

1 approximately 655 square feet of library space and an additional
2 3,273 volumes will be needed to support the project. Currently,
3 Perris Library, which serves the project area, is approximately 2,172
4 square feet and contains 80,000 volumes. Therefore, the increase in
5 residents associated with the Project build-out would significantly
6 affect existing library facilities and services.

7 In order to reduce impacts associated with additional residents
8 increasing the demand on the local library system, Riverside County
9 Ordinance No. 659.7 sets forth a fee for residential projects of is
10 \$341 per single-family dwelling unit and \$286 per multi-family
11 dwelling unit. This fee pays for library materials only, and not the
12 acquisition and construction of additional library facilities. The
13 project Proponent will be required to pay this development impact
14 fee, which is considered sufficient to reduce impacts to library
15 facilities and/or services to less than significant levels.

16 Cumulatively, the Project, in conjunction with other projects
17 anticipated within the Elsinore Area Plan (EAP), will generate
18 demand for Library Services in excess of what the local library
19 system is presently able to accommodate. The payment of library
20 impact fees commensurate with each project's level of impact is
21 considered adequate fair share contribution to mitigate both Project,
22 and cumulative impacts associated with development, which leads to
23 a determination of less than significant impacts.

24 e. Health Services

25 The Project is anticipated to generate a new population of 1,309
26 persons. Currently, the County of Riverside has been identified as
27 having adequate facilities and Health Services for its population, but
28

1 the Project includes a General Plan Amendment that will allow an
2 increase in population within the Community of Meadowbrook. This
3 combined with cumulative growth forecasts in the Project area will
4 result in the population in this portion of the County to be higher
5 than anticipated in the County's General Plan. Therefore, the Project
6 will create a need for medical services, which was not anticipated in
7 the General Plan.

8 Since the Project may include land uses that will allow medical
9 offices and urgent care clinics, local medical services may be
10 provided within the project in response to free market demand.
11 Hospital beds and major facilities, such as trauma units and
12 emergency rooms, are not allowed within the Project. However,
13 there is one hospital and three medical clinics within approximately
14 ten miles of the project site. This fact coupled with the Periodic
15 Medical Needs Assessment, which is required by Mitigation
16 Measure 4.15.7A of the County General Plan EIR, can ensure that
17 adequate medical services are available to the project residents.
18 Based on this analysis, the potential adverse impacts related to
19 medical services are considered less than significant.

20 The Project, in conjunction with other projects anticipated within the
21 Elsinore Area Plan (EAP) will generate a population that is
22 anticipated to incrementally increase the need for Health Service
23 facilities. The County has established a structure to expand health
24 service facilities based on future identified demand and the Project
25 will generate future funds that can be used to support this effort.
26 Project impacts will be considered less than significant. This is
27 considered adequate fair share contribution to cumulative impacts
28

1 associated with development, which leads to a determination of less
2 than significant impact to Health Services.

3 2. Mitigation:

4 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
5 significant impacts by the following mitigation measure:

- 6 a. 5.13.3-1: To assure that the future project development incorporates
7 defensible space concepts, the design of each tract shall be reviewed
8 with the Sheriff Department prior to submittal of any tract maps,
9 conditional use permits or other entitlements.

10 M. Recreation

11 1. Impacts:

12 The following is the formula used to determine the recreational facilities
13 generated by a Project residential population of 1,309 residents, at 5 acres
14 per 1,000 residents:

15 $243 \text{ units} \times 3.01 \text{ persons/house} = 731 \text{ residents}$

16 $247 \text{ units} \times 2.34 \text{ persons/house} = 578 \text{ residents}$

17 $(1,309/1000) \times 5 = 6.6 \text{ acres}$

18 As a general planning "rule of thumb," a project should provide
19 approximately five acres of park and recreational area per 1,000 persons.
20 With a forecast population of 1,309 persons, total acreage of park and
21 recreation area should encompass approximately 6.6 acres.

22 A total of approximately 10.0 acres of active park area will be implemented
23 in conjunction with the Project. In addition, the Project includes passive
24 open space to be utilized for hiking and viewing and other passive activities,
25 of approximately 40.4 acres. Based on the amount of recreational area and
26 related facilities that will be incorporated into the Project, the Project has no
27 potential to cause any significant adverse effects on recreational demand by
28

1 the Project and other projects in the area. However, the construction of the
2 proposed recreational facilities will require grading with associated
3 unavoidable significant adverse air quality impacts in the short term. No
4 other potential significant physical effects have been identified with use of
5 approximately 48.8 acres (or 38.6% of the Project site) of park/open space
6 areas designated for recreational facilities in SP 364.

