose of this permit was to regulate discharge of pollutants in urban runoff from MS4 storm drain systems. Today, that MS4 Permit has been superseded with an updated, more stringent MS4 Permit (Order No. R8-2010-0033). The proposed Project is required to comply with standards set forth in the current MS4 Permit. With mandatory adherence to the updated MS4 Permit, the proposed Project is expected to result in an overall improvement in the quality of storm water discharged from the Project site than anticipated by EIR 439. Accordingly, the Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than disclosed by EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

h) The proposed Project proposes to construct and operate water quality treatment facilities on the subject property. The water quality treatment facilities are designed to filter and pass water into natural drainage courses, and ultimately, the regional drainage system. Storm water in the water

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

quality treatment facilities would not be stagnant, and proposed water quality treatment facilities would drain within the time limits required by the RCFCWCD to preclude vector attraction and odor. Therefore, there is no potential for proposed water quality treatment facilities to attract vectors or produce obnoxious odors. As such, a significant impact would not occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required. All measures identified in EIR 439 to mitigate SP 327's impact to hydrology and water quality continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

26. Floodplains

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

NA - Not Applicable ☒ U - Generally Unsuitable ☐ R - Restricted ☐

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.C, "Hydrology, Flooding and Drainage;" EIR 439, Section VI.F, "Water Resources;" EIR 439 Appendix C-1 "Hydrology Report for Temescal Hills" (Trans-Pacific Consultants, 2002); EIR 439 Appendix C-2 "Bridge Hydraulics for Two Proposed Bridges on Temescal Wash" (Howard H. Chang Consultants); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix F, "Toscana Specific Plan Preliminary Drainage Study" (Proactive Engineering, 2013); Addendum No. 1 Appendix G, "Bridge Hydraulics Letter Update" (Webb, 2013); Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones;" Riverside County General Plan Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone;" Temescal Canyon Area Plan Figure 10 "Flood Hazards;" Elsinore Area Plan Figure 10 "Flood Hazards;" Preliminary Drainage Study (Proactive Engineering Consultants, 2013); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a & b) EIR 439 concluded that implementation of SP 327 would not result in a significant adverse effect to the existing drainage pattern within the Specific Plan area. Similarly, Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would result in less-than-significant impacts to the area's existing drainage pattern, and that no new or more severe significant impacts than previously disclosed in EIR 439 would occur.

As discussed in detail in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 is designed to maximize the preservation of the natural drainage courses that traverse the subject property – more than more than half of the Specific Plan area would be preserved within open space areas. Storm water flows originating from off-site areas, excluding flows in Temescal Wash, would be captured by one of two proposed underground storm drain systems planned by SP 327A1, which would discharge to the natural drainage course northwest of the Specific Plan area and the Temescal Wash. This dual storm drain system would reduce potential flood hazard risks (from to stormwater flows originating from outside the Specific Plan area) within the Spanish Hills community located northwest of the Specific Plan area. Stormwater flows originating from developed portions of the Specific Plan area would be captured via SP 327A1's planned system of storm drains installed beneath on-site roadways. First flush storm water flows (all flows with the exception of flows from very large storm events) originating from developed areas on-site would be routed to water quality treatment facilities distributed throughout the Specific Plan area for water quality treatment. From the water quality treatment facilities, storm water flows would either infiltrate into the ground or be discharged in close proximity to historic flow locations within on-site open space areas. Runoff in excess of first flush flows would bypass the water quality treatment facilities and would be discharged in close proximity to historic flow locations within on-site open space areas (and would then, ultimately, leave the Specific Plan area). SP 327A1 plans for a majority of on-site runoff (runoff originating within the Specific Plan area) to be directly conveyed to Temescal Wash. Under SP 327A1, detention basins are not required within the Specific Plan area to attenuate runoff flows to pre-development levels due to the direct proximity of the property to the Temescal Wash. Detention basins would delay the discharge of storm water flows into the Temescal Wash during peak storm events. If detention were proposed, storm water flows would be discharged into the Temescal Creek closer to the peak flow rate of the Wash, thereby potentially exposing areas on the Project site and properties downstream to an increased risk of flooding. With the construction of SP 327A1's planned storm water drainage system, development would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern or absorption rate of the Specific Plan in any way that could result in substantial on- or off-site flooding and, as such, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1, including a portion of its planned storm water drainage system. Because the Project would not construct the entire SP 327A1 storm water drainage system (the Project comprises the first of three development phases for SP 327A1), the Project includes several interim storm water drainage facilities to capture and convey storm water runoff. These interim facilities would be replaced by permanent facilities upon buildout of the subsequent phases of SP 327A1. A Preliminary Drainage Study was prepared for the Project and demonstrates that the performance of the permanent and interim storm water drainage facilities proposed by the Project would be consistent with the planned SP 327A1 storm water drainage system (refer to *Appendix D* of this EIR Addendum). Therefore, the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern or absorption rates of the subject property in any way that could result in substantial on- or off-site flooding. The Project's impact would be less than significant. The proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant erosion impacts associated with drainage pattern alteration than previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

c) As disclosed in EIR 439, a portion of the Project site is located within the Dam Inundation Area for Lee Lake. EIR 439 concluded that flood hazard risks on the subject property associated with the failure of Lee Lake would be less than significant because all areas on the subject property within the Dam Inundation Area would be retained as open space – no habitable structures would be located within the Dam Inundation Area. Although the proposed Project includes a different land use design than what was evaluated in EIR 439, the proposed Project would reserve areas on the property within the Dam Inundation Area as open space. No homes or habitable structures would be constructed on

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

the subject property within the designated Dam Inundation Area. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of Lee Lake. Impacts would be less than significant. The Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than disclosed by EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

d) As discussed above in the responses to Items 26(a) and (b), implementation of the proposed Project would not substantially alter the historical drainage patterns of the Project site. Because the Project would not substantially alter the drainage characteristics of the Project site, there would be not be a substantial increase in the amount of surface water in downstream water bodies. Impacts would be less than significant, which is the same conclusion drawn by EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required. All measures identified in EIR 439 to mitigate SP 327's impact to hydrology and water quality continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

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: SP 327; EIR 439, Section V, "General Plan Consistency Analysis;" SP 327A1; Addendum No. 1; Riverside County General Plan; City of Corona General Plan; City of Lake Elsinore General Plan; RCLIS; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed Project seeks to implement the allowed land uses pursuant to the approved SP 327A1. As concluded in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, development of the Specific Plan would not result in a substantial alteration of the planned or present land uses in the Temescal Canyon area. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of impacts previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

b) The Project site is located within the Sphere of Influence of the City of Corona. EIR 439 did not identify a significant adverse effect to the Sphere of Influence of the City of Corona as a result of development of SP 327. Similarly, Addendum No. 1 concluded that implementation of SP 327A1 would result in a less-than-significant effect to the Sphere of Influence of the City of Corona. The City of Corona General Plan designates the Project site for Light Industrial land uses. The Project proposes to develop the subject property with residential land uses, recreation facilities, water quality treatment facilities, open space, and private roads. Although the proposed Project would develop a portion of the City of Corona's Sphere of Influence with land uses other than those identified in the City of Corona General Plan, no physical land use impact would occur as a result of the inconsistency. As such, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant environmental impacts associated with land use designation inconsistencies within a City Sphere of Influence or within City boundaries than disclosed by EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not 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 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: EIR 439, Section V, "General Plan Consistency Analysis;" SP 327A1; Riverside County General Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Elsinore Area Plan; RCLIS; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is zoned "Specific Plan" (SP) and development of the property is governed by the Zoning Ordinance for approved SP 327, as amended by SP 327A1 (Ordinance No. 348.4797). The proposed Project would implement SP 327A1 and would be consistent with the land uses and development standards allowed by Ordinance No. 348.4797. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

b & c) The issues of land use and zoning compatibility were evaluated as part of EIR 439, which concluded that development of the Project site as a master-planned mixed use community with residential and commercial retail land uses would be compatible with surrounding land uses and zoning. Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 also would be compatible with surrounding land uses and zoning. The proposed Project would implement the land uses allowed by SP 327A1 and would not present a conflict with surrounding land uses and/or zoning. As such, a significant land use compatibility impact would not occur. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

d) The proposed Project would be fully consistent with SP 327 (as amended by SP 327A1), which was previously determined to be consistent with the General Plan as part of Addendum No. 1. The proposed Project is fully consistent with the land use designations and policies contained within SP 327 (as amended by SP 327A1) and the General Plan; accordingly, no impact would occur. Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of impacts previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

e) The Project site is vacant under existing conditions; implementation of the proposed Project would not result in the physical disruption or division of any established communities on-site. The Project would represent a continuation of an existing pattern of residential development from the south (although the Project site is physically separated from the existing residential land uses to the south by I-15), and would be consistent with the planned pattern of land uses within the local area as

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

anticipated by the Riverside County General Plan and Temescal Canyon and Elsinore Area Plans. As such, the Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not 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 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.H, "Mineral Resources;" Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area;" Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a & b) EIR 439 concluded that implementation of SP 327 would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or residents of the State. In addition, EIR 439 concluded that implementation of SP 327 would not result in the loss of availability of a site designated by the County as a locally-important mineral resource recovery area. No component of the proposed Project would result in new impacts to mineral resources or increase the severity of impacts to mineral resources beyond those disclosed in EIR 439. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not cause the loss of availability of important mineral resources and impacts would be less than significant. This conclusion is consistent with the finding of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

c & d) The proposed Project site is not located in close proximity to any existing surface mines, proposed surface mines, or abandoned quarries or mines. No mines on or around the subject property have been identified since EIR 439 was certified in 2006, so there has been no change in circumstance. Accordingly, there is no potential for the proposed Project to cause an incompatibility with or present a hazard to a mine or quarry. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
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: EIR 439, Section VI.D, "Noise;" Addendum No. 1; Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," Google Earth (accessed October 6, 2014); RCLIS

Findings of Fact:

a & b) Consistent with information disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, the Project site is not located within an airport influence area or within two miles of a public or private airport or airstrip. As such, the proposed Project could not expose people residing in the Project area to excessive noise levels associated with airports or airstrips. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

31. Railroad Noise NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.D, "Noise;" Addendum No. 1; Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," Google Earth (accessed October 6, 2014)

Findings of Fact:

There are no active railroad corridors in the vicinity of the Project site. Accordingly, and consistent with the information disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, there is no potential for the Project to expose people residing in the Project area to excessive railroad noise.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
32. Highway Noise NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: SP 327; EIR 439, Section VI.D, "Noise;" EIR 439, Appendix D, "Temescal Hills Specific Plan Noise Analysis (Urban Crossroads, 2004); Addendum No. 1; TTM No. 36593 Noise Impact Analysis (Urban Crossroads, 2013); Google Earth (accessed October 6, 2014); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

The Project site is approximately 0.2-mile north of a source of highway noise (i.e., I-15). Neither EIR 439 nor Addendum No. 1 identified any significant, adverse effects to future residents on the Project site due to noise from I-15. No component of the Project would increase noise effects due to highway noise above levels assumed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, as proposed residential development would be set back from I-15 at a similar distance to what was evaluated in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1 and would be of a similar character. Therefore, the Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts due to highway-related noise than previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

33. Other Noise NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.D, "Noise;" Addendum No. 1; Google Earth (accessed October 6, 2014)

Findings of Fact:

Neither EIR 439 nor Addendum No. 1 disclosed any other sources of noise that have the potential to expose people residing in the Project area to excessive noise. No new, off-site sources of substantial noise have been constructed in the Project vicinity since Addendum No. 1 was approved in 2014. Therefore, no other noise impacts would occur. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

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

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.D, "Noise;" EIR 439, Appendix D, "Temescal Hills Specific Plan Noise Analysis (Urban Crossroads, 2004); EIR 439 Appendix B-1 "Geotechnical Feasibility Investigation" (T.H.E. Soils Co., 2001); EIR 439 Appendix B-2 "Seismic Refraction Survey" (Terra Geosciences, 2000); EIR 439 Appendix B-4 "General Geologic Investigation & Shallow Refraction Seismic Refraction for Rippability Study" (Pacific Soils and Engineering, 1989); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix H "Trip Generation Analysis" (Urban Crossroads, 2013); Addendum No. 1 Appendix C1 "Geotechnical Feasibility Letter" (Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, 2013); Addendum No. 1 Appendix C2 "Rock Blasting Analysis" (Revey, 2013); Riverside County General Plan, Table N-1 "Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure"; Noise Impact Analysis (Urban Crossroads, 2013); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a, b & c) EIR 439 evaluated the potential for residential land uses within the Project area to result in, or be affected by, substantial adverse noise effects. As previously documented in EIR 439, development on the Project site would not cause significant permanent or temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the subject property or expose persons to noise levels in excess of allowable applicable standards, with compliance to the conditions of approval imposed on SP 327. To ensure that future residential land uses were not exposed to substantial noise levels, SP 327 was conditioned to require future implementing tract maps within the Specific Plan area to prepare a site-specific noise impact analysis to evaluate current site noise conditions and to identify site-specific measures (e.g., construction techniques, design considerations) that would ensure noise levels do not exceed acceptable levels (SP 327 Condition of Approval 30.Planning 007).

In adherence to SP 327's conditions of approval, a site-specific noise impact analysis has been prepared to evaluate the Project's potential to generate substantial noise levels or be affected by excessive noise levels, under both near- and long-term conditions. Potential near- and long-term noise impacts associated with the Project are discussed in further detail on the following pages.

Near-Term Construction Noise Impacts

Construction noise represents a short-term impact on the ambient noise levels. Noise generated by construction equipment, including trucks, graders, bulldozers, concrete mixers and portable generators can reach high levels. Grading activities typically represent one of the highest potential sources for noise impacts. According to a national database of construction equipment noise emission levels compiled by the Federal Highway Administration (FWHA), noise levels generated during construction can range from approximately 70 A-weighted decibels (dBA) to in excess of 100 dBA when measured at 50 feet. These noise levels would diminish with distance from the construction site at a rate of 6 dBA per doubling distance. For example, a noise level of 78 dBA measured at 50 feet from the noise source would be reduced to 72 dBA at 100 feet from the noise source.

Construction activities proposed by the Project would be similar to what was evaluated in EIR 439. The nearest noise sensitive receptor (i.e., occupied residence) to the Project site is located over 2,000 feet from the Project site. At this distance, temporary noise levels generated during Project construction are estimated to range between 37.1 dBA and 67.1 dBA.

Although construction noise would result in a temporary increase over ambient noise levels, construction noise would not present any long-term impacts on the Project site or the surrounding area. Furthermore, construction noise within the County is regulated by Ordinance No. 847, which exempts "private construction projects," provided that:

1) Construction does not occur between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. during the months of June through September; and
2) Construction does not occur between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. during the months of October through May.