7 The Project is located within an area where Quimby Act fees could apply.
8 However, the Project proposes to install park and recreation resources for
9 the residents of the Project. Based on the provision of these park and
10 recreation facilities, the Project is fully consistent with this significance
11 threshold and no adverse impacts are forecast to result if the project is
12 implemented as proposed. A final determination regarding fees and park
13 and recreation resources will occur at the time the Project is implemented,
14 but the facts support a finding that the proposed park and recreation
15 resources are adequate.

16 The provision of on-site park and recreation facilities will ensure that the
17 existing facilities will not incur substantial physical deterioration. The
18 Fiscal Impact Analysis for the Project indicates that adequate recurring
19 financial resources will be available to support the on-site recreation
20 facilities. Any impacts are considered less than significant and no additional
21 mitigation is required.

22 A comprehensive trail system is planned within SP 364, and connects
23 residential neighborhoods to the parks, recreational areas, mixed-use area
24 and off-site existing and proposed trails. There are two types of Regional
25 Trails – Urban and Open Space. Regional Trails are located within PA4a,
26 PA4b, PA6, and PA7, and connect off-site at the southeastern and
27 northwestern portions of the Project.
28

1 Cumulatively, the Project, in conjunction with other projects anticipated
2 within the Meadowbrook Community will generate a population that is
3 anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing local park and recreation
4 facilities. The Project will provide active and passive park and recreation
5 facilities as well as a regional trail (a total of approximately 10.0 acres of
6 active park area will be implemented in conjunction with the Project). In
7 addition, the Project includes passive open space to be utilized for hiking
8 and viewing and other passive activities (approximately 40.4 acres) that
9 exceeds the requirement of the Project. This is considered a beneficial
10 fair share contribution to cumulative impacts associated with future
11 development, which results in a determination of less than significant
12 impact to Recreation resources.

13 2. Mitigation:

14 No mitigation is required.

15 N. Transportation and Traffic

16 1. Impacts:

17 The Project will contribute to the generation of additional traffic on local
18 and regional roadways. The County has indicated that, due to their
19 intersection spacing criterion, the southerly Project intersection should not
20 be a signalized intersection with full-turning movements. Instead the
21 County Traffic Engineer has conditioned this Project Access to be restricted
22 to right-in/right-out turning movements, (enforced with a raised median)
23 while maintaining the existing southbound left-in and westbound left-out
24 from Richard Street. The Project Access will be stop controlled. Based on
25 the information contained in Table 5.15-2, Existing Plus Ambient Growth
26 Plus Project Intersection Delay and Level of Service, and Table 5.15-4,
27 Existing Plus Ambient Growth Plus Project Plus Cumulative Projects
28

1 Intersection Delay and Level of Service, this intersection is projected to
2 operate at an acceptable Levels of Service.

3 Approval of SP No. 364 will not result in inadequate parking capacity, as
4 the SP No. 364 document in and of itself does not generate any parking
5 needs. Short-term construction (grading and building) of SP No. 364 will
6 not result in any significant impacts that would result in inadequate parking
7 capacity. There are sufficient areas within the Project site that can be used
8 for parking and staging during the construction phase of the Project. In
9 addition, long-term implementation of the Project will not result in
10 inadequate parking capacity. SP 364, as well as County of Riverside
11 Ordinance No. 348 contain parking standards that will be required for any
12 future development. Adherence to these standards will ensure that future
13 uses will provide adequate parking. Therefore, any impacts will be
14 considered less than significant and no additional mitigation will be
15 required.

16 The Project will not create any roadways or road improvements that could
17 increase hazards to a circulation system design feature (e.g., sharp curves or
18 dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment). To the
19 contrary, roadway improvements to area roadways, as a result of
20 implementation of the Project, will reduce hazards in the area. The
21 roadways will all be designed to meet all Riverside County Transportation
22 requirements. Impacts will be considered less than significant and no
23 additional mitigation is required. Since there are no agricultural uses in the
24 immediate Project are, no impacts to farm equipment are anticipated.

25 The Project may affect the operation of the immediate circulation network,
26 as it is adjacent to SR 74, as well as several local roadways. Any impacts
27 during the construction phase of the Project will be short-term and
28

1 considered less than significant. Mitigation Measure 5.15-5 (below) will be
2 implemented to ensure that Project impacts during construction will remain
3 less than significant. Operational impacts will also be considered less than
4 significant, as all roadway improvements will be constructed in accordance
5 with the County standards. No additional mitigation is required.

6 Development of the Project will result in the need for new roads (the
7 widening of expansion of SR 74 along the Project frontage and on-site
8 streets. These improvements will be made by the Project developer.
9 According to the Project's Fiscal Impact Analysis annual recurring revenues
10 to the County General Fund at Project buildout will equal \$1,264,978
11 compared to recurring fiscal costs of \$1,004,149, a net benefit to the County
12 of approximately \$260,838. Roadway maintenance and traffic signal
13 maintenance were factored into the recurring fiscal costs. Since the Project
14 will operate with a net benefit to the County, any impacts will be considered
15 less than significant. No additional mitigation is required. A copy of the FIA
16 is provided in Volume 2, Technical Appendices, to the DEIR.

17 All access to the Project will be designed and installed per County of
18 Riverside standards. Since the Project will meet this criterion,
19 implementation of the Project will not result in inadequate emergency
20 access or access to nearby uses. No impacts are anticipated and no
21 mitigation is required.

22 Both regional and community trails have been provided as part of the
23 Project. These trails are intended for "multi-use," which would not preclude
24 them being used as bike trails. These trails, in addition to the ability to ride
25 bicycles within the Project will be supportive of the policies of alternative
26 transportation.

1 Implementation of the SP will help support and foster alternative
2 transportation methods within and to and from the community. Any impacts
3 are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

4 The analysis contained in the transportation impact analysis (TIA) for the
5 Project determined that roadway improvements in the study area are not
6 needed either with or without the Project.

7 Cumulatively, based on careful evaluation of the timing of area planned
8 road improvement, the improvements required to address cumulative traffic
9 and circulation system effects are currently in place, and the Project will
10 need to make limited improvements on-site to mitigate Project-specific
11 impacts during the short-term and at buildout. Therefore, the Project is not
12 forecast to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the further
13 decline in the level of service at the identified study area intersections.

14 In 2002, the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program was
15 initiated in Western Riverside County. Under the TUMF, developers of
16 residential, industrial and commercial property are required to pay a
17 development fee to fund regional transportation projects, which mitigates
18 cumulative impacts to the roadway segments and intersections included in
19 the TUMF program. The TUMF funds both local and regional arterial
20 projects. The applicant shall participate in the funding or construction of
21 off-site improvements, including traffic signals that are needed to serve
22 cumulative traffic conditions through the payment of required Western
23 Riverside County TUMF, in addition to the County of Riverside
24 Development Impact Fee (DIF) and other fair share contributions as
25 directed by the County, including any future Road Bridge Building District.
26 The Project's contribution to the TUMF program as a fair share contribution
27 is considered sufficient to address the Project's fair share toward a
28

1 mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate any potential
2 cumulative impacts.

3 2. Mitigation:

4 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
5 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

- 6 a. 5.15-1: Construct SR-74 from the north Project boundary to the
7 south Project boundary at its ultimate half-section width as an
8 Expressway (220 foot right-of-way) including landscaping and
9 parkway improvements in conjunction with development.
- 10 b. 5.15-2: Participate in the phased construction of off-site traffic
11 signals through payment of traffic signal mitigation fees. The traffic
12 signals within the study area at buildout should specifically include
13 an interconnect of the traffic signals to function in a coordinated
14 system.
- 15 c. 5.15-3: The following study area intersection improvements are
16 required for both the Existing Plus Ambient Growth Plus Project
17 and the Existing Plus Ambient Growth Plus Project Plus Cumulative
18 scenarios. It is assumed that the Project will be implemented in one
19 phase and no additional phased improvements will be necessary.

20 SR-74 (NS) at:

- 21 1. Richard Street/Project South Access (EW) - #10.
22 a. Stripe a northbound left turn lane.
- 23 2. Project North Access (EW) - #11.
24 a. Stripe a northbound left turn lane.
25 b. Install a traffic signal.
- 26 3. Theda Street (EW) - #13.
27 a. Install a traffic signal.

1 d. 5.15-4: Prior to any construction of any Project components within
2 any existing roadway right-of-way, the developer shall submit a
3 traffic control plan (TCP) for review and approval by the
4 appropriate agency that has jurisdiction over that roadway.

5 O. Utilities and Service Systems

6 1. Impacts:

7 a. Water Supply

8 According to Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD),
9 there is an adequate water supply and sewer capacity to meet the
10 demand of the Project. Based on the analysis in EIR No. 530 and the
11 referenced documentation, the water, wastewater and recycled water
12 management systems are capable of meeting the cumulative demand
13 for these systems. Recycled water is available in the EVMWD
14 system, but is not available to the Project site. Additionally, the
15 Project will not cause cumulatively considerable significant adverse
16 impacts on these systems.

17 b. Energy (Electricity, Natural Gas and Dry Utilities)

18 Development proposed by the Project would result in a permanent
19 and continued use of electricity and natural gas resources. Sufficient
20 power and distribution capabilities exist to provide electrical
21 services to the Project. Since the project would constitute a small
22 incremental increase of the current residential customer base and the
23 Project has been required to install Energy Star-rated models of
24 appliances and be served by existing service and transmission lines
25 within and around the Project area. Additionally, the Project's
26 cumulative energy impacts are concluded to a less than significant
27 cumulative impact.