Compliance with Ordinance No. 847 was assumed in the analysis presented in EIR 439. The proposed Project would be similarly required to comply with the standards and restrictions of Ordinance No. 847 to ensure that construction activities would not expose persons in the vicinity of the subject property to substantial temporary or periodic increases to ambient noise levels. Compliance with Ordinance No. 847 would be assured by conditions of approval applied to the Project. With mandatory compliance with Ordinance No. 847, noise impacts during the Project's construction phase would be less than significant, and would not result in any new or more severe impacts than were previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Long-Term Off-Site Noise Impacts

❒ *Existing plus Project Conditions*

The off-site noise effect of the Project on the existing noise environment, in the absence of ambient growth and cumulative development, is presented below (Existing plus Project, E+P). This noise analysis scenario was not evaluated in EIR 439 and is provided herein for informational purposes to disclose the potential for the noise generated by Project-related traffic to cause direct impacts to the existing environment as required by CEQA. The E+P scenario rarely occurs as an actual real world scenario. The time period between the baseline date for establishing the environment's existing conditions and the date that the Project is fully built out can often be a period of several years or more. In the case of the proposed Project, the time period estimated between the environmental baseline date and Project buildout is five (5) years. During this time period, environmental conditions are not static. Other projects are being constructed and the noise environment is changing. Therefore the E+P scenario is very unlikely to materialize in real world conditions and thus does not accurately describe the environment that exists when a particular project is constructed and becomes operational. Regardless, the E+P scenario is evaluated to satisfy CEQA requirements to identify the Project's impacts to the existing environment.

Table 1, *Existing Off-Site Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts*, summarizes the noise contribution of Project-related traffic to the existing noise environment. As shown in Table 1, Project-related traffic has the potential to cause a direct noise impact along three (3) roadway segments in the Project's study area. Using the rationale from EIR 439, a significant impact would occur if noise sensitive receptors are located within the 65 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour of a

Table 1 Existing Off-Site Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts

ID	Road	Segment	CNEL at 100 Feet (dBA)			Potential Significant Impact?[1]
			No Project	With Project	Project Addition	
1	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	n/o Dos Lagos Dr.	69.0	69.2	0.2	No
2	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	s/o Dos Lagos Dr.	66.9	67.2	0.3	No
3	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	n/o I-215 Fwy. NB Ramps	66.5	66.9	0.4	No
4	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	s/o I-215 Fwy. SB Ramps	69.7	70.6	0.9	No
5	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	n/o Trilogy Pkwy.	68.5	69.7	1.3	No
6	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	s/o Trilogy Pkwy.	67.1	68.8	1.7	Yes
7	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	s/o Glen Ivy Rd.	63.1	66.5	3.4	Yes
8	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	n/o Campbell Ranch Rd.	65.8	68.0	2.1	Yes
9	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	n/o Indian Truck Trail	58.8	63.4	4.6	No
10	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	s/o Indian Truck Trail	62.4	62.7	0.3	No
11	Campbell Ranch Rd.	s/o Temescal Canyon Rd.	64.7	64.8	0.1	No
12	Campbell Ranch Rd.	n/o Indian Truck Trail	65.4	65.4	0.1	No
13	Campbell Ranch Rd.	s/o Indian Truck Trail	68.3	68.4	0.1	No
14	Trilogy Pkwy.	w/o Campbell Ranch Rd.	63.4	63.6	0.1	No
15	Indian Truck Tr.	e/o Campbell Ranch Rd.	68.3	68.4	0.1	No
16	Indian Truck Tr.	w/o Temescal Canyon Rd.	62.0	64.8	2.7	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2013 (Appendix E to this EIR Addendum, Table 6-5)

roadway where the Project contributes substantial noise levels. For two of the potentially affected roadways listed in Table 1 (Temescal Canyon Road south of Trilogy Parkway and Temescal Canyon Road south of Glen Ivy Road) no noise sensitive receptors are located within the 65 dBA CNEL contour (refer to Table 6-1 from *Appendix E* to this EIR Addendum). However, sensitive receptors are located within the 65 dBA CNEL contour of Temescal Canyon Road north of Campbell Ranch Road, and these receptors would be exposed to unacceptable noise levels in the absence of a noise barrier (a noise barrier is present at this location under existing conditions). The impact to sensitive receptors adjacent to Temescal Canyon Road north of Campbell Ranch Road would not be unique to the Project. If SP 327 were implemented as originally approved, sensitive receptors adjacent to this roadway segment also would be impacted, and, in fact, the original SP 327's impact would be more severe than what would occur under the proposed Project. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, the original SP 327 proposal would generate 3,434 more daily traffic trips than SP 327A1 (for which the Project is an implementing action); therefore, SP 327 would generate substantially more off-site traffic noise than SP 327A1 (and the Project). Accordingly, the Project's off-site traffic noise impacts under the E+P scenario would not be greater than the land uses that were evaluated in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1, and no new or more severe impact would occur.

❒ *Opening Year Conditions*

Table 2, *Opening Year Off-Site Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts*, summarizes the noise contribution of Project-related traffic to the projected future noise environment at Project buildout (Year 2018). As shown in Table 2, the Project would not contribute substantial traffic-related noise to any off-site road segment at buildout, and impacts would be less than significant. This conclusion is

Table 2 Opening Year Off-Site Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts

ID	Road	Segment	CNEL at 100 Feet (dBA)			Potential Significant Impact?[1]
			No Project	With Project	Project Addition	
1	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	n/o Dos Lagos Dr.	71.1	71.2	0.1	No
2	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	s/o Dos Lagos Dr.	69.4	69.6	0.2	No
3	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	n/o I-215 Fwy. NB Ramps	69.5	69.7	0.2	No
4	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	s/o I-215 Fwy. SB Ramps	73.2	73.2	0.0	No
5	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	n/o Trilogy Pkwy.	71.9	72.0	0.1	No
6	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	s/o Trilogy Pkwy.	69.0	69.2	0.1	No
7	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	s/o Glen Ivy Rd.	68.8	68.9	0.1	No
8	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	n/o Campbell Ranch Rd.	68.6	68.8	0.1	No
9	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	n/o Indian Truck Trail	69.4	70.1	0.7	No
10	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	s/o Indian Truck Trail	67.3	67.4	0.1	No
11	Campbell Ranch Rd.	s/o Temescal Canyon Rd.	68.9	69.0	0.0	No
12	Campbell Ranch Rd.	n/o Indian Truck Trail	68.2	68.2	0.0	No
13	Campbell Ranch Rd.	s/o Indian Truck Trail	71.3	71.4	0.0	No
14	Trilogy Pkwy.	w/o Campbell Ranch Rd.	67.1	67.2	0.1	No
15	Indian Truck Tr.	e/o Campbell Ranch Rd.	71.0	71.1	0.1	No
16	Indian Truck Tr.	w/o Temescal Canyon Rd.	68.5	69.3	0.8	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2013 (Appendix E to this EIR Addendum, Table 6-6)

consistent with the finding of EIR 439. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than were previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Long-Term On-Site Noise Impacts

❒ *On-Site Exterior Noise Impacts*

The primary source of noise impacts on the Project site would be traffic along major roadways, including I-15 and Temescal Canyon Road. The Project also would experience some background noise from on-site, internal roads, including Toscana Drive and Temescal Hills Drive. As required by SP 327 Condition of Approval 30.Planning 007, a site-specific Noise Impact Analysis has been prepared for the Project to determine if proposed residential land uses would be exposed to excessive noise levels. Noise levels in exterior private areas in excess of 65 dBA CNEL would be classified as "excessive."

Future on-site exterior noise levels were calculated using the FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model and the parameters outlined in the Project Noise Impact Analysis (refer to *Appendix E* of this EIR Addendum). Based on the FHWA traffic noise prediction model, noise levels affecting private exterior areas (i.e., backyards) in the central portions of the Project site would be less than 65 dBA CNEL. However, private exterior areas for lots facing I-15, Temescal Canyon Road, Toscana Drive and Temescal Hills Drive would be exposed to unmitigated noise levels up to 69.0 dba CNEL (refer to Table 3, *Project Exterior Noise Levels*). Noise affecting lots facing I-15, Temescal Canyon Road, Toscana Drive and Temescal Hills Drive represents a significant impact for which mitigation is

Table 3 Project Exterior Noise Levels

Lot	Roadway	Unmitigated Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Mitigated Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Barrier Height (Feet)	Top Of Barrier Elevation (Feet)
43	Temescal Hills Dr.	60.7	60.7	0.0	1079.6
40	Temescal Hills Dr.	62.0	62.0	0.0	1069.4
35	Temescal Hills Dr.	63.5	63.5	0.0	1068.0
32	Temescal Hills Dr.	64.6	64.6	0.0	1074.6
29	Temescal Hills Dr.	66.2	54.0	6.0	1101.0
25	Temescal Hills Dr.	67.0	53.9	6.0	1131.0
62	Temescal Hills Dr.	65.7	56.3	6.0	1194.7
54	Temescal Hills Dr.	65.8	54.3	6.0	1241.0
49	Temescal Hills Dr.	64.5	55.2	6.0	1254.0
11	Temescal Hills Dr.	66.7	57.4	6.0	1256.8
6	Toscana Dr.	64.1	64.1	0.0	1245.0
3	Toscana Dr.	59.1	59.1	0.0	1220.0
105	Toscana Dr.	65.7	56.5	6.0	1173.5
102	Toscana Dr.	63.1	63.1	0.0	1158.5
80	Toscana Dr.	67.4	56.2	6.0	1095.9
30	Toscana Dr.	60.5	60.5	0.0	1100.4
9	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	65.7	54.9	6.0	1168.8
5	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	65.3	54.7	6.0	1171.4
53	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	64.9	55.0	6.0	1145.0
9	I-15 Freeway	69.4	60.4	6.0	1168.8
5	I-15 Freeway	69.3	60.3	6.0	1171.4
53	I-15 Freeway	69.0	60.3	6.0	1145.0

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2013 (Appendix E to this EIR Addendum, Table 7-1)

required. To mitigate significant exterior noise impacts, the proposed Project would be required to construct a 6.0-foot tall noise barrier adjacent to affected lots. As summarized in Table 3, implementation of the required noise barrier would reduce exterior noise levels to less than 65 dBA CNEL within the Project.

Although the Project's Noise Impact Analysis identified a significant exterior noise impact, this impact is not a new significant impact of the Project, because EIR 439 previously identified that residential lots facing I-15, Temescal Canyon Road, and internal collector roads could be exposed to unacceptable traffic noise levels. EIR 439 further disclosed that a future noise study would be required to identify site-specific measures that would ensure on-site noise levels do not exceed acceptable levels (this requirement was also applied to SP 327 by Condition of Approval 30.Planning 007). Therefore, the mitigation measures proposed for the Project would merely fulfill the conditions of approval for SP 327. As such, the proposed Project would not result in new or more severe long-term exterior noise impacts that were not previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

❒ *On-Site Interior Noise Impacts*

The interior noise level is the difference between the predicted exterior noise level at the building façade and the noise reduction provided by the structure. Interior noise levels greater than 45 dBA CNEL would be classified as "excessive."

Within the Project site, all homes would be exposed to acceptable indoor noise levels, with the exception of lots facing I-15, Temescal Canyon Road, Toscana Drive and Temescal Hills Drive. Unmitigated interior noise levels are presented on Table 4 and Table 5. Interior noise affecting lots facing I-15, Temescal Canyon Road, Toscana Drive and Temescal Hills Drive represents a significant impact for which mitigation is required. To mitigate significant exterior noise impacts, the proposed Project would be required to implement design features into affected homes, including dual glazed windows, sealed openings, and special insulation considerations. As summarized in Table 4 and Table 5, the required mitigation would lower interior noise levels by a minimum of 25 dBA CNEL, which would reduce interior noise impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Although the Project's Noise Impact Analysis identified a significant interior noise impact, this impact is not a new significant impact of the Project, because EIR 439 previously identified that residential lots on the Project site could be exposed to unacceptable interior noise levels. EIR 439 further disclosed that a future noise study would be required to identify site-specific measures that would ensure on-site interior noise levels do not exceed acceptable levels (this requirement was also applied to SP 327 by Condition of Approval 30.Planning 007). Therefore, the mitigation measures proposed for the Project would merely fulfill the conditions of approval for SP 327. As such, the proposed Project would not result in new or more severe long-term interior noise impacts that were not previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

d) There are no conditions associated with the proposed Project that would result in the exposure of residents either on- or off-site to new or more severe ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise impacts than would have occurred under approved SP 327 and previously disclosed in EIR 439. During construction of the proposed Project, the construction equipment likely to be used would be similar to the equipment fleet evaluated in EIR 439, and is not anticipated to produce significant amounts of ground-borne vibration of ground-borne noise levels. In addition, as disclosed in EIR 439, and confirmed in the rock blasting analysis contained as Appendix C1 to Addendum No. 1, it is highly unlikely that potential blasting activities on the Project site would produce a significant amount of ground-borne vibration beyond the boundary of the property. During long-term operation of the proposed Project, there are no uses proposed on the Project site that would result in the generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. Accordingly, Project-related impacts associated with ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels would be less than significant, and would be similar to those disclosed in EIR 439.

Table 4 First Floor Interior Noise Levels (CNEL)

Lot	Roadway	Noise Level At Façade[1]	Interior Noise Level For Windows		Required Interior Noise Reduction
			Open[2]	Closed[3]	
43	Temescal Hills Dr.	54.6	42.6	29.6	9.6
40	Temescal Hills Dr.	55.9	43.9	30.9	10.9
35	Temescal Hills Dr.	60.5	48.5	35.5	15.5
32	Temescal Hills Dr.	64.2	52.2	39.2	19.2
29	Temescal Hills Dr.	56.7	44.7	31.7	11.7
25	Temescal Hills Dr.	56.6	44.6	31.6	11.6
62	Temescal Hills Dr.	58.3	46.3	33.3	13.3
54	Temescal Hills Dr.	56.7	44.7	31.7	11.7
49	Temescal Hills Dr.	57.3	45.3	32.3	12.3
11	Temescal Hills Dr.	59.0	47.0	34.0	14.0
6	Toscana Dr.	63.7	51.7	38.7	18.7
3	Toscana Dr.	61.2	49.2	36.2	16.2
105	Toscana Dr.	58.6	46.6	33.6	13.6
102	Toscana Dr.	62.8	50.8	37.8	17.8
80	Toscana Dr.	58.4	46.4	33.4	13.4
30	Toscana Dr.	60.3	48.3	35.3	15.3
9	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	56.5	44.5	31.5	11.5
5	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	56.4	44.4	31.4	11.4
53	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	56.4	44.4	31.4	11.4
9	I-15 Freeway	63.4	51.4	38.4	18.4
5	I-15 Freeway	63.3	51.3	38.3	18.3
53	I-15 Freeway	63.3	51.3	38.3	18.3

[1] Includes the noise attenuation provided by the barrier as shown on Table 7-1.
[2] A minimum of 12 dBA noise reduction is assumed with a windows open condition
[3] A minimum of 25 dBA noise reduction is assumed with windows closed and standard windows with a minimum STC of 27.
Source: Urban Crossroads, 2013 (Appendix E to this EIR Addendum, Table 7-2)

Table 5 Second Floor Interior Noise Levels (CNEL)

Lot	Roadway	Noise Level At Façade[1]	Interior Noise Level For Windows		Required Interior Noise Reduction
			Open[2]	Closed[3]	
43	Temescal Hills Dr.	60.5	48.5	35.5	15.5
40	Temescal Hills Dr.	61.6	49.6	36.6	16.6
35	Temescal Hills Dr.	63.1	51.1	38.1	18.1
32	Temescal Hills Dr.	64.1	52.1	39.1	19.1
29	Temescal Hills Dr.	65.6	53.6	40.6	20.6
25	Temescal Hills Dr.	66.2	54.2	41.2	21.2
62	Temescal Hills Dr.	65.1	53.1	40.1	20.1
54	Temescal Hills Dr.	65.2	53.2	40.2	20.2
49	Temescal Hills Dr.	63.9	51.9	38.9	18.9
11	Temescal Hills Dr.	65.8	53.8	40.8	20.8
6	Toscana Dr.	63.7	51.7	38.7	18.7
3	Toscana Dr.	64.8	52.8	39.8	19.8
105	Toscana Dr.	65.1	53.1	40.1	20.1
102	Toscana Dr.	62.7	50.7	37.7	17.7
80	Toscana Dr.	66.4	54.4	41.4	21.4
30	Toscana Dr.	60.3	48.3	35.3	15.3
9	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	65.7	53.7	40.7	20.7
5	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	65.3	53.3	40.3	20.3
53	Temescal Cyn. Rd.	64.8	52.8	39.8	19.8
9	I-15 Freeway	69.3	57.3	44.3	24.3
5	I-15 Freeway	69.3	57.3	44.3	24.3
53	I-15 Freeway	68.9	56.9	43.9	23.9

[1] Includes the noise attenuation provided by the barrier as shown on Table 7-1.
[2] A minimum of 12 dBA noise reduction is assumed with a windows open condition
[3] A minimum of 25 dBA noise reduction is assumed with windows closed and standard windows with a minimum STC of 27.
Source: Urban Crossroads, 2013 (Appendix E to this EIR Addendum, Table 7-3)

Mitigation: All mitigation measures from EIR 439 shall continue to apply to the Project. In addition to the mitigation measures from EIR 439, the additional mitigation measures listed below shall apply to the Project:

N-1 (Condition of Approval 80.Planning.032) Prior to issuance of any building permits for Lots 2-27 in Planning Area 5, a six-foot tall noise barrier shall be constructed along the lot boundary facing I-15. The noise barrier may consist of any material (block, tempered glass, earthen berm, etc.) or combination of materials that attenuates noise levels to 65 dBA CNEL or lower within the private exterior areas (i.e., front, side, or back yards) of the above-listed residential lots.