1 c. Solid Waste

2 Project impacts to landfill capacity from construction and
3 demolition debris were found to be less than significant with an
4 annual contribution over 7 years of 151 tons. Mitigation measures
5 address construction debris recycling and reuse to achieve a
6 reduction in waste beyond the County requirement of a 50 percent
7 reduction by weight. Implementation of this measure would reduce
8 the construction waste from the Project at a higher level than
9 required by the County. The Project will comply with County
10 Conditions of Approval and will exceed those requirements with
11 implementation of mitigation measures outlined above.
12 Additionally, cumulative impacts to landfill capacity will be less
13 than significant due to the Project construction debris representing a
14 less than substantial cumulative increment with mitigation. The
15 Project's contribution to cumulative demand for landfill capacity is
16 approximately 0.0002 percent of annual landfill capacity demand.
17 Therefore, due to available capacity and implementation of the
18 above mitigation measures, which provide for recycling on site to
19 reduce project operational waste, cumulative impacts to the existing
20 landfills resulting from waste generated by the Project during
21 operations are considered less than significant.

22 d. Maintenance of Public Facilities and other Governmental Services

23 The Project is forecast to generate sufficient funds to ensure
24 maintenance of public facilities and other governmental services that
25 are paid for out of the County General Fund. For public utilities such
26 as water, wastewater and energy, these systems are enterprise
27 funded, which means that the extension of utilities and provision of
28

1 service is based upon direct payment for receipt of the utility
2 connection and delivery of the resource or service. For roads, law
3 enforcement, fire, etc. funds are received and allocated based upon
4 initial development fees and payment of property taxes and other
5 direct fees as a service (such as planning) provided by the County.
6 The data in the fiscal impact report (FIA) indicate that the
7 infrastructure systems required to support the Project development
8 in the future will be sufficient to maintain public facilities and other
9 governmental services in the routine course of occupancy in the
10 future.

11 2. Mitigation:

12 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
13 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

14 a. 5.16.3-1: Prior to issuance of a building permit:

- 15 1. To utilize energy efficiently, all residential buildings, large
16 public buildings (library, public community center, schools,
17 and joint-use facilities), large private recreation buildings
18 and large commercial buildings (retail and office) shall
19 exceed the 2008 California Energy Code – Title 24, Part 6
20 energy efficiency standards by 35%. To meet this rating
21 standard, combinations of the following energy efficiency
22 design elements or future elements shall be used to achieve
23 at least a 35% energy savings compared to the 2008 Building
24 Energy Standards:

- 25 a. Tankless water heaters
26 b. High efficiency lighting
27
28

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

- c. Low energy HVAC systems with tighter HVAC ducts
- d. Improved drywall, insulation and sealing installation
- e. “Cool roofs” reflect the sun’s light back to the sky
- f. Heat-repelling radiant barrier roof foil reflect the sun’s heat back to the sky
- g. Double-paned windows
- h. Dual-glazed, Lo E2 windows
- i. Other energy conservation measures developed between 2011 and 2017 when the propose project is envisioned to begin actual construction.

- 2. To utilize energy efficiently, homebuilders shall install Energy Star- rated model appliances, if the homebuilder chooses to install major appliances such as a dishwasher, washing machine, and refrigerator in the new residential units.
- 3. To utilize energy efficiently, major appliances installed in large public buildings (library, public community center, schools, and joint-use facilities) and large private recreation buildings shall be Energy Star- rated.
- 4. To utilize energy efficiently, street lights shall be installed with energy- efficient lighting, such as approved LED lights the meet the requirements of County Ordinance No. 655.
- 5. To increase renewable energy sources and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, large public buildings (library, public community center, schools, and joint-use facilities) and large private recreation buildings shall be installed with

1 solar panels, photovoltaic cells, solar thermal systems or
2 other renewable energy generating technology.

3 6. To increase renewable energy sources and reduce
4 greenhouse gas emissions, homebuilders shall offer to home
5 buyers solar panels, photovoltaic cells, solar thermal systems
6 or other renewable energy generating technology as part of
7 the homebuilder's option program.

8 7. Where professional management is available, such as an
9 HOA, recycled water shall be used in residential front-yards
10 and backyards, i.e. private common area, and in adjacent
11 street parkways, subject to EVMWD and County approvals.

12 8. Where professional management is not available, grass turf
13 (live not artificial) shall be limited to 33% of the landscaped
14 area of a conventional single-family detached lot.

15 b. 5.16.3-2: Prior to recordation of a final map by the County, the
16 current or subsequent project applicant shall construct, or enter into
17 an agreement and post security, in a form and amount acceptable to
18 the Building and Safety Department, guaranteeing the
19 undergrounding of proposed utility distribution lines in conformance
20 with applicable County standards and the County's Capital
21 Improvement Policy.

22 c. 5.16.3-3: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, tentative tract maps
23 shall be conditioned to require that all electrical service lines
24 (excluding transmission lines) serving development within the
25 project will be installed underground. This includes existing service
26 facilities that may have to be relocated temporarily during grading.

- 1 d. 5.16.3-4: Prior to grading permit final, the contractor shall
2 temporarily relocate existing overhead facilities, as necessary to
3 maintain service, while grading and installing the new underground
4 system is underway.
- 5 e. 5.16.3-5: Gas service shall remain available to all existing customers
6 during construction of new and replacement gas lines within the
7 project site.
- 8 f. 5.16.4-1: The project proponent shall recycle, reuse, and/or reduce
9 the amount of construction and demolition materials (i.e., concrete,
10 asphalt, wood, etc.) generated by development of the project that
11 would otherwise be taken to a landfill. This diversion of waste must
12 exceed a 50 percent reduction by weight. The project shall complete
13 the Riverside County Waste Management Department Construction
14 and Demolition Waste Diversion Program – Form B and Form C to
15 ensure compliance. Form B – Recycling Plan must be submitted and
16 approved by the Riverside County Waste Management Department
17 and provided to the Department of Building and Safety prior to the
18 issuance of building permits. Form C – Reporting Form must be
19 approved by the Riverside County Waste Management Department
20 and submitted to the Department of Building and Safety prior to
21 building final inspection.
- 22 g. 5.16.4-2: The Homeowners Association established for the proposed
23 development shall establish green waste recycling through its yard
24 maintenance or waste hauling contracts. Green waste recycling
25 includes such things as grass recycling (where lawn clippings from a
26 mulching type mower are left on the lawn) and on- or off-site
27 composting. This measure shall be implemented to reduce green
28

1 waste going to landfills. If such services are not available through
2 the yard maintenance or waste haulers in the area, the HOA shall
3 provide individual homeowners with information about ways to
4 recycle green waste individually and collectively. Homeowners shall
5 be notified of such in the CC&Rs. This shall be performed prior to
6 map recordation.

- 7 h. 5.16.4-3: To assure compliance with the California Solid Waste
8 Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991 (AB 1327), which requires the
9 local jurisdiction to require adequate areas for collecting and loading
10 recyclable materials, prior to issuance of building permits for any
11 multi-unit residential, commercial or industrial facilities, clearance
12 from the Riverside County Waste Management Department is
13 needed to verify compliance with AB 1327 in terms of installation
14 of recycling access areas at these facilities.

15 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that all applicable regulatory
16 requirements and feasible mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts have been considered and
17 are applied as conditions of the Project approval, yet the following impacts potentially resulting from the
18 Project cannot be fully mitigated and will be only partially avoided or lessened by the mitigation
19 measures hereinafter specified; a statement of overriding findings is therefore included herein:

20 A. Population/Housing

21 1. Impacts:

22 The Project would cumulatively exceed official regional or local population
23 projections and would induce population growth in an area – primarily
24 directly, by proposing new homes. This would be considered an
25 unavoidable adverse impact. Indirect effects from implementation of the
26 Project (the through the extension of roads or other infrastructure) would
27 not create any unavoidable adverse impacts, as the roadways and other
28

1 infrastructure (with the exception of water and sewer) are already available
2 in the Project vicinity. Water and sewer extensions proposed by the Project
3 will only be adequate to serve the needs of the Project. The Project does not
4 improve the region's jobs/housing balance. Therefore, the residential
5 population growth from the Project is considered an unavoidable adverse
6 impact in terms of the jobs-housing balance.

7 2. Mitigation:

8 The proposed Project cannot be fully mitigated below a level of significance
9 for this issue area. There is no mitigation that is applicable.

10 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered the following
11 alternatives identified in EIR No. 530 in light of the environmental impacts which cannot be fully
12 mitigated or substantially lessened and has rejected those alternatives as infeasible for the reasons
13 described below:

14 A. Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

- 15 1. This alternative assumes that the proposed Project, including supporting
16 infrastructure (i.e., roadways and utilities connections), would not be
17 constructed. The site would remain vacant.
- 18 2. Under the No Build Alternative, the construction of new structures and
19 recreational facilities would be prohibited. This alternative would therefore
20 fail to achieve any of the Project objectives.
- 21 3. Under the No Development Alternative, infrastructure improvements that
22 would benefit County residents would not occur, including a 7.0 acre
23 community park/community center site, a 3,000 square foot community
24 center, the installation of a regional trail and the preservation of 40.4 acres
25 of permanent open space.
- 26 4. Because no discretionary action would be required, payment of TUMF fees
27 pursuant to County Ordinance No. 824 would not occur, which would
28

1 reduce the County's ability to implement long-range transportation
2 infrastructure improvements.

3 5. Because no discretionary action would be required, no roadway
4 improvement fees would be paid into the County's Development Impact
5 Fee.

6 6. No permanent open space would be established, and therefore, no formal
7 protection of the on-site biological resources would occur.