N-2 (Condition of Approval 80.Planning.033) Prior to issuance of any building permits for Lots 8-16, 31-32 in Planning Area 2, Lots 49-62 in Planning Area 3, and Lots 23-31 in Planning Area

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

4, a six-foot tall noise barrier shall be constructed along the lot boundary facing Temescal Hills Drive. The noise barrier may consist of any material (block, tempered glass, earthen berm, etc.) or combination of materials that attenuates noise levels to 65 dBA CNEL or lower within the private exterior areas (i.e., front, side, or back yards) of the above-listed residential lots.

N-3 (Condition of Approval 80.Planning.034) Prior to issuance of building permits for Lots 1-16 in Planning Area 1, Lots 103-106 in Planning Area 3, and Lot 80 in Planning Area 5, a six-foot tall noise barrier shall be constructed along the lot boundary facing Toscana Drive. The noise barrier may consist of any material (block, tempered glass, earthen berm, etc.) or combination of materials that attenuates noise levels to 65 dBA CNEL or lower within the private exterior areas (i.e., front, side, or back yards) of the above-listed residential lots.

N-4 (Condition of Approval 80.Planning.035) Prior to final building permit final inspection, for Lots 1-16, 95, 163-169 in Planning Area 1, Lots 1-16, 31-32 in Planning Area 2, Lots 49-64, 94-102 in Planning Area 3, Lots 1, 20-57 in Planning Area 4, and Lots 2-27, 80-83 in Planning Area 5 shall incorporate building materials that will achieve interior noise levels less than 45 dBA CNEL. Building materials that would facilitate compliance with the 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard, include, but are not limited to, dual-glazed windows and a means of "windows closed" mechanical ventilation (e.g., air conditioning).

N-5 (Condition of Approval 80.Planning.036) Prior to any building permit final inspection, an interior noise analysis shall be completed to the satisfaction of the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health, Industrial Hygiene Division demonstrating that proposed residential construction will achieve interior noise levels less than 45 dBA.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439 and in the revised Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for Addendum No. 2 to EIR 439.

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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Source: EIR 439, Section V, "General Plan Consistency Analysis;" EIR 439, Section IX, "Mandatory CEQA Topics;" SP 327A1; Addendum No. 1; Riverside County General Plan; Project Application Materials; RCLIS; Google Earth (accessed March 10, 2014)

Findings of Fact:

a & c) The proposed Project seeks to implement the land uses of an existing, approved specific plan. Within the areas proposed for subdivision by the Project, there are no existing homes that would be displaced by the proposed development, and the Project would result in the development of 602 residential units on-site. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not displace any existing housing, would not result in the need to construct replacement housing elsewhere, and would not displace any people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The Project would not result in new or substantially increased impacts that were not previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

b) The proposed Project seeks to implement land uses within an existing, approved specific plan, and would result in the development of 602 residential units. Development of the Project as proposed would not increase the demand for affordable housing, which will be accommodated County-wide though implementation of Riverside County General Plan and as evaluated in the Riverside County General Plan EIR. Accordingly, and as concluded by EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, no impact would occur.

d) EIR 439 did not disclose any redevelopment areas as being located on or near the Project site. According to the Riverside County GIS database (RCLIS), the proposed Project site is not located within or near any County Redevelopment Project Areas. Accordingly, the Project would not affect any such area.

e) Impacts due to the introduction of residential uses to the site were previously evaluated as part of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that such impacts would be less than significant. The proposed Project is fully consistent with the land use designations of the approved SP 327 (as amended by SP327A1); accordingly, no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in would not result in new or substantially increased impacts that were not previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

f) Impacts due to growth inducement were previously evaluated as part of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that such impacts would be less than significant. The proposed Project is fully consistent with the land use designations of the approved SP 327 (as amended by SP 327A1); accordingly, no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in new or substantially increased impacts that were not previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

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	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VII.C, "Fire Protection Services and Fire Hazards;" Addendum No. 1; Ord. 659; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Impacts associated with fire protection services were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, which found that implementation of SP 327 would not overburden Riverside County Fire Department resources, and would not result in the need to construct or physically alter fire stations to provide adequate service levels. The proposed Project s would implement SP 327 (as amended by SP 327A1) and does not contain any components that would increase the burden being placed on fire protection services or facilities beyond the levels previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Since certification of EIR 439 in 2006, additional fire protection facilities have been constructed in close proximity to the Project site. The Toscana property is now within the response area of the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) Fire Station #64 located at 25310 Campbell Ranch Road, approximately two miles from the Project site and within a five minute response time to the Project site. The second closest engine is located at RCFD Fire Station #15, at 20320 Temescal Canyon Road, approximately seven miles from the Project site. Additional agencies such as the USDA-Forest Service and nearby fire departments would likely respond with equipment under mutual aid agreements but may arrive after RCFD engines were on-scene. Accordingly, all areas proposed for development by the Project would receive adequate emergency response from fire protection facilities.

EIR 439 concluded that mandatory compliance with County regulations, including Ordinance No. 787 (Uniform Fire Code) and Ordinance No. 659 (Development Impact Fee Program) would further reduce potential adverse impacts to local fire protection services. The Project would be conditioned to comply with the same County regulations as assumed by EIR 439 to maximize safety and minimize the demand for fire protection services. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts to fire protection services than previously disclosed by EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

37. Sheriff Services	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VII.D, "Law Enforcement Services;" Addendum No. 1; Ord. 659; Project Application Materials

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Findings of Fact:

Impacts to sheriff services were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, which found that implementation of SP 327 would not overburden Riverside County Sheriff Department resources and would not result in the need to construct or physically alter sheriff stations to provide adequate service levels. The proposed Project would implement SP 327 (as amended by SP 327A1) and does not contain any components that would increase the burden being placed on sheriff services or facilities beyond the levels previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

EIR 439 concluded that mandatory compliance with County regulations, including Ordinance No. 659 (Development Impact Fee Program), would further reduce potential adverse impacts to local sheriff services. The Project would be conditioned to comply with Ordinance No. 659, which would provide fair share funds for the provision of additional police protection services, which may be applied to sheriff facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand that would be created by the Project, as assumed by EIR 439. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts to sheriff protection services than previously disclosed by EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required. All measures identified in EIR 439 to mitigate SP 327's impact to sheriff services continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

38. Schools	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VII.F, "Schools;" Addendum No. 1; Ord. 659; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

As disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, implementation of SP 327 would increase the population in the local area and would consequently place greater demand on the existing public school system by generating additional students to be served by the Corona-Norco Unified School District (CNUSD). EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1 concluded that payment of school impact fees by implementing development projects would constitute complete mitigation for project-related impacts to school services (pursuant to the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, Senate Bill 50).

The CNUSD plans for long-term facilities based on the land uses specified by the Riverside County General Plan Land Use Plan. The Project would result in the construction of new residential dwelling units pursuant to an existing, approved specific plan – the Project would not construct a greater number of residential dwelling units on-site than disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1. Although it is possible that the CNUSD may ultimately need to construct new school facilities in the region to serve the growing population within their service boundaries, such facility planning is conducted by CNUSD and is not the responsibility of the Project. However, the Project would be required to contribute school impact fees pursuant to the requirements of Senate Bill 50. Mandatory payment of school impact fees would reduce the Project's impacts to school facilities to a level below significant, and no mitigation would be required. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts to public school services than previously disclosed by EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

39. Libraries	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VII.G, "Libraries;" Addendum No. 1; Ord. 659; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Impacts to public library services were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, which found that implementation of SP 327 would not overburden facilities or resources of the Riverside County Library System. The proposed Project would implement SP 327 (as amended by SP 327A1) and does not contain any components that would increase the burden being placed on library services or facilities beyond the levels previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1. Furthermore, as assumed by EIR 439, the Project would be conditioned to comply with the provisions of Ordinance No. 659 to provide a fair-share payment to offset the projected increased demand for library services. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts to library services than previously disclosed by EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

40. Health Services	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VII.E, "Health Services;" Ord. 659; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Potential impacts to public health services were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, which found that implementation of SP 327 would not overburden Riverside County's public health services facilities or resources. The proposed Project would implement SP 327 (as amended by SP 327A1) and does not contain any components that would increase the burden being placed on public health services or facilities beyond the levels previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1. Furthermore, as assumed by EIR 439, the Project would be conditioned to comply with the provisions of Ordinance No. 659 to provide a fair-share payment to offset the projected increased demand for public health services. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts to public health services than previously disclosed by EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
RECREATION				
41. Parks and Recreation 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VII.B, "Parks and Recreation;" SP 327A1; Addendum No. 1; CSA 152B Park and Recreation Master Plan; Riverside County Ordinance No. 460; Riverside County Ordinance No. 659; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) As disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, SP 327 would result in the construction of public and private recreational amenities (i.e., parks and trails) within the Specific Plan area. The proposed Project would construct recreational amenities on-site pursuant to approved SP 327 (as amended by SP 327A1). Construction of the recreational amenities proposed by the Project would result in potential impacts to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, and hydrology and water quality, which have already been disclosed and evaluated within the respective issue areas of EIR 439, Addendum No. 1, and this EIR Addendum. Where potentially significant impacts associated with the construction of park facilities on the Project site are identified in EIR 439, mitigation measures are identified to reduce the impact to the maximum feasible extent. The mitigation measures identified in EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1) would continue to apply to the proposed Project. With the implementation of required mitigation, the proposed Project would not result in significant environmental impacts associated with the construction of recreational facilities that are new or more severe than what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

b) Impacts associated with Project residents' use of existing recreational facilities were evaluated and disclosed in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1, which concluded that SP 327 (as amended by SP 327A1) would not contribute to substantial physical deterioration of existing neighborhood and regional parks because the Specific Plan would provide sufficient park land on-site to accommodate on-site residents' demand and would pay impact fees pursuant to County Ordinance No. 659. Fees paid pursuant to Ordinance No. 659 would be used by the County, in part, to acquire, construct, and/or maintain regional and community park and recreation facilities. The proposed Project would construct recreational amenities on-site pursuant to approved SP 327 (as amended by SP 327A1). The Project does not contain any component that would increase the usage of existing, off-site recreational amenities beyond what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1. Further, as a standard condition of Project approval, the Project would be required to pay development impact fees (DIF) pursuant to Ordinance No. 659, which would provide additional funding for the provision of park and recreation facilities, including regional park facilities. As such, the proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks that could lead to or substantially contribute to their physical deterioration. Therefore,

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

c) The Project seeks to implement a portion of approved SP 327 (as amended by SP 327A1), including the construction of on-site parks and trails. As previously disclosed in Addendum No. 1, the Specific Plan provides sufficient recreational amenities within the Specific Plan area to meet the future demand of its residents. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts related to recreation that were not previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

42. Recreational Trails	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VII.B, "Parks and Recreation;" SP 327A1; Addendum No. 1; Temescal Canyon Area Plan Figure 8 "Trails and Bikeway System;" Elsinore Area Plan Figure 8 "Trails and Bikeway System;" Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Temescal Canyon Area Plan Figure 8, *Trails and Bikeway System*, depicts planned recreational trails within the Project vicinity. As shown, a regional trail is planned to traverse the central and eastern portions of the Project site, and a multi-purpose trail is proposed on Temescal Canyon Road along the Project site's frontage. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 would result in slight modifications to the planned regional trail system through the Specific Plan area, but the modified trail alignment would be consistent with the planned trail designations as applied to the property by the Temescal Canyon Area Plan. The modified trail alignment provided by SP 327A1 was approved by the Riverside County Regional Park & Open Space District. The proposed Project is consistent with SP 327A1 and would implement a portion of its trail network. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with the County's recreational trail system; a significant impact would not occur. This finding is consistent with the conclusions of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
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 such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VII.A, "Circulation and Traffic;" EIR 439, Appendix I "Temescal Hills Specific Plan Traffic Impact Analysis" (Urban Crossroads, 2004); Addendum No. 1; Addendum No. 1 Appendix H "Toscana Specific Plan 327 Amendment #1 Trip Generation Analysis" (Urban Crossroads, 2013); Traffic Impact Analysis (Urban Crossroads, 2014); Congestion Management Program; Ord. No. 460; Ord. No. 461; Google Earth (accessed October, 2014); RCLIS; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The analysis under this threshold focuses on potential impacts to local roadways, based on applicable level of service (LOS) established by the County of Riverside General Plan. Refer to Item 43(b), below, for an analysis of potential impacts to the Riverside County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) roadway network, including I-15 based on the acceptable LOS standard recommended by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

As disclosed in EIR 439, SP 327 would have generated an average of 17,707 traffic trips per day, including 1,183 vehicle trips during the AM peak hour (7AM-9AM) and 1,811 vehicle trips during the PM peak hour (4PM-6PM). EIR 439 concluded that SP 327's impact to the local circulation system would be less than significant with mitigation.

As documented in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 modified the land uses allowed within the Specific Plan area, which resulted in a substantial reduction in average daily traffic trips as compared to the original SP 327 approval. Addendum No. 1 disclosed that SP 327A1 would generate approximately 14,272 average daily traffic trips (an approximately 19 percent reduction as compared to the original SP 327 proposal), including 1,162 AM peak hour vehicle trips and 1,491 PM peak hour vehicle trips. As such, Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would not increase the severity of any impacts beyond what was previously evaluated as part of EIR 439.