8 B. Alternative 2 – Reduced Project Density Alternative

9 1. This alternative assumes that there would be no General Plan Amendment
10 or Zone Change to allow development on the site as proposed under
11 Specific Plan No. 364. Existing designations and zoning would allow for
12 the development of up to 117 single-family residences with minimum lot
13 sizes of 0.5 acres. This alternative would not include the preservation of
14 40.4 acres in the western portion of the Project site. No commercial and/or
15 office uses would be allowed.

16 2. Under the Reduced Project Density Alternative, none of the nine Project
17 objectives would be met. This alternative would not develop a master-
18 planned community, provide Improvements that will contribute to a more
19 efficient system of regional drainage, promote walkability throughout the
20 community, ensure that residential planning areas are located in close
21 proximity to services, transportation links and recreational amenities,
22 establish recreational facilities capable of serving Colinas del Oro as well as
23 the entire Elsinore region, implement housing type diversity by providing a
24 variety of single family and multi-family residential homes designed to be
25 marketable within the evolving economic profile within Riverside County,
26 establish a community-wide circulation system that meets the community
27 needs and accommodates a variety of transportation modes, develop
28

1 guidelines for architecture, landscaping, color treatments, paving, walls,
2 fencing, signage, and entry treatments that are consistent with the County-
3 wide Design Standards & Guidelines, and reinforce the community theme
4 of “Western Community”, or develop an environment that is visually
5 attractive and efficiently and effectively organized, including a pleasing
6 landscape palette.

7 C. Alternative 3 – Meadowbrook Study (Industrial) Alternative

- 8 1. Under this Alternative, the entire site could be developed as some form of
9 industrial use. With the exception of the restricted zone, the entire site could
10 be utilized for development. Either the LI or BP scenarios could be utilized,
11 as they would be the most appropriate application of industrial uses in the
12 Meadowbrook area. Both of these scenarios will allow a 0.25 to 0.6 FAR.
13 Due to the topography, the lower end of the FAR range was utilized in
14 determining potential square footage. Therefore, based on the Project
15 acreage, approximately 1,376,496 square feet of industrial development
16 would be allowed on the Project site in lieu of the 69,500 square feet of
17 commercial/office area proposed by the Project, and 490 residential
18 dwelling units proposed by the Project. This Alternative was selected for
19 consideration, as it is consistent with an alternative considered for the
20 Project site entitled “Rural Village Study at Meadowbrook, Proposed Land
21 Use Designations, Scenario 2,” dated November 24, 2008, which is the land
22 use plan that was developed by the General Plan Advisory Committee, has
23 been to two (2) Planning Commission Workshops and is the preferred plan
24 for the pending General Plan Update.
- 25 2. Implementation of the Meadowbrook Study (Industrial) would not meet any
26 of the objectives of the proposed Project.

1 3. This Alternative will have fewer impacts than the Project to Population/
2 Housing Resources, Public Services Resources (Libraries, Schools), and
3 Recreation Resources. This Alternative will have similar impacts than the
4 Project to Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural
5 Resources, Geology and Soils Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials
6 Resources, Hydrology/Water Quality Resources, Mineral Resources. This
7 Alternative will have greater impacts than the Project to Aesthetic
8 Resources, Air Quality Resources, Noise Resources, Land Use/Planning,
9 Public Services Resources (Fire and Sheriff Services),
10 Transportation/Traffic Resources, and Utilities Resources (Solid Waste,
11 Water and Sewer, and Natural Gas and Electricity). Although
12 implementation of the Reduced Impact Alternative would reduce the
13 Project's impacts to the environment, implementation of this alternative
14 would not fully eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts
15 to air quality during both construction and long-term operation, or its
16 significant and unavoidable impacts to noise during construction. The
17 Project's contribution to cumulatively significant visual impacts also would
18 not be eliminated.

19 D. Alternative Site

20 1. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2) requires that an EIR identify
21 alternatives to the Project, but does not expressly require that it discuss
22 alternative locations for the Project. In the case of EIR No. 530, the County
23 required analysis of a site specific alternative location. The Alternative
24 Location is located immediately to the northwest of the Project site, and is
25 identified as APN 346-090-006. It is an approximately 160-acre parcel.
26 90% of the Alternative Location site is designated RR on the General Plan,
27 with the remaining 10% designated RM. The Alternative Location parcel is
28

1 located within Cell J of the MSHCP. Based on the MSHCP requirements,
2 the analysis in the DEIR assumed that 55% of the Alternative Location site
3 would be conserved. That left approximately 89.4 acres remaining for
4 development. The Project, netting out the open space in PA's 6 and 7
5 results in 83.7 acres of developable area. For purposes of the analysis, the
6 Alternative Location contained all of the same components of the Project.