Pursuant to a condition imposed on the original SP 327 approval (SP 327 Condition of Approval 30.TRANS 002), a site-specific traffic study was prepared to evaluate the Project's potential effect on existing traffic conditions and currently anticipated future traffic conditions in the Project vicinity. The traffic report utilizes analysis techniques that are consistent with the most current County of Riverside Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guide (August 2008). Because traffic volumes and road improvement projects evolve over time, existing traffic conditions are not the same as they were in 2004 when the traffic study supporting EIR 439 was prepared. Therefore, the traffic study area and the Project's anticipated traffic distribution pattern are not exactly the same as disclosed in EIR 439. Regardless, this analysis provides an adequate basis to determine the level of traffic impact of the currently proposed Project compared to the traffic impacts that were disclosed in EIR 439.

Existing plus Project Traffic Impact Analysis

The effect of Project-related traffic on the existing traffic network, in the absence of ambient growth and cumulative development, is presented below (Existing plus Project, E+P). This analysis scenario was not evaluated in EIR 439 and is provided herein for informational purposes to disclose the potential for the traffic generated by Project-related traffic to cause direct impacts to the existing environment as required by CEQA. The E+P scenario rarely occurs as an actual real world scenario. The time period between the baseline date for establishing the environment's existing conditions and the date project buildout occurs can often be a period of several years or more. In the case of the proposed Project, the time period estimated between the environmental baseline date and complete Project buildout is five (5) years. During this time period, environmental conditions are not static. Other projects are being constructed and the traffic environment is evolving. Therefore the E+P scenario is very unlikely to materialize in real world conditions and thus does not accurately describe the environment that exists when a particular project is constructed and becomes operational. Regardless, the E+P scenario is evaluated to satisfy CEQA requirements to identify the Project's impacts to the existing environment.

Table 6, *Existing plus Project (E+P) Intersection Analysis*, summarizes the effect of Project-related traffic on the local circulation network. As shown in Table 6, all intersections in the Project's study area would operate at an acceptable LOS during the AM and PM peak hours under E+P conditions, with the exception of the I-15 Northbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road intersection. The I-15 Northbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road intersection operates at deficient levels under existing conditions (without Project traffic), and Project-related traffic would worsen this existing deficiency. Because the Project would contribute substantial more than 50 AM and PM peak hour trips at this

Table 6 Existing plus Project (E+P) Intersection Analysis

#	Intersection	Traffic Control[3]	Intersection Approach Lanes[1]												Existing (2013)				Existing Plus Project			
			Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound			Delay[2] (Secs.)		Level of Service		Delay[2] (Secs.)		Level of Service	
			L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
1	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Dos Lagos Dr.	TS	1	2	0	1	1	1>>	1	1	1>	0	0	0	20.3	24.8	C	C	20.5	24.7	C	C
2	Temescal Canyon Rd. (North) / Temescal Canyon Rd.	Future Intersection																				
3	I-15 NB Ramps / Temescal Canyon Rd.	TS	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	1>>	**78.9**	34.1	**F[4]**	C	**114.9**	39.3	**F**	D
4	I-15 SB Ramps / Temescal Canyon Rd.	TS	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1>>	1	1	0	20.3	25.7	C	C	24.2	29.7	C	C
5	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Lawson Rd.	CSS	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	16.8	17.7	C	C	25.9	30.1	D	D
6	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Trilogy Pkwy.	TS	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	14.2	16.6	B	B	14.0	17.3	B	B
7	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Glen Ivy Rd.	CSS	1	1	d	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	15.7	15.1	C	C	24.6	26.8	C	D
8	Campbell Ranch Rd. / Temescal Canyon Rd.	TS	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	13.9	16.4	B	B	16.7	14.7	B	B
9	Temescal Canyon Rd. (South) / Temescal Canyon Rd.	Future Intersection																				
10	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Temescal Hills Dr. North	CSS	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	Not Applicable				11.7	12.5	B	B
11	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Temescal Hills Dr. South	CSS	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	Not Applicable				10.8	11.9	B	B
12	Campbell Ranch Rd. / Indian Truck Trail	TS	1	2	1>	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	22.5	19.6	C	B	22.7	19.7	C	B
13	I-15 SB Ramps / Indian Truck Trail	TS	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	1	1	2	0	16.1	18.4	B	B	25.2	21.4	C	C
14	I-15 NB Ramps / Indian Truck Trail	TS	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	25.7	23.0	C	C	26.9	23.3	C	C
15	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Indian Truck Trail	TS	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	27.0	13.7	C	B	22.6	21.4	C	C

BOLD = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS).

[1] When a right turn is designated, the lane can either be striped or unstriped. To function as a right turn lane there must be sufficient width for right turning vehicles to travel outside the through lanes (minimum of 19-feet). These lanes have been designated as defacto (d) right turn lanes.
L = Left; T = Through; R = Right; d = Defacto Right-Turn Lane; > = Right-Turn Overlap Phasing; >> = Free Right-Turn; 1 = Improvement

[2] Delay and LOS calculated using the TRAFFIX operation analysis software, Traffix Version 8.0, based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) method. Synchro 8 (Version 8) has been utilized to calculate delay and LOS for the I-215 Freeway ramps at Temescal Canyon Road and Indian Truck Trail.

[3] TS = Traffic Signal; CSS = Cross Street Stop; AWS = All-Way Stop

[4] Volume-to-capacity ratio is greater than 1.00; Intersection unstable; Level of Service "F".

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014 (Appendix F to this EIR Addendum, Table 5-1)

intersection, the Project would have a significant direct, adverse effect on traffic operations at the I-15 Northbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road intersection. Mitigation, in the form of payment of the applicable Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee, is available to reduce impacts to this intersection to less-than-significant levels.

The traffic impact at the I-15 Northbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road intersection would not be unique to the Project. If SP 327 were implemented as originally approved, this same intersection would be impacted under E+P conditions, and, in fact, the impact would be more severe than what would occur under the proposed Project. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, the original SP 327 proposal would generate 3,434 more daily traffic trips than SP 327A1 (for which the Project is an implementing action), and therefore would generate more traffic at the intersection of I-15 Northbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road than SP 327A1 (and the Project). Accordingly, the Project's significant, adverse impact at the I-15 Northbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road intersection under the E+P scenario would not be greater than the land uses that were evaluated in EIR 439, and no new or more severe impact would occur.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Opening Year Traffic Impact Analysis

The Project Applicant estimates the Project would be fully built and occupied by the Year 2018 ("Opening Year"). Opening year background traffic forecasts are based upon a background (ambient) growth rate of 2% per year, compounded annually. As directed by Riverside County staff, opening year traffic forecasts are defined as existing (2013) traffic conditions plus five (5) years of ambient growth plus Project traffic (Existing plus Ambient Growth plus Project, E+A+P). The total ambient growth rate assumed for the Project is 10.4 percent.

Table 7, *Opening Year (E+A+P) Intersection Analysis*, summarizes local intersection operations under the E+A+P traffic scenario. As shown in Table 7, all intersections in the Project's study area would operate at acceptable LOS during AM and PM hours under the E+A+P traffic scenario, with the exception of the I-15 Northbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road intersection. The Project's contribution of traffic at this intersection would be substantial (i.e., more than 50 peak hour trips). The analysis below provides a comparison between the information disclosed in EIR 439 and the information available in the Project's traffic report.

- ***I-15 Northbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road:*** With implementation of the Project, this intersection is projected to operate at deficient levels (LOS "F") during the AM peak hour only under E+A+P traffic conditions. The proposed Project would contribute 226 AM peak hour trips and 183 PM peak hour trips to this intersection under E+A+P traffic conditions.

  EIR 439 disclosed that the I-15 Northbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road intersection would operate at deficient LOS during both the AM and PM peak hours under both the Year 2008 E+A+P traffic scenario (i.e., LOS "E") and Year 2012 E+A+P traffic scenario (i.e., LOS "F") traffic scenarios. EIR 439 documented that SP 327 would contribute 322 AM peak hour trips and 315 PM peak hour trips at this intersection under Year 2008 E+A+P traffic conditions, and 429 AM peak hour trips and 469 PM peak hour trips under Year 2012 E+A+P traffic conditions. As summarized above, the proposed Project would contribute fewer peak hour trips to this intersection than disclosed in EIR 439.

EIR 439 disclosed that all intersections significantly impacted by SP 327 could operate at acceptable levels with identified mitigation. The mitigation measures identified in EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1 to reflect changes to the Specific Plan design that occurred as part of SP 327A1, to reflect current, as-built conditions, and to reference currently applicable County of Riverside road improvement standards and mitigation fee ordinances) would continue to apply to the proposed Project to ensure that Project-related impacts to the I-15 Northbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road intersection would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in a significant new or more severe direct traffic impact under E+A+P traffic conditions 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 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1) would not be required.

Table 7 Opening Year (E+A+P) Intersection Analysis

#	Intersection	Traffic Control[3]	Intersection Approach Lanes[1]												Delay[2] (Secs.)		Level of Service	
			Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound						
			L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	AM	PM	AM	PM
1	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Dos Lagos Dr.	TS	1	2	0	1	1	1>>	1	1	1>	0	0	0	21.3	25.6	C	C
2	Temescal Canyon Rd. (North) / Temescal Canyon Rd.	Future Intersection																
3	I-15 NB Ramps / Temescal Canyon Rd.	TS	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	1>>	**151.9**	46.5	**F**	D
4	I-15 SB Ramps / Temescal Canyon Rd.	TS	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1>>	1	1	0	26.3	33.3	C	C
5	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Lawson Rd.	CSS	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	29.5	34.9	D	D
6	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Trilogy Pkwy.	TS	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	14.4	17.9	B	B
7	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Glen Ivy Rd.	CSS	1	1	d	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	28.0	31.6	D	D
8	Campbell Ranch Rd. / Temescal Canyon Rd.	TS	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	17.6	15.0	B	B
9	Temescal Canyon Rd. (South) / Temescal Canyon Rd.	Future Intersection																
10	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Temescal Hills Dr. North	CSS	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	11.8	12.6	B	B
11	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Temescal Hills Dr. South	CSS	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10.9	12.0	B	B
12	Campbell Ranch Rd. / Indian Truck Trail	TS	1	2	1>	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	23.0	19.9	C	B
13	I-15 SB Ramps / Indian Truck Trail	TS	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	1	1	2	0	25.3	21.5	C	C
14	I-15 NB Ramps / Indian Truck Trail	TS	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	27.9	23.5	C	C
15	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Indian Truck Trail	TS	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	23.9	21.6	C	C

BOLD = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS).

[1] When a right turn is designated, the lane can either be striped or unstriped. To function as a right turn lane there must be sufficient width for right turning vehicles to travel outside the through lanes (minimum of 19-feet). These lanes have been designated as defacto (d) right turn lanes.
L = Left; T = Through; R = Right; d = Defacto Right-Turn Lane; > = Right-Turn Overlap Phasing; >> = Free Right-Turn; 1 = Improvement

[2] Delay and LOS calculated using the TRAFFIX operation analysis software, Traffix Version 8.0, based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) method. Synchro 8 (Version 8) has been utilized to calculate delay and LOS for the I-215 Freeway ramps at Temescal Canyon Road and Indian Truck Trail.

[3] TS = Traffic Signal; CSS = Cross Street Stop; AWS = All-Way Stop

[4] Volume-to-capacity ratio is greater than 1.00; Intersection unstable; Level of Service "F".

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014 (Appendix F to this EIR Addendum, Table 6-1)

Cumulative Impact Analysis

The analysis presented below evaluates the effect on the local circulation system of the incremental addition of Project traffic when combined with traffic from ambient growth and other nearby projects (Existing plus Ambient Growth plus Project plus Cumulative Development Projects, E+A+P+C). A total of 15 other known cumulative development projects in the local area were included in the E+A+P+C (2018) analysis.

Table 8, *Opening Year plus Cumulative Developments (E+A+P+C) Intersection Analysis*, summarizes local intersection operations under the E+A+P+C traffic scenario. As shown in Table 8, all intersections in the Project's study area would operate at acceptable LOS during AM and PM hours under the E+A+P+C traffic scenario, with the exception of the three (3) intersections listed below.

Table 8 Opening Year plus Cumulative Developments (E+A+P+C) Intersection Analysis

#	Intersection	Traffic Control[3]	Intersection Approach Lanes[1]												Delay[2] (Secs.)		Level of Service	
			Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound						
			L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	AM	PM	AM	PM
1	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Dos Lagos Dr.	TS	1	2	0	1	1	1>>	1	1	1>	0	0	0	23.7	33.3	C	C
2	Temescal Canyon Rd. (North) / Temescal Canyon Rd.	New Intersection (See Table 7-5)																
3	I-15 NB Ramps / Temescal Canyon Rd.	TS	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	1>>	**>200.0**	**91.7**	F	F
4	I-15 SB Ramps / Temescal Canyon Rd.	TS	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1>>	1	1	0	**>200.0**	**164.2**	F	F
5	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Lawson Rd.	CSS	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**>100.0**	**>100.0**	F	F
6	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Trilogy Pkwy.	TS	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	19.6	20.0	B	C
7	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Glen Ivy Rd.	CSS	1	1	d	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	25.0	34.1	D	D
8	Campbell Ranch Rd. / Temescal Canyon Rd.	TS	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	30.3	34.5	C	C
9	Temescal Canyon Rd. (South) / Temescal Canyon Rd.	New Intersection (See Table 7-5)																
10	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Temescal Hills Dr.	TS	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	39.9	50.8	D	D
11	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Toscana Dr.	TS	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	38.1	40.3	D	D
12	Campbell Ranch Rd. / Indian Truck Trail	TS	1	2	1>	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	25.3	23.2	C	C
13	I-15 SB Ramps / Indian Truck Trail	TS	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	1	1	2	0	49.5	36.9	D	D
14	I-15 NB Ramps / Indian Truck Trail	TS	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	46.7	30.8	D	C
15	Temescal Canyon Rd. / Indian Truck Trail	TS	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	27.4	24.2	C	C

BOLD = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS).

[1] When a right turn is designated, the lane can either be striped or unstriped. To function as a right turn lane there must be sufficient width for right turning vehicles to travel outside the through lanes (minimum of 19-feet).

L = Left; T = Through; R = Right; d = Defacto Right-Turn Lane; > = Right-Turn Overlap Phasing; >> = Free Right-Turn

[2] Delay and LOS calculated using the TRAFFIX operation analysis software, Traffix Version 8.0, based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) method. Synchro 8 (Version 8) has been utilized to calculate delay and LOS for the I-215 Freeway ramps at Temescal Canyon Road and Indian Truck Trail.

[3] TS = Traffic Signal; CSS = Cross Street Stop

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014 (Appendix F to this EIR Addendum, Table 7-1)

The analysis below provides a comparison between the information disclosed in EIR 439 and the information available in the Project's traffic report.

- ***I-15 Northbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road:*** With implementation of the Project, this intersection is projected to operate at deficient levels (LOS "F") during the AM and PM peak hours under E+A+P+C (2018) traffic conditions. The proposed Project would contribute 236 AM peak hour trips and 294 PM peak hour trips to this intersection under E+A+P+C traffic conditions.

  EIR 439 disclosed that the I-15 Northbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road intersection would operate at LOS "F") during both the AM and PM peak hours under both the Year 2008 E+A+P+C and Year 2012 E+A+P+C traffic scenarios. EIR 439 documented that SP 327 would contribute 322 AM peak hour trips and 315 PM peak hour trips at this intersection under Year 2008 E+A+P+C traffic conditions, and 429 AM peak hour trips and 469 PM peak hour trips under Year 2012 E+A+P+C traffic conditions. As summarized above, the proposed Project would contribute fewer peak hour trips to this intersection than disclosed in EIR 439.

- ***I-15 Southbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road:*** With implementation of the Project, this intersection is projected to operate at deficient levels (LOS "F") during the AM and PM peak hours under E+A+P+C (2018) traffic conditions. The proposed Project would contribute 67 AM peak hour trips and 183 PM peak hour trips to this intersection under E+A+P+C traffic conditions.

  EIR 439 disclosed that the I-15 Southbound Ramps/Temescal Canyon Road intersection would operate at LOS "F") during both the AM and PM peak hours under both the Year 2008 E+A+P+C and Year 2012 E+A+P+C traffic scenarios. EIR 439 documented that SP 327 would contribute 433 AM peak hour trips and 600 PM peak hour trips at this intersection under Year 2008 E+A+P+C traffic conditions, and 581 AM peak hour trips and 865 PM peak hour trips under Year 2012 E+A+PC traffic conditions. As summarized above, the proposed Project would contribute fewer peak hour trips to this intersection than disclosed in EIR 439.

- ***Temescal Canyon Road/Lawson Road:*** With implementation of the Project, this intersection is projected to operate at deficient levels (LOS "F") during the AM and PM peak hours under E+A+P+C (2018) traffic conditions. The proposed Project would contribute 26 AM peak hour trips and 32 PM peak hour trips to this intersection under E+A+P+C traffic conditions.

  EIR 439 disclosed that the Temescal Canyon Road/Lawson Road intersection would operate at LOS "F") during both the AM and PM peak hours under both the Year 2008 E+A+P+C and Year 2012 E+A+P+C traffic scenarios. EIR 439 documented that SP 327 would contribute 434 AM peak hour trips and 600 PM peak hour trips at this intersection under Year 2008 E+A+P+C traffic conditions, and 583 AM peak hour trips and 881 PM peak hour trips under Year 2012 E+A+PC traffic conditions. In comparison, and using current analysis methodology and traffic data, the proposed Project would contribute fewer peak hour trips to this intersection than disclosed in EIR 439.

EIR 439 disclosed that all intersections impacted by SP 327 on a cumulatively considerable basis could operate at acceptable levels with identified mitigation. The mitigation measures identified in EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1) would continue to apply to the proposed Project to ensure that all Project-related cumulatively considerable impacts to the three (3) intersections identified above are reduced to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in a significant new or more severe cumulatively considerable traffic impact under E+A+P+C traffic conditions 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 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1) would not be required.

b) The only Riverside County CMP-designated roadway in the Project vicinity is I-15. EIR 439 concluded that implementation of SP 327 would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to I-15. Addendum No. 1 disclosed that SP 327A1 would substantially reduce impacts to I-15 from what was previously disclosed in EIR 439 (due to an approximately 19 percent reduction in average daily traffic trips as compared to the original SP 327 proposal), but that impacts to I-15 would remain significant and unavoidable. The proposed Project seeks to implement the land uses allowed on the site by SP 327A1.

Although EIR 439 did not quantify the impact that traffic associated with SP 327 would have on the performance of I-15, the EIR disclosed the total number of daily traffic trips resulting from buildout of

the Specific Plan and the distribution of those daily traffic trips on the circulation network. EIR 439 also disclosed that the EIR for the County's General Plan, which was certified in 2003, concluded that I-15 would operate at failing levels as a result of anticipated growth in Riverside County. As such, the issue of potentially deficient service on I-15 resulting from development in the County does not represent new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known at the time EIR 439 was certified, and information about the Project's potential direct and/or cumulative impact on I-15 was available with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time EIR 439 was certified in 2006. During the public review period and public hearings associated with EIR 439, no objections or concerns were raised regarding the EIR's analysis of potential effects to I-15, and no legal challenge was filed within the statute of limitations period established by Public Resources Code §21167(c). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3), the issue of Project-related effects to I-15 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 439 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 and serves as an Addendum to the EIR.

Existing plus Project Traffic Impact Analysis

The effect of Project-related traffic on the existing traffic network, in the absence of ambient growth and cumulative development, is presented below (Existing plus Project, E+P). This analysis scenario is provided herein for informational purposes to disclose the potential for the traffic generated by Project-related traffic to cause direct impacts to the existing environment as required by CEQA. As described above under the response to Item 43(a), the E+P scenario is very unlikely to materialize in real world conditions and thus does not accurately describe the environment that exists when a particular project is constructed and becomes operational. Regardless, the E+P scenario is evaluated to satisfy CEQA requirements to identify the Project's impacts to the existing environment.

❒ *Freeway Mainline Segment Operations Analysis*

E+P freeway mainline volumes for I-15 are summarized in Table 9, *Existing plus Project (E+P) Freeway Mainline Segment Analysis*. As shown in Table 9, all freeway mainline segments in the Project study area would operate at acceptable LOS under the E+P traffic scenario. The Project's impact to the operation of I-15 freeway mainline segments would be less than significant.

❒ *Freeway Ramp Operations Analysis*

Table 10, *Existing plus Project (E+P) Freeway Ramp Analysis*, summarizes freeway ramp queuing at the I-15/Temescal Canyon Road and I-15/Indian Truck Trail interchanges under E+P traffic conditions. As shown in Table 10, all freeway ramps at the I-15/Temescal Canyon Road and I-15/Indian Truck Trail interchanges would experience acceptable stacking lengths during the AM and PM peak hours under E+P traffic conditions, which would preclude "spill back" of traffic from this interchange onto mainline segments of I-15. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts to freeway ramp operations under E+P traffic conditions.

Table 9 Existing plus Project (E+P) Freeway Mainline Segment Analysis

Freeway	Direction	Mainline Segment	Lanes[1]	Existing (2013)				Existing Plus Project			
				Density[2]		LOS		Density[2]		LOS	
				AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
I-15 Freeway	Southbound	North of Temescal Canyon Road	3	15.8	22.7	B	C	16.1	23.7	B	C
		Temescal Canyon Road to Indian Truck Trail	3	14.8	22.1	B	C	14.7	22.1	B	C
		South of Indian Truck Trail	3	14.4	20.1	B	C	14.9	20.5	B	C
	Northbound	North of Temescal Canyon Road	3	23.9	25.5	C	C	25.0	26.2	C	D
		Temescal Canyon Road to Indian Truck Trail	3	30.1	23.6	D	C	30.1	23.6	D	C
		South of Indian Truck Trail	3	26.9	22.5	D	C	27.2	23.3	D	C

[1] Number of lanes are in the specified direction and is based on existing conditions.

[2] Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/m/ln).

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014 (Appendix F to this EIR Addendum, Table 5-3)

Table 10 Existing plus Project (E+P) Freeway Ramp Analysis

Intersection	Movement	Stacking Distance (Feet)	Existing (2013)				Existing Plus Project			
			95th Percentile Stacking Distance Required (Feet)		Acceptable?[1]		95th Percentile Stacking Distance Required (Feet)		Acceptable?[1]	
			AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM	PM	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM	PM
I-15 NB Ramps / Temescal Canyon Road	NBL/T/R	1,350	1,287[2]	116	Yes	Yes	1,301[2]	122	Yes	Yes
I-15 SB Ramps / Temescal Canyon Road	SBL/T	1,360	78	50	Yes	Yes	78	50	Yes	Yes
	SBR	500	69	70	Yes	Yes	80	123	Yes	Yes
I-15 SB Ramps / Indian Truck Trail	SBL	875	35	65	Yes	Yes	35	65	Yes	Yes
	SBT/R	1,740	31	56	Yes	Yes	31	50	Yes	Yes
	SBR	500	29	54	Yes	Yes	29	54	Yes	Yes
I-15 NB Ramps / Indian Truck Trail	NBL	500	48	48	Yes	Yes	52	68	Yes	Yes
	NBT	1,350	49	49	Yes	Yes	43	38	Yes	Yes
	NBR	500	0	0	Yes	Yes	11	32	Yes	Yes

[1] Stacking Distance is acceptable if the required stacking distance is less than or equal to the stacking distance provided. An additional 15 feet of stacking which is assumed to be provided in the transition for turn pockets is reflected in the stacking distance shown on this table, where applicable.

[2] 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014 (Appendix F to this EIR Addendum, Table 5-2)

❒ *Freeway Merge/Diverge Operations Analysis*

Table 11, *Existing plus Project (E+P) Merge/Diverge Analysis*, summarizes traffic operations at freeway ramp junction merge/diverge areas within the Project study area under E+P traffic conditions. As shown in Table 11, all freeway ramp junction merge/diverge areas at the I-15/Temescal Canyon Road and I-15/Indian Truck Trail interchanges are projected to operate at acceptable LOS under E+P traffic conditions, with the exception of the I-15 Northbound Off-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road (which would operate at LOS "E" during the AM peak hour). The merge/diverge area at the I-15 Northbound Off-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road operates at LOS "E" during the AM peak hour under existing conditions without Project-related traffic, and the Project would not worsen existing traffic density (as measured by passenger cars per mile per lane, refer to Table 11). As such, the Project would not cause or worsen the LOS deficiency at this freeway ramp junction merge/diverge area under E+P traffic conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

Table 11 Existing plus Project (E+P) Merge/Diverge Analysis

Freeway	Direction	Ramp or Segment	Lanes on Freeway	Existing (2013)				Existing Plus Project			
				AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
				Density[1]	LOS	Density[1]	LOS	Density[1]	LOS	Density[1]	LOS
I-15 Freeway	Southbound	Off-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road	3	22.5	C	29.3	D	22.9	C	30.5	D
		On-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road	3	18.7	B	26.4	C	18.7	B	26.4	C
		Off-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail	3	21.0	C	29.0	D	21.0	C	29.0	D
		On-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail	3	18.2	B	23.7	C	19.2	B	24.3	C
	Northbound	On-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road	3	26.7	C	28.4	D	28.1	D	29.3	D
		Off-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road	3	**35.8**	**E**	29.9	D	**35.8**	**E**	29.9	D
		On-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail	3	32.6	D	27.3	C	32.6	D	27.3	C
		Off-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail	3	32.4	D	29.2	D	32.7	D	29.9	D

BOLD = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS).

[1] Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln)

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014 (Appendix F to this EIR Addendum, Table 5-4)

Opening Year Traffic Impact Analysis

As previously described under the response to Item 43(a), the Project would be fully built and occupied by the Year 2018. As directed by Riverside County staff, opening year traffic forecasts are defined as existing (2013) traffic conditions plus five (5) years of ambient growth (2 percent per year, compounded annually) plus Project traffic (Existing plus Ambient Growth plus Project, E+A+P). The total ambient growth rate assumed for the Project is 10.4 percent.

❒ *Freeway Mainline Segment Operations Analysis*

E+A+P freeway mainline volumes for I-15 are summarized in Table 12, *Opening Year (E+A+P) Freeway Mainline Segment Analysis*. As shown in Table 12, all freeway mainline segments in the Project study area would operate at acceptable LOS under the E+A+P traffic scenario, with the exception of I-15 Northbound between Temescal Canyon Road and Indian Truck Trail. If SP 327 were implemented as originally approved, the deficiency at the above-listed freeway mainline segment would have been greater than shown in Table 12. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, the original SP 327 proposal would have generated 3,434 more daily traffic trips than SP 327A1 (for which the Project is an implementing action), and would contribute a substantially higher number of daily traffic trips to I-15 than would occur under SP 327A1 (and the Project). Accordingly, the LOS deficiencies at I-15 freeway mainlines segments under the E+A+P traffic scenario would not be greater than the land uses that were evaluated in EIR 439, and a less severe impact would occur.

❒ *Freeway Ramp Operations Analysis*

Table 13, *Opening Year (E+A+P) Freeway Ramp Analysis*, summarizes freeway ramp queuing at the I-15/Temescal Canyon Road and I-15/Indian Truck Trail interchanges under E+A+P traffic conditions. As shown in Table 13, all freeway ramps at the I-15/Temescal Canyon Road and I-15/Indian Truck Trail interchanges would experience acceptable stacking lengths during the AM and PM peak hours under E+A+P traffic conditions, with the exception of the I-15 Northbound Ramps at Temescal Canyon Road (unacceptable stacking in the AM peak hour). If SP 327 were implemented as originally approved, the stacking deficiency at the above-listed freeway mainline segment would be greater than

Table 12 Opening Year (E+A+P) Freeway Mainline Segment Analysis

Freeway	Direction	Mainline Segment	Lanes[1]	Existing (2013)				EAP (2018)			
				Density[2]		LOS		Density[2]		LOS	
				AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
I-15 Freeway	Southbound	North of Temescal Canyon Road	3	15.8	22.7	B	C	17.7	26.7	B	D
		Temescal Canyon Road to Indian Truck Trail	3	14.8	22.1	B	C	16.2	24.8	B	C
		South of Indian Truck Trail	3	14.4	20.1	B	C	16.4	22.7	B	C
	Northbound	North of Temescal Canyon Road	3	23.9	25.5	C	C	28.3	30.0	D	D
		Temescal Canyon Road to Indian Truck Trail	3	30.1	23.6	D	C	**35.8**	26.7	**E**	D
		South of Indian Truck Trail	3	26.9	22.5	D	C	31.5	26.1	D	D

BOLD = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS)

[1] Number of lanes are in the specified direction and is based on existing conditions

[2] Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln).

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014 (Appendix F to this EIR Addendum, Table 6-3)

Table 13 Opening Year (E+A+P) Freeway Ramp Analysis

Intersection	Movement	Stacking Distance (Feet)	Existing (2013)				EAP (2018)			
			95th Percentile Stacking Distance Required (Feet)		Acceptable?[1]		95th Percentile Stacking Distance Required (Feet)		Acceptable?[1]	
			AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM	PM	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM	PM
I-15 NB Ramps / Temescal Canyon Road	NBL/T/R	1,350	1,287[2]	116	Yes	Yes	1,611[2]	137	No	Yes
I-15 SB Ramps / Temescal Canyon Road	SBL/T	1,360	70	50	Yes	Yes	66	54	Yes	Yes
	SBR	500	69	70	Yes	Yes	84	211	Yes	Yes
I-15 SB Ramps / Indian Truck Trail	SBL	675	35	65	Yes	Yes	37	70	Yes	Yes
	SBT/R	1,740	31	58	Yes	Yes	32	58	Yes	Yes
	SBR	500	29	54	Yes	Yes	30	56	Yes	Yes
I-15 NB Ramps / Indian Truck Trail	NBL	500	48	48	Yes	Yes	55	73	Yes	Yes
	NBT	1,350	49	49	Yes	Yes	47	39	Yes	Yes
	NBR	500	0	0	Yes	Yes	15	33	Yes	Yes

[1] Stacking Distance is acceptable if the required stacking distance is less than or equal to the stacking distance provided. An additional 15 feet of stacking which is assumed to be provided in the transition for turn pockets is reflected in the stacking distance shown on this table, where applicable.

[2] 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014 (Appendix F to this EIR Addendum, Table 6-2)

shown in Table 13. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, the original SP 327 proposal would generate 3,434 more daily traffic trips than SP 327A1 (for which the Project is an implementing action), and would contribute a substantially higher number of daily traffic trips to I-15 than would occur under SP 327A1 (and the Project). Accordingly, the stacking deficiency at I-15 ramp interchanges under the E+A+P traffic scenario would be less than the land uses that were evaluated in EIR 439, and a less severe impact would occur.