7 2. The Alternative Location would result in greater impacts due to its more
8 "remote" location, location within Cell J, proximity to greater biological
9 resources, and a need to extend the off-site water and sewer facilities. The
10 Alternative Location will have fewer impacts than the Project to the
11 Hazards and Hazardous Materials Resources.

12 3. The Alternative Location will have similar impacts to the proposed Project
13 to Agricultural Resources; Hydrology/Water Quality Resources; Mineral
14 Resources; Noise Resources; Population/Housing Resources; Public
15 Services Resources (Fire and Sheriff Services, Libraries, and Schools);
16 Recreation Resources; Transportation/Traffic Resources; and Utilities
17 Resource (Solid Waste).

18 4. The Alternative Location will have similar to, or greater than, impacts than
19 the Project to Aesthetic Resources; Air Quality Resources; Biological
20 Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology and Soils Resources; Land
21 Use/Planning Resources; and Utilities Resources.

22 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has balanced the "economic,
23 legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project, against the unavoidable adverse
24 environmental effects thereof, and has determined that the following benefits outweigh and render
25 acceptable those environmental effects:

26 A. The population/housing impacts are outweighed and rendered acceptable because the
27 proposed Project would provide for a variety of housing types within the Project site,
28

1 which would assist the County in meeting for the County's overall housing needs.

2 B. The population/housing impacts are outweighed and rendered acceptable because the
3 proposed Project would preserve in perpetuity 40.4 acres of open space.

4 C. The population/housing impacts are outweighed and rendered acceptable because
5 development of the Project will generate additional employment opportunities (during and
6 following construction) for skilled labor within Riverside County. Environmentally
7 superior Project alternatives would not create an array of new employment opportunities to
8 utilize the skilled labor pool within Riverside County to the same extent as the proposed
9 Project, as each alternative would involve a substantial reduction in the amount of
10 proposed construction and commercial/mixed use space.

11 D. The population/housing impacts are outweighed and rendered acceptable because the
12 Project will create an aesthetically pleasing and distinct community identity (sense of
13 place) through the establishment of design criteria for architecture, landscaping, walls,
14 street improvements, signs, entry monuments, and other planning and design features.
15 Riverside County has determined and finds that it is more important in this case to obtain
16 the benefit of the Project's aesthetic enhancement for the community than to forego the
17 Project out of regard for the air quality impacts.

18 E. The population/housing impacts are outweighed and rendered acceptable because the
19 Project will construct regional and community trails which will help to accommodate the
20 recreational needs of both Project and nearby residents.

21 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that State CEQA Guidelines
22 (Section 15126, (g)), requires an EIR to discuss how a proposed Project could directly or indirectly lead to
23 economic, population, or housing growth. The following growth-inducing impacts were considered in
24 relation to the proposed Project:

25 A. SP No. 364 would result in an increase of approximately 1,475 people living at the site,
26 which is 1,123 above that allowed by current planning designations. This increase would
27 not significantly affect the population of the County. In addition, it is anticipated that many
28

1 of the proposed residents of the Specific Plan would be residents that are already living
2 somewhere within Riverside County. Population increases that may result from the
3 implementation of the proposed Project would be generally consistent with the population
4 increases previously projected by SCAG, which estimates an annual growth of
5 approximately 25,055 persons within unincorporated Riverside County. For these reasons,
6 the number of new homes proposed by the Project would not be considered substantial
7 from a growth inducement perspective.

8 B. Urbanization of the Project site will not influence continued development within adjacent
9 properties. SR 74, the major thoroughfare in the Project area, and a major east/west
10 roadway between I-15 and I-215, has been recently widened. The Project will be required
11 to install additional improvements to SR 74, but these will only service the Project itself.
12 The proposed improvements would not provide a thoroughfare to other, previously
13 undeveloped areas. As a result, the Project roadway improvements would not induce
14 growth.

15 C. The off-site Project components, water and sewer service, will be and extended to the
16 Project site, via the immediate area; however, the size of these facilities will be only
17 sufficient to meet the needs of the Project. Natural gas lines will also be extended to the
18 Project site. Regardless of whether they will be sized for the Project, or even larger, the
19 limiting factor for additional growth in the area will be the water and sewer facilities. Even
20 though the surrounding area is primarily vacant or rural-type properties, the infrastructure
21 improved/expanded by the Project will not contribute to elimination of potential
22 constraints for future development in this area.