❒ *Freeway Merge/Diverge Operations Analysis*

Table 14, *Opening Year (E+A+P) Merge/Diverge Analysis*, summarizes traffic operations at freeway ramp junction merge/diverge areas within the Project study area under E+A+P traffic conditions. As shown in Table 14, all freeway ramp junction merge/diverge areas at the I-15/Temescal Canyon Road

Table 14 Opening Year (E+A+P) Merge/Diverge Analysis

Freeway	Direction	Ramp or Segment	Lanes on Freeway	Existing (2013)				EAP (2018)			
				AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
				Density[1]	LOS	Density[1]	LOS	Density[1]	LOS	Density[1]	LOS
I-15 Freeway	Southbound	Off-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road	3	22.5	C	29.3	D	24.7	C	32.7	D
		On-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road	3	18.7	B	26.4	C	20.3	C	28.7	D
		Off-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail	3	21.0	C	29.0	D	22.7	C	31.2	D
		On-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail	3	18.2	B	23.7	C	20.6	C	26.3	C
	Northbound	On-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road	3	26.7	C	28.4	D	30.5	D	32.0	D
		Off-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road	3	**35.8**	**E**	29.9	D	**38.3**	**E**	32.1	D
		On-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail	3	32.6	D	27.3	C	**35.5**	**E**	29.7	D
		Off-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail	3	32.4	D	29.2	D	**35.0**	**E**	32.1	D

BOLD = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS).

[1] Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln).

*Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014 (Appendix F to this EIR Addendum, **Table 6-4**)*

and I-15/Indian Truck Trail interchanges are projected to operate at acceptable LOS under E+A+P traffic conditions, with the exception of the following three (3) merge/diverge areas:

- I-15, Northbound, Off-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road (LOS "E" during AM peak hour);
- I-15 Northbound, On-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail (LOS "E" during AM peak hour); and
- I-15 Northbound, Off-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail (LOS "E" during the AM peak hour).

If SP 327 were implemented as originally approved, the stacking deficiency at the above-listed freeway mainline segment would have been greater than shown in Table 14. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, the original SP 327 proposal would have generated 3,434 more daily traffic trips than SP 327A1 (for which the Project is an implementing action), and would have contributed a substantially higher number of daily traffic trips to I-15 than would occur under SP 327A1 (and the Project). Accordingly, the LOS deficiencies at I-15 ramp interchanges under the E+A+P traffic scenario would be less than the land uses that were evaluated in EIR 439, and a less severe impact would occur.

Cumulative Impact Analysis

The analysis presented below evaluates the effect on the local circulation system of the incremental addition of Project traffic when combined with traffic from ambient growth and other nearby projects (Existing plus Ambient Growth plus Project plus Cumulative Developments, E+A+P+C). As previously described under the response to Item 43(a), 15 other known cumulative development projects in the local area were included in the E+A+P+C (2018) analysis.

❒ *Freeway Mainline Segment Operations Analysis*

E+A+P+C freeway mainline volumes for I-15 are summarized in Table 15, *Opening Year plus Cumulative Developments (E+A+P+C) Freeway Mainline Segment Analysis*. As shown in Table 15, all freeway mainline segments in the Project study area would operate at acceptable LOS under the E+A+P+C traffic scenario, with the exception of the three (3) freeway mainline segments listed below:

Table 15 Opening Year plus Cumulative Developments (E+A+P+C) Freeway Mainline Segment Analysis

Freeway	Direction	Mainline Segment	Volume		Lanes[1]	Density[2]		LOS	
			AM	PM		AM	PM	AM	PM
I-15 Freeway	Southbound	North of Temescal Canyon Road	4,592	5,827	3	24.5	34.8	C	D
		Temescal Canyon Road to Indian Truck Trail	3,312	5,169	3	17.3	28.6	B	D
		South of Indian Truck Trail	3,622	5,383	3	18.9	30.4	C	D
	Northbound	North of Temescal Canyon Road	5,647	6,831	3	33.1	–	D	**F**
		Temescal Canyon Road to Indian Truck Trail	6,257	5,339	3	**40.4**	30.0	**E**	D
		South of Indian Truck Trail	6,356	5,593	3	**42.0**	32.3	**E**	D

BOLD = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS).

[1] Number of lanes are in the specified direction and is based on existing conditions.

[2] Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln).

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014 (Appendix F to this EIR Addendum, Table 7-3)

- I-15 Northbound, North of Temescal Canyon Road (LOS "F" during AM peak hour);
- I-15 Northbound, Temescal Canyon Road to Indian Truck Trail (LOS "E" during AM peak hour); and
- I-15 Northbound, South of Indian Truck Trail (LOS "E" during the AM peak hour).

EIR 439 disclosed that SP 327's contribution of traffic to I-15 would be cumulatively considerable, but did not quantify the potential cumulative impacts associated with SP 327. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 would generate approximately 19-percent fewer average daily traffic trips than disclosed in EIR 439, thereby reducing the contribution of traffic from the Specific Plan to the state highway network (i.e., I-15). Therefore, the Project, as an implementing action of SP 327A1, would contribute fewer peak hour trips to I-15 freeway mainline segments than previously assumed by EIR 439. Based on the foregoing information, although the cumulative impact would remain considerable, implementation of the Project would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of impacts to I-15 under E+A+P+C traffic conditions beyond what was previously evaluated as part of EIR 439.

❒ *Freeway Ramp Operations Analysis*

Table 16, *Opening Year plus Cumulative Developments (E+A+P+C) Freeway Ramp Analysis*, summarizes freeway ramp queuing at the I-15/Temescal Canyon Road and I-15/Indian Truck Trail interchanges under E+A+P+C traffic conditions. As shown in Table 16, all freeway ramps at the I-15/Temescal Canyon Road and I-15/Indian Truck Trail interchanges would experience acceptable stacking lengths during the AM and PM peak hours under E+A+P+C traffic conditions, with the exception of the three (3) movements listed below:

- I-15 Northbound Ramps at Temescal Canyon Road (unacceptable stacking in the AM peak hour);
- I-15 Southbound Ramps at Temescal Canyon Road (unacceptable stacking in the southbound left/through movement in the AM peak hour); and
- I-15 Southbound Ramps at Temescal Canyon Road (unacceptable stacking in the southbound right movement in the PM peak hour).

Table 16 Opening Year plus Cumulative Developments (E+A+P+C) Freeway Ramp Analysis

Intersection	Movement	Stacking Distance (Feet)	95th Percentile Stacking Distance Required (Feet)		Acceptable? [1]	
			AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM	PM
I-15 NB Ramps / Temescal Canyon Road	NBL/T/R	1,350	**1,670** [2]	464 [2]	**No**	Yes
I-15 SB Ramps / Temescal Canyon Road	SBL/T	1,360	**1,667** [2]	747 [2]	**No**	Yes
	SBR	500	462 [2]	**911** [2]	Yes	**No**
I-15 SB Ramps / Indian Truck Trail	SBL	675	37	109	Yes	Yes
	SBT/R	1,740	35	109	Yes	Yes
	SBR	500	33	106	Yes	Yes
I-15 NB Ramps / Indian Truck Trail	NBL	500	155	204	Yes	Yes
	NBT	1,350	126	156	Yes	Yes
	NBR	500	96	56	Yes	Yes

[1] Stacking Distance is acceptable if the required stacking distance is less than or equal to the stacking distance provided. An additional 15 feet of stacking which is assumed to be provided in the transition for turn pockets is reflected in the stacking distance shown on this table, where applicable.

[2] 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014 (Appendix F to this EIR Addendum, Table 7-2)

EIR 439 disclosed that SP 327's contribution of traffic to I-15 would be cumulatively considerable, but did not quantify the potential cumulative impacts associated with SP 327. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 would generate approximately 19-percent fewer average daily traffic trips than disclosed in EIR 439, thereby reducing the contribution of traffic from the Specific Plan to the state highway network (i.e., I-15). Therefore, the Project, as an implementing action of SP 327A1, would contribute fewer peak hour trips to I-15 freeway ramp junctions than previously assumed by EIR 439. Based on the foregoing information, although the cumulative impact would remain considerable, implementation of the Project would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of impacts to I-15 under E+A+P+C traffic conditions beyond what was previously evaluated as part of EIR 439.

❒ *Freeway Merge/Diverge Operations Analysis*

Table 17, *Opening Year plus Cumulative Developments (E+A+P+C) Merge/Diverge Analysis*, summarizes traffic operations at freeway ramp junction merge/diverge areas within the Project study area under E+A+P+C traffic conditions. As shown in Table 17, all freeway ramp junction merge/diverge areas at the I-15/Temescal Canyon Road and I-15/Indian Truck Trail interchanges are projected to operate at acceptable LOS under E+A+P+C traffic conditions, with the exception of the following five (5) merge/diverge areas:

- I-15 Southbound, Off-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road (LOS "E" during PM peak hour);
- I-15 Northbound, On-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road (LOS "F" during PM peak hour);
- I-15, Northbound, Off-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road (LOS "E" during AM peak hour);
- I-15 Northbound, On-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail (LOS "E" during AM peak hour); and
- I-15 Northbound, Off-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail (LOS "E" during the AM and PM peak hours).

Table 17 Opening Year plus Cumulative Developments (E+A+P+C) Merge/Diverge Analysis

Freeway	Direction	Ramp or Segment	Lanes on Freeway	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
				Density[1]	LOS	Density[1]	LOS
I-15 Freeway	Southbound	Off-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road	3	33.1	D	**37.8**	**E**
		On-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road	3	21.5	C	32.2	D
		Off-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail	3	24.0	C	34.0	D
		On-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail	3	24.1	C	34.1	D
	Northbound	On-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road	3	34.1	D	**43.6**	**F**
		Off-Ramp at Temescal Canyon Road	3	**39.8**	**E**	34.5	D
		On-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail	3	**37.8**	**E**	32.3	D
		Off-Ramp at Indian Truck Trail	3	**40.1**	**E**	**36.3**	**E**

BOLD = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS).

[1] Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln)

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2014 (Appendix F to this EIR Addendum, Table 7-4)

EIR 439 disclosed that SP 327's contribution of traffic to I-15 would be cumulatively considerable, but did not quantify the potential cumulative impacts associated with SP 327. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 would generate approximately 19-percent fewer average daily traffic trips than disclosed in EIR 439, thereby reducing the contribution of traffic from the Specific Plan to the state highway network (i.e., I-15). Therefore, the Project, as an implementing action of SP 327A1, would contribute fewer peak hour trips to I-15 freeway ramp junctions than previously assumed by EIR 439. Based on the foregoing information, although the cumulative impact would remain considerable, implementation of the Project would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of impacts to I-15 under E+A+P+C traffic conditions beyond what was previously evaluated as part of EIR 439..

c & d) The proposed Project site is not located within an airport influence area and is not located adjacent to a waterway or active rail corridor. Therefore, the Project would neither increase air, rail or waterborne traffic levels, nor result in substantial safety risks associated with these modes of travel. No impact would occur.

e) The proposed Project would be conditioned to construct all on-site roadway segments and frontage improvements in accordance with Riverside County road improvement standards and specifications. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not create any sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or other transportation hazards. The land uses proposed on the Project site would be compatible with the surrounding area; therefore, the proposed Project would not create or substantially increase a transportation hazard due to incompatible uses.

f) The Project would not construct any public streets on-site. Project-related traffic would travel on public roads off-site, which would require maintenance. Although public roads require periodic maintenance, such maintenance is inherent in operational activities assumed for the Project and would not cause any new or more severe physical impacts to the environment beyond those disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

g) The proposed Project is not anticipated to affect any roadways in the vicinity of the site during construction, as it is anticipated that surrounding roadways have sufficient capacity to accommodate

construction vehicle traffic traveling to and from the site. The proposed Project would have similar construction characteristics as analyzed by EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1. As such, the proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse effect upon circulation during construction, and a significant impact would not occur.

h) The proposed Project would be required to comply with Riverside County Ordinance Nos. 460 & 461, which regulate access road provisions. The requirement to provide adequate paved access to the Project site 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. With required adherence to County requirements for emergency access, impacts would be less than significant. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

i) The proposed Project would accommodate multi-use trails on the subject property. The Project site is not served by the Regional Transportation Agency (RTA) under existing conditions; therefore, the Project is not required to provide transit support facilities. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not result in conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation, and would not result in a new or more severe impact that was not previously identified in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: EIR 439 identified mitigation measures that would minimize the transportation/traffic impact of SP 327 to the maximum feasible extent. The mitigation measures identified by EIR 439 were modified by Addendum No. 1 to reflect land use design changes that resulted from SP 327A1, current, as-built conditions, and currently applicable County of Riverside road improvement standards and mitigation fee ordinances. These mitigation measures (as modified by Addendum No. 1) would continue to apply to the proposed Project. No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1) are required.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1).

44. Bike Trails	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VII.B, "Parks and Recreation;" SP 327A1; Addendum No. 1; Temescal Canyon Area Plan Figure 8 "Trails and Bikeway System;" Elsinore Area Plan Figure 8 "Trails and Bikeway System;" Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

The proposed Project would implement the approved trail plan for SP 327A1. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, implementation of the SP 327A1 trails plan would not create an inconsistency or conflict with the planned bike trail alignment for the area. Accordingly, the Project would result in a less-than-significant impact to bicycle trails. This finding is consistent with the conclusions of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439
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 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.F, "Water Resources;" Project Application Materials; Addendum No. 1; Water Supply Assessment (Lee Lake Water District, 2013)

Findings of Fact:

a) As discussed in EIR 439, the Lee Lake Water District (LLWD) would provide domestic water service for the Project, treated by existing treatment facilities that do not require expansion to service the Project. The LLWD would also provide recycled water service to the proposed Project; recycled water was not available to the Project site at the time EIR 439 was certified in 2006. Potential physical impacts associated with supplying potable water to a master-planned residential community, including the construction of on- and off-site water conveyance infrastructure and storage tanks, were evaluated as part of EIR 439, which concluded that impacts would be less than significant. Addendum No. 1 concluded that SP 327A1 would provide similar infrastructure improvements as SP 327, including the addition of recycled water infrastructure, and would not result in new or more severe impacts to water utilities above what was previously disclosed in EIR 439. The proposed Project seeks to implement SP 327A1. The infrastructure plan for the Project is consistent with what was disclosed and evaluated in SP 327A1. Accordingly, the construction of infrastructure to serve the Project would not result in a new or more severe impact to the environment than previously disclosed in EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

b) Potential water supply impacts associated with delivering domestic water to the development approved by SP 327 were evaluated as part of EIR 439, which concluded that impacts would be less than significant. As documented in the Water Supply Assessment issued by LLWD for SP327A1, the amount of water demanded by SP327A1 (for which the Project is an implementing action) would be substantially lower than previously estimated for the original SP 327 proposal. Furthermore, the proposed Project is required to implement the most recent version of the California Building Standards Code that requires much more stringent water conservation practices than evaluated by EIR 439. Specifically, the California Building Standards Code requires a 20-percent reduction in indoor water use as compared standard baselines for plumbing fixtures and fittings. The water conservation requirements of the California Building Standards Code are anticipated to further reduce potable water demand above levels disclosed in EIR 439. As such, the proposed Project would result in a measurable decrease in the demand for potable water as disclosed in EIR 439. Sufficient water supplies from existing entitlements or resources are available from LLWD to serve the Project, and new or expanded entitlements would not be needed. As such, impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required. The Project would not result in new or more severe significant impacts to water utilities above what was previously disclosed in EIR 439.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required. All measures identified in EIR 439 to mitigate SP 327's impact to utility and service systems continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

46. Sewer 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VI.F, "Water Resources;" Addendum No. 1; California Building Standards Code; Project Application Materials;

Findings of Fact:

a & b) As discussed in EIR 439, the subject property is located within the wastewater service area of the LLWD. Potential impacts associated with supplying wastewater services to a master-planned residential community, including the construction of wastewater conveyance infrastructure, were evaluated as part of EIR 439, which concluded that SP 327 would result in a significant cumulative impact to LLWD wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities due to a lack of capacity (within a wastewater pumping station along Temescal Canyon Road and at LLWD's Water Reclamation Facility). Mitigation was imposed on SP 327 by EIR 439 to ensure that the Master Developer of SP 327 provide fair share payments for the expansion of the pump station and water treatment facilities. After mitigation, EIR 439 concluded that SP 327 would result in less-than-significant impacts to LLWD wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities.

The proposed Project would be required to comply with the most recent version of the California Building Standards Code, which requires much more stringent water conservation practices than evaluated by EIR 439. Specifically, the California Building Standards Code requires a 20-percent reduction in indoor water use, as compared standard baselines for plumbing fixtures and fittings, which would substantially reduce the amount of wastewater generated by the Project from the levels assumed in EIR 439. As such, the proposed Project would not increase the demand for wastewater services or infrastructure above what was disclosed in EIR 439 and the Project would not result in new or more severe significant impacts to wastewater utilities above what was previously disclosed in EIR 439.

Mitigation: EIR 439 identified mitigation measures that would minimize the impact of SP 327 on utility and service systems to less-than-significant levels. The mitigation measures identified by EIR 439 were modified by Addendum No. 1 to reflect land use design changes that resulted from SP 327A1. These mitigation measures would continue to apply to the proposed Project. No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 (as modified by Addendum No. 1) are required.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439 (as amended by Addendum No. 1).

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: EIR 439, Section VII.I, "Solid Waste;" Addendum No. 1; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a & b) Impacts to solid waste services and landfill capacity were evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 439, which concluded that such impacts would be less than significant. Conditions of approval were applied to SP 327 to ensure that development and long-term operation of the Project site would comply with applicable solid waste statutes and regulations. As disclosed in Addendum No. 1, SP 327A1 would substantially decrease the amount of solid waste that would be generated upon full buildout of the Specific Plan. The proposed Project seeks to implement the land uses of approved SP 327A1, and therefore would generate less solid waste than disclosed in EIR 439. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would result in reduced impacts to solid waste services as compared to EIR 439.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in EIR 439 are required. All measures identified in EIR 439 to mitigate SP 327's impact to utility and service systems continue to apply to the proposed Project.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall occur as specified in EIR 439.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Natural gas?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Communications systems?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Storm water drainage?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Street lighting?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Other governmental services?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: EIR 439, Section VII.H, "Utilities;" California Building Standards Code; Addendum No. 1; Project Application Materials

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Findings of Fact:

a-g) Impacts to utilities were evaluated and disclosed as part of EIR 439, which concluded that physical impacts associated with the provision of utility services to the Project site would occur within the ground disturbance area analyzed by EIR 439 (including off-site utility improvements that would be constructed within the existing public rights-of-ways of developed/paved streets). No other physical impacts would have the potential to occur. Addendum No. 1 concluded that the installation of utilities to serve SP 327A1 would result in similar impact as disclose in EIR 439. The proposed Project seeks to implement a portion of SP 327A1, and the utilities required to serve the Project are similar to those previously evaluated in EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not create any new or more severe significant impacts related to the installation and use of utilities. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required, which is similar to the conclusion of EIR 439 and Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

49. Energy Conservation a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: EIR 439, Section VII.H, "Utilities;" Addendum No. 1; California Building Standards Code; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

The proposed Project would not conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans. The proposed Project would be required to comply with the most recent version of the California Building Standards Code, which required much more stringent energy efficiency practices (the use of energy efficient appliances and building materials, lower water usage, and landfill waste diversion/recycling, etc.) than assumed by EIR 439. Mandatory compliance with the California Building Standards Code would further decrease the Project's energy demand below levels disclosed in EIR 439. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not create a substantial conflict with adopted energy conservation plans and impacts would be less than significant, which is consistent with the conclusion of EIR 439 or Addendum No. 1.

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

OTHER				
50. Other:	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Staff review

Findings of Fact:

There are no other impacts identified.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Monitoring: Monitoring is not required.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

51.	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

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, to a greater degree than previously disclosed in EIR 439.

52.	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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The proposed Project does not create any additional impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable, beyond those disclosed in EIR 439.

53.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The proposed Project would not result in new or more severe environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly beyond those disclosed in EIR 439.

	Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

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: Final EIR No. 439 (SCH No. 2001121105)
Addendum No. 1 to Final EIR No. 439

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

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.

VIII. DOCUMENT PREPARERS

County of Riverside
Matt Straite

T&B Planning
Tracy Zinn, AICP
David Ornelas

VIII. REFERENCES

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

Cited As:	**Source:**
1996 SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan	*1996 Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide.* Southern California Association of Governments. 1996.
1997 SCAQMD AQMP	*1997 Air Quality Management Plan.* South Coast Air Quality Management District. November 15, 1996. http://www.aqmd.gov/aqmp/97aqmp/index.html

Cited As:	**Source:**
Addendum No. 1 and Addendum No. 1 Appendices	*Addendum No. 1 to Final EIR No. 439*. Approved November 25, 2104.
California Building Standards Code	California Code of Regulations, Title 24, "California Building Standards Code" as in effect as of January 1, 2014.
California Scenic Highway Program	California Department of Transportation. "California Scenic Highway Program: Eligible (E) and Officially Designated (OD) Routes." Web. Available: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/cahisys.htm>. Accessed: October 6, 2014.
California Water Resources Control Board List of Active Cease and Desist Orders and Cleanup Abatement Orders	California Water Resources Control Board. "List of 'Active' Cease and Desist Orders and Cleanup Abatement Orders." Web. Available: http://www.calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/default.htm. Accessed: October 6, 2014.
California Water Resources Control Board List of Solid Waste Disposal Sites	California Environmental Protection Agency. "Sites Identified with Waste Constituents above Hazardous Waste Levels Outside the Waste Management Unit." Web. Available: http://www.calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/CurrentList.pdf. Accessed: October 6, 2014.
City of Corona General Plan	*City of Corona General Plan*. City of Corona, March 2004.
City of Lake Elsinore General Plan	*City of Lake Elsinore General Plan*. City of Lake Elsinore, December 2011.
Congestion Management Program	*2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program*. Riverside County Transportation Commission. December 14, 2011.
County General Plan	*County of Riverside General Plan*. Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency, October 2003.
County General Plan EIR	*General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report*. County of Riverside Transportation and Land Management Agency, Planning Department. Certified October 7, 2003 (SCH No. 2002051143).
CREED v. City of San Diego	*Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development v. City of San Diego*, 196 Cal. App. 4th 515 (2011).
CSA 152B Park and Recreation Master Plan	*County of Riverside Park and Recreation Master Plan County Services Area 152B*. Purkiss-Rose RSI, November 2004.
EnviroStor Database	EnviroStor Database. California Department of Toxic Substances Control.

		Potentially Significant New Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Impact Fully Analyzed in EIR 439

Cited As:	**Source:**
	Web. Available: http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public. Accessed: October 6, 2014.
EIR 439 and EIR 439 Appendices	*Final Environmental Impact Report No. 439 (SCH No. 2001121105) for the Toscana Specific Plan.* Certified December 2006.
Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program	"Riverside County Important Farmland 2010." California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, January 2012.
Findings and Statement of Facts, Statement of Overriding Considerations for EIR No. 439	Contained within Riverside County Resolution No. 2006-463 Certifying Environmental Impact Report No. 439 and Adopting Specific Plan No. 327(Toscana). Adopted December 2006.
Fire Protection Plan	*Toscana Phase 1 Tentative TM 36593 Conceptual Fire Protection Plan.* Firewise 2000, February 25, 2014. (Appendix C)
GeoTracker Database	GeoTracker. Web. California Water Resources Control Board. https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov
Greenhouse Gas Reduction Memorandum	*Toscana Specific Plan No. 327 Supplemental Greenhouse Gas Assessment.* Urban Crossroads. October 9, 2014 (Appendix G).
Google Earth	Google Earth. Vers. 7.1.2.2041. Computer software. Google, 2013.
Noise Impact Analysis	*TTM No. 36593 Noise Impact Analysis.* Urban Crossroads. November 20, 2013. (Appendix E)
Ord. No. 460	Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, Subdivision Regulations.
Ord. No. 461	Riverside County Ordinance No. 461, Road Improvement Standards & Specifications
Ord. No. 484	Riverside County Ordinance No. 484, Sand Blowing.
Ord. No. 625	Riverside County Ordinance No. 625, Agricultural Activities for Nuisance Defenses.
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.
Ord. No. 915	Riverside County Ordinance No. 915, Regulating Outdoor Lighting

Cited As:	Source:
Preliminary Drainage Study	*Preliminary Drainage Study Tentative Tract Map No. 36593*. Proactive Engineering Consultants. September 2013. (Appendix D)
Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation	*Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation TTM 36593*. Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, Inc. November 8, 2013. (Appendix A1)
Preliminary WQMP	*Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan, Toscana – Phase 1*. Proactive Engineering Consultants. September 25, 2013. (Appendix B)
Project Application Materials	TR36593, as on file with the Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency
RCLIS	Riverside County Land Information System. Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency. http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rclis/index.html
Resolution No. 2006-463	Riverside County Resolution No. 2006-463 Certifying Environmental Impact Report No. 439 and Adopting Specific Plan No. 327 (Toscana). Adopted December 2006.
SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)	*Final 2012 Air Quality Management Plan.* South Coast Air Quality Management District, February 2013. http://www.aqmd.gov/aqmp/2012aqmp/Final-February2013/index.html
SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook	*CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. South Coast Air Quality Management District. April 1993, with November 1993 Update.
SCAQMD Rule 1113	South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113, Architectural Coatings, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
SP 327A1	Toscana Specific Plan (Specific Plan 327, Amendment No. 1). Approved November 25, 2014 (Adopted December 9, 2014).
Supplemental Geotechnical Analysis	*Supplemental Geotechnical Analysis 1.5:1 Fill Slopes, Toscana Project*. Advanced Geotechnical Solutions. May 28, 2014) (Appendix A2).
Traffic Impact Analysis	*Tentative Tract Map No. 36593 Traffic Impact Analysis*. Urban Crossroads. June 24, 2014. (Appendix F)
Western Riverside County Growth Forecasts 2010-2035	*Western Riverside County Growth Forecasts 2010-2035*. Western Riverside Council of Governments. www.wrcog.cog.ca.us/downloads/Revised%20WRCOG20GF%20From%20SCAG%20092211.pdf
Western Riverside County MSHCP	*Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan*. Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency, June 2003.

III. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

III. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for EIR 439 included mitigation measures from the County General Plan EIR (EIR 441). Mitigation measures from the County General Plan EIR that do not require the Toscana Project Applicant or the County of Riverside to implement project-specific action(s) to avoid or lessen a unique environmental effect, references to those County General Plan EIR mitigation measures have been removed from the MMRP Table, below.

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	Specific Action to be Taken	Time Frame	Responsible Party	
VI.A Geology and Seismicity					
Project implementation (including grading and earth-moving of up to 9 million cubic yards of earth) will alter site topography and surface geology. Project will also result in the introduction of people and property to a region subject to seismic activity, resulting in an increased number of persons and property exposed to risk of damage, injury or loss of life in the event of an earthquake.	**Measures from EIR No. 441 for the Riverside County General Plan**				Less than Significant
	4.10.1A: Before a project is approved or otherwise permitted within a State Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Faulting Zone (A-P Zone), County Fault Zone, within 150 feet of any other active or potentially active fault mapped in a published United States Geologic Survey (USGS) or California Geologic Survey (CGS) reports, or within other potential earthquake hazard area (as deter-mined by the County Geologist), a site-specific geologic investigation shall be prepared to assess potential seismic hazards resulting from development of the project site. Where and when required, the geotechnical investigation shall address the issue(s), hazard(s), and geographic area(s) determined by the County Geologist to be relevant to each development. The site-specific geotechnical investigation shall incorporate up-to-date data from government and non-government sources. Based on the site-specific geotechnical investigation, no structures intended for human occupancy shall be constructed across active faults. This site-specific evaluation and written report shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to the	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department and County Geologist shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.10.1A.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department County Geologist	

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	**Specific Action to be Taken**	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Party**	
	issuance of building permits. If an active fault is discovered, any structure intended for human occupancy shall be set back at least 50 feet from the fault. A larger or smaller setback may be established if such a setback is supported by adequate evidence as presented to and accepted by the County Geologist.				
	4.10.2A: The design and construction of structures and facilities shall adhere to the standards and requirements detailed in the California Building Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24), County Building Code, and/or professional engineering standards appropriate for the seismic zone in which such construction may occur. Conformance with these design standards shall be enforced through building plan review and approval by the Riverside County Department of Building and Safety prior to the issuance of building permits for any structure or facility.	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.10.2A.	Prior to issuance of building permits.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	
	4.10.2B: As determined by the County Geologist, a site-specific assessment shall be prepared to ascertain potential ground shaking impacts resulting from development. The site-specific ground shaking assessment shall incorporate up-to-date data from government and non-government sources and may be included as part of any site-specific geotechnical investigation required in Mitigation Measure 4.10.1A. The site-specific ground shaking assessment shall include specific measures to reduce the significance of potential ground shaking hazards. This site-specific ground shaking assessment shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits.	The Riverside County Geologist shall review all the ground-shaking assessment for compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.10.2B.	Prior to issuance of building permits	Riverside County Building and Safety Department County Geologist	

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	Specific Action to be Taken	Time Frame	Responsible Party	
VI.B Soils, Slopes and Erosion					
Project implementation will disturb soils and bedrock, alter slopes and topography, and increase areas exposed to soil erosion (both through water and wind).	**Measures from EIR No. 441 for the Riverside County General Plan**				Less than Significant
	4.10.7A: Proponents of new development within Riverside County shall adhere to applicable policies and standards of the California Building Code related to the construction of structures and facilities on expansive soils.	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.10.7A.	Prior to issuance of building permits.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	
	4.10.9A: Riverside County, where required, and in accordance with issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, shall require the construction and/or grading contractor for individual developments to establish and implement specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) at time of project implementation.	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.10.9A.	Prior to issuance of building permits.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	
	4.10.9B: Prior to any development within the County, a Grading Plan shall be submitted to the Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside County Geologist for review and approval. As required by the County, the grading plan shall include erosion and sediment control plans. Measures included in individual erosion control plans may include, but shall not be limited to, the following: (a) Grading and development plans shall be designed in a manner which minimizes the amount of terrain modification. (b) Surface water shall be controlled and diverted around potential landslide areas to prevent erosion and saturation of slopes. (c) Structures shall not be sited on or below identified landslides unless slides are stabilized.	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department and County Geologist shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.10.9B.	Prior to issuance of grading building permit.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department County Geologist	

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	**Specific Action to be Taken**	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Party**	
	(d) The extent and duration of ground disturbing activities during and immediately following periods of rain shall be limited, to avoid the potential for erosion which may be accelerated by rainfall on exposed soils. (e) To the extent possible, the amount of cut and fill shall be balanced. (f) The amount of water entering and exiting a graded site shall be limited though the placement of interceptor trenches or other erosion control devices. (g) Erosion and sediment control plans shall be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits.				
	4.10.9C: Where required, drainage design measures shall be incorporated into the final design of individual projects onsite. These measures shall include, but will not be limited to: (a) Runoff entering developing areas shall be collected into surface and subsurface drains for removal to nearby drainages. (b) Runoff generated above steep slopes or poorly vegetated areas shall be captured and conveyed to nearby drainages. (c) Runoff generated on paved or covered areas shall be conveyed via swales and drains to natural drainage courses. (d) Disturbed areas that have been identified as highly erosive shall be revegetated.	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.10.9C.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	**Specific Action to be Taken**	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Party**	
	(e) Irrigation systems shall be designed, installed, and maintained in a manner which minimizes runoff. (f) The landscape scheme for projects within the project site shall utilize drought- tolerant plants. (g) Erosion control devices such as rip-rap, gabions, small check dams, etc., may be utilized in gullies and active stream channels to reduce erosion.				
VI.C Hydrology, Flooding and Drainage					
Project implementation will alter drainage and runoff patterns on site and down-stream, create non-permeable surfaces that will contribute to increased flow rates, and require alterations within the 100-year flood plain associated with Temescal Wash.	**Measures from EIR No. 441 for the Riverside County General Plan**				Less than Significant
	4.9.1C: Riverside County shall not necessarily require all land uses to withstand flooding. Some development may be compatible within floodplains and floodways, as may some other land uses. For these land uses, flows shall not be obstructed and upstream and downstream properties shall not be adversely affected by increased velocities, erosion backwater effects or concentration of flows, and adverse impacts to water quality from point and non-point sources of pollution.	The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.9.1C.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.	
	4.9.1.D: Riverside County shall generally require the 10-year flood flows to be contained within the top of curbs and the 100-year flood flows within the street rights-of-way.	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.9.1D.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	**Specific Action to be Taken**	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Party**	
	4.9.2A: Riverside County shall require that all structures (residential, commercial, and industrial) be flood-proofed from the 100-year storm flows. In some cases, this may involve elevating the finished floor more than 1 foot.	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.9.2A.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	
	4.9.2D: Provided the applicant does hydrological studies, engineers structures to be safe from flooding and provides evidence that the structures will not adversely impact the floodplain, Riverside County may allow development into the floodway fringe.	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.9.2D.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	
	4.17.4A: Where development may interfere with, disrupt, or otherwise affect surface or subsurface hydrologic baseline conditions (as determined by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the California Department of Fish and Game, and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board), preparation of a project specific hydrologic study shall be required. The hydrologic study shall include (but shall not be limited to): an inventory of surface and subsurface hydrologic conditions existing at the time of the study; an analysis of how the proposed development would affect these hydrologic baseline conditions; and specific measures to limit or eliminate the interference or disruption of onsite hydrologic	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.17.4A.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District U.S Army Corps of Engineers Cal. Dept. of Fish & Wildlife Regional Water Quality Control Board	

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	**Specific Action to be Taken**	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Party**	
	process. The hydrologic study shall evaluate the feasibility of incorporating bioengineering measures into any project that may alter the hydrologic process. Where required by the County, the hydrologic study shall include analysis of, at an equal level of detail, potential impacts to tributary or downstream areas. The hydrologic study shall be submitted to the County or responsible entity for review and shall be approved prior to the issuance of any entitlement that would result in the physical modification of the project site.				
	4.17.4B: The project applicant shall submit to the County for review and approval, evidence that the specific measures to limit or eliminate the disruption or interference to the hydrologic process resulting from the entire development process, will be implemented as set forth in the hydrologic study. Such evidence may take the form of (but shall not be limited to): a development agreement; land banking; the provision of adequate funds to guarantee the construction, maintenance or restoration of hydrologic features; or any other mechanism that will achieve said goals. Said evidence shall be submitted and approved prior to the issuance of any entitlement that would result in the physical modification of the project site.	The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.17.4B.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	
	4.17.4C: Where determined feasible by the County or responsible entity, bioengineering measures shall be incorporated into any project that may alter the hydrologic process.	The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.17.4C.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	Specific Action to be Taken	Time Frame	Responsible Party	
VI.D Noise					
Project implementation and operation will result in increased ambient noise levels in the region and expose persons onsite and off to increased noise levels. Regional ambient noise level increases will be primarily due to increased vehicle traffic associated with the project. Project will also introduce sensitive receptors (homes) into a previously undeveloped area.	**Measures from EIR No. 441 for the Riverside County General Plan** **4.13.1A:** Prior to the issuance of any grading plans, the County shall condition approval of subdivisions adjacent to any developed/ occupied noise-sensitive land uses by requiring applicants to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the County for review and approval. The plan should depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of the project through the use of such methods as: (a) The construction contractor shall use temporary noise attenuation fences where feasible to reduce construction noise impacts on adjacent noise sensitive land uses. (b) During all project site excavation and grading onsite, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards. The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site. (c) The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction. (d) The construction contractor shall limit all construction-related activities that would result in high noise levels to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. No	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.13.1A.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	Less than Significant

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	**Specific Action to be Taken**	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Party**	
	construction shall be allowed on Sundays and public holidays.				
	4.13.1B: The required construction-related noise mitigation plan shall also specify that haul truck deliveries be subject to the same hours specified for construction equipment. Additionally, the plan shall denote any construction traffic haul routes where heavy trucks would exceed 100 daily trips (counting those both to and from the construction site). To the extent feasible, the plan shall denote haul routes that do not pass sensitive land uses or residential dwellings. Lastly, the construction-related noise mitigation plan shall incorporate any other restrictions imposed by County staff.	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.13.1B.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	
	4.13.2A: All new residential developments within the County shall conform to a noise exposure standard of 65 dBA Ldn for outdoor noise in noise-sensitive outdoor activity areas and 45 dBA Ldn for indoor noise in bedrooms and living/family rooms. New development, which does not and cannot be made to conform to this standard, shall not be permitted.	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.13.2A.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department Riverside County Planning Department	
	4.13.2B: Acoustical studies, describing how the exterior and interior noise standards will be met, shall be required for all new residential developments with a noise exposure greater than 65 dBA Ldn. The studies shall also satisfy the requirements set forth in Title 24, Part 2, or the California Administrative Code, Noise Insulation Standards, for multiple family attached homes, hotels, motels, etc., regulated by Title 24. No development permits or approval of land use applications shall be issued until an acoustic analysis is received and approved by the County Planning Department.	The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall review all development proposals to verify compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.13.2B.	Implementing project approval and as required in the Conditions of Approval.	Riverside County Planning Department	

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	**Specific Action to be Taken**	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Party**	
	Project Specific Mitigation Measures				
	N-1: Prior to issuance of any building permits for Lots 2-27 in Planning Area 5, a six-foot tall noise barrier shall be constructed along the lot boundary facing I-15. The noise barrier may consist of any material (block, tempered glass, earthen berm, etc.) or combination of materials that attenuates noise levels to 65 dBA CNEL or lower within the private exterior areas (i.e., front, side, or back yards) of the above-listed residential lots.	Prior to issuance of building permits for the residentia lots listed in Mitigation Measure N-1, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure the required noise barrier is constructed.	Prior to the issuance of building permits for the residential lots listed in Mitigation Measure N-1.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	
	N-2: Prior to issuance of any building permits for Lots 8-16, 31-32 in Planning Area 2, Lots 49-62 in Planning Area 3, and Lots 23-31 in Planning Area 4, a six-foot tall noise barrier shall be constructed along the lot boundary facing Temescal Hills Drive. The noise barrier may consist of any material (block, tempered glass, earthen berm, etc.) or combination of materials that attenuates noise levels to 65 dBA CNEL or lower within the private exterior areas (i.e., front, side, or back yards) of the above-listed residential lots.	Prior to issuance of building permits for the residentia lots listed in Mitigation Measure N-2, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure the required noise barrier is constructed.	Prior to the issuance of building permits for the residential lots listed in Mitigation Measure N-2.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	
	N-3: Prior to issuance of building permits for Lots 1-16 in Planning Area 1, Lots 103-106 in Planning Area 3, and Lot 80 in Planning Area 5, a six-foot tall noise barrier shall be constructed along the lot boundary facing Toscana Drive. The noise barrier may consist of any material (block, tempered glass, earthen berm, etc.) or combination of materials that attenuates noise levels to 65 dBA CNEL or lower within the private exterior areas (i.e., front, side, or back yards) of the above-listed residential lots.	Prior to issuance of building permits for the residentia lots listed in Mitigation Measure N-3, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure the required noise barrier is constructed.	Prior to the issuance of building permits for the residential lots listed in Mitigation Measure N-3.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	
	N-4: Prior to final building permit final inspection, for Lots 1-16, 95, 163-169 in Planning Area 1, Lots 1-16, 31-32 in Planning Area 2, Lots 49-64, 94-102 in Planning Area 3, Lots 1, 20-57 in Planning Area	Prior to final building permit inspection for the residential lots listed in Mitigation Measure N-4,	Prior to final building permit inspection for the residential lots	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	**Specific Action to be Taken**	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Party**	
	4, and Lots 2-27, 80-83 in Planning Area 5 shall incorporate building materials that will achieve interior noise levels less than 45 dBA CNEL. Building materials that would facilitate compliance with the 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard, include, but are not limited to, dual-glazed windows and a means of "windows closed" mechanical ventilation (e.g., air conditioning).	the Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure that adequate noise attenuating building materials have been installed.	listed in Mitigation Measure N-4.		
	N-5: Prior to any building permit final inspection, an interior noise analysis shall be completed to the satisfaction of the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health, Industrial Hygiene Division demonstrating that proposed residential construction will achieve interior noise levels less than 45 dBA.	Prior to any building permit final inspection, the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health, Industrial Hygiene Division shall ensure that interior noise levels do not exceed 45 dBA.	Prior to any final building permit inspection.	Riverside County Department of Environmental Health, Industrial Hygiene Division	
VI.E Air Quality					
Project construction will generate construction-related emissions (ROG, NOx, CO and PM10). Project will exceed the SCAQMD daily thresholds of significance for ROG, NOx, CO, and PM10 during ongoing project operations.	**Measures from EIR No. 441 for the Riverside County General Plan**				Construction Emissions: Less than Significant Operational Emissions: Significant and Unavoidable
	4.5.1A - Applicable Rule 403 Measures: Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more). (a) Water active sites at least twice daily. (Locations where grading is to occur will be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving). (b) All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer). (c) Pave construction access roads at least 100 feet onto the site from main road.	The project proponent shall incorporate Mitigation Measure 4.5.1A in the Construction Contractor's grading plans and submit said grading plans to the County for review and approval.	Prior to issuance of grading permit.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	**Specific Action to be Taken**	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Party**	
	(d) Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.				
	4.5.1B - Additional SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* Dust Measures: (a) Revegetate disturbed areas as quickly as possible. (b) All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph. (c) All streets shall be swept once a day if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water). (d) Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.	The project proponent shall incorporate Mitigation Measure 4.5.1B in the Construction Contractor's grading plans and submit said grading plans to the County for review and approval.	Prior to issuance of grading permit.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	
	4.5.1C - Mitigation Measures for Construction Equipment and Vehicles Exhaust Emissions: (a) The Construction Contractor shall select the construction equipment used on site based on low emission factors and high energy efficiency. (b) The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. (c) The Construction Contractor shall utilize electric- or diesel-powered equipment, in lieu of gasoline-powered engines, where feasible.	The project proponent shall incorporate Mitigation Measure 4.5.1C in the Construction Contractor's grading plans and submit said grading plans to the County for review and approval.	Prior to issuance of grading permit.	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	Specific Action to be Taken	Time Frame	Responsible Party	
	(d) The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period will be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time. (e) The Construction Contractor shall time the construction activities so as to not interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flag-person shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways. (f) The Construction Contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew. (g) Dust generated by the development activities shall be retained onsite, and kept to a minimum by following the dust control measures listed below: (i) During clearing, grading, earthmoving, excavation or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease. (ii) During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At minimum, this includes wetting down such areas in the late morning, after work is completed for the day, and whenever wind exceeds 15 mph.				

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	**Specific Action to be Taken**	**Time Frame**	**Responsible Party**	
	(iii) Immediately after clearing, grading, earthmoving or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur. (iv) Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. (v) Trucks carrying soil, sand, cut or fill materials, and/or construction debris to or from the site shall have their payloads covered with a tarp from the point of origin during offsite transportation.				
	Project Specific Mitigation Measures				
	AQ-1: Non-toxic soil stabilizers shall be applied to inactive graded areas as needed to minimize dust.	The project proponent shall incorporate Mitigation Measure AQ-1 in the Construction Contractor's grading plans and submit said grading plans to the County for review and approval.	Prior to issuance of grading permit.	Riverside County Building & Safety Dept.	
	AQ-2: Water exposed grading areas twice per day and replace ground cover in disturbed areas quickly.	The project proponent shall incorporate Mitigation Measure AQ-2 in the Construction Contractor's grading plans and submit said grading plans to the County for review and approval.	Prior to issuance of grading permit.	Riverside County Building & Safety Dept.	
	AQ-3: Use cooled exhaust gas recirculation (EGR) equipment for both on-road and off-road construction vehicles and equipment.	The project proponent shall incorporate Mitigation Measure AQ-3 in the	Prior to issuance of grading permit.	Riverside County Building & Safety Dept.	

Impact	Mitigation Associated with the Impact				Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure(s)	Specific Action to be Taken	Time Frame	Responsible Party	
		Construction Contractor's grading plans and submit said grading plans to the County for review and approval.			
	AQ-4: Use alternative fuels, such as ultra-low sulfur diesel fuels for off-road construction vehicles and equipment, where possible.	The project proponent shall incorporate Mitigation Measure AQ-4 in the Construction Contractor's grading plans and submit said grading plans to the County for review and approval.	Prior to issuance of grading permit.	Riverside County Building & Safety Dept.	
	AQ-5: Perform regularly scheduled equipment maintenance to minimize equipment emissions.	The project proponent shall incorporate Mitigation Measure AQ-5 in the Construction Contractor's grading plans and submit said grading plans to the County for review and approval.	Prior to issuance of grading permit.	Riverside County Building & Safety Dept.	
	AQ-6: A phased approach shall be followed for the application of architectural coatings, thereby limiting the amount of architectural coating emissions (mainly off-gassing of volatile organic compounds [VOC], also known as reactive organic compounds [ROC]) by limiting application of architectural coatings to 225 gallons per week or less.	The project proponent shall incorporate Mitigation Measures AQ-6 in the Construction Contractor's building plans and submit said building plans to the County for review and approval.	Prior to issuance of building permit.	Riverside County Building & Safety Dept.	
	AQ-7: Use water-based low-VOC (ROC) emission asphalt sealers to reduce off-gassing and odors associated with new asphalt on new asphalt streets and parking areas.	The project proponent shall incorporate Mitigation Measure AQ-7 in the Construction Contractor's building plans and submit	Prior to issuance of building permit.	Riverside County Building & Safety Dept.	