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

25 A. Land Use Element

- 26 1. The Project includes a GPA and Change of Zone to allow development of
27 the site with uses other than those planned in the General Plan. These
28

1 changes would allow greater density development of the site. Under the
2 current Rural Residential land use designation, the Project site could be
3 developed with up to 117 single-family residences. The proposed
4 Project would include a GPA to allow for the development of a target
5 of 80 medium-density residences, 163 medium high-density residences, 247
6 very high-density residences, and up to 69,500 square feet of
7 commercial/office uses on site. While the Specific Plan would not be
8 consistent with existing General Plan or Elsinore Area Plan land use maps,
9 the proposed Project includes a GPA, which would change the on-site land
10 use designations from Very Low Density Residential to Mixed Use, Very
11 High Density Residential, Medium High Density Residential, Medium
12 Density Residential, Open Space Recreation, and Open Space Conservation,
13 as reflected on the Specific Plan Land Use Plan. The proposed changes to
14 the General Plan land use designations are allowed pursuant to policies
15 within the Administrative Element. With approval of the proposed GPA, the
16 Project would be consistent with land use designations; therefore, the
17 proposed Project would be consistent with this policy. Analysis of
18 applicable policies of the Land Use Element is presented throughout EIR
19 No. 530 and concludes that the Project would not conflict with any
20 applicable policy of the General Plan Land Use Element. Furthermore the
21 proposed Project complies with all design standards for the various land use
22 designation and considers the unique characteristics and features of the
23 Project site and surrounding community. The proposed Project is consistent
24 with the General Plan Land Use Element, and is therefore consistent with
25 the General Plan.

26 B. Circulation Element

- 27 1. The Project will construct or contribute its fair share of the costs associated
28

1 with the improvement of roadways and certain intersections. The Project
2 will implement mitigation measures that address Project-specific and
3 cumulative transportation and traffic impacts, and based thereon, the Board
4 of Supervisors finds that the Project is consistent with the General Plan
5 Circulation Element. All required improvements that are directly
6 attributable to the Project would be constructed as part of the Project and
7 fair share costs would be contributed for improvements to affected off- site
8 roadways through payment of the TUMF, and County's Development
9 Impact Fee. In addition, the Specific Plan would provide for a variety of
10 transportation options. The Specific Plan includes the provision of bike
11 lanes for bicyclists and trails and sidewalks for pedestrians. Bus stops can
12 be accommodated along SR 74 (at the discretion of Riverside Transit
13 Agency). The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan
14 Circulation Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

15 C. Multipurpose Open Space Element

- 16 1. The Multipurpose Open Space Element of the General Plan describes an
17 open space system which includes methods for the acquisition,
18 maintenance, and operation of a variety of open spaces. The County's open
19 spaces are utilized for visual relief, natural resources protection, habitat
20 protection, recreational uses, and protection from natural hazards for public
21 health and safety. The western portion of the Project site is proposed for
22 open space recreation and conservation. This area contains habitat targeted
23 by the MSHCP for preservation and contributes to a regional wildlife
24 linkage for various animal species. The Project will have direct effects on
25 0.622 acres of Riparian/Riverine Areas (refer to Riparian/Riverine Areas
26 Impacts Map of the DBESP). Direct effects will result from (1) the
27 removal of all 0.440 acres of the Southern willow scrub vegetation and
28

1 habitat growing along the upland swales (100 percent), and (2) the removal
2 of 0.180 acres the upland swales (82 percent).

3 The Project will also result in indirect impacts on Riparian/Riverine Areas.
4 The tree removal phase of the project would have indirect effects on some
5 of the common wildlife species that use the trees growing on the site. A
6 predatory bird species like the red-tailed hawk that perches in trees while
7 resting or foraging will likely exclude the site from its range, and relocate to
8 another suitable habitat available in the vicinity. Perching bird species
9 would either move into the conserved areas of the site or abandon the entire
10 site and relocate to other suitable habitat available in the vicinity.

11 The loss of upland swales to channel storm water runoff downslope in a
12 manner that prevents erosion would also be an indirect effect of the project.
13 Topography is steep in the western portion of the site, sloping down to areas
14 of low relief in the eastern half.

15 Implementation of the Project will not result in cultural resource impacts
16 (including paleontological resources), that will exceed the established
17 thresholds of significance. Nonetheless, as part of mitigation for potential
18 impacts to unknown cultural resources, all ground-disturbing activities
19 would be monitored.

20 Furthermore, the proposed Project would provide adequate on-site facilities
21 to meet the local parkland and open space requirements of Riverside County
22 Ordinance 460, Section 10.35, and State Quimby Act requirements. The
23 proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan's Multipurpose Open
24 Space Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

25 D. Safety Element

- 26 1. The Project complies with all applicable building codes, County
27 Ordinances, and State and Federal laws. The Project complies with all
28

1 applicable provisions of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act,
2 and as concluded by the Project geotechnical study, the Project site is not
3 subject to significant hazards associated with earthquake induced
4 liquefaction, landsliding, or settlement (assuming the implementation of
5 mitigation). In addition, the proposed Project would not be subject to flood
6 or dam inundation. The Project also would comply with all applicable
7 standards for fire safety and be consistent with the Riverside County Fire
8 Protection Master Plan. Furthermore, Project impacts associated with
9 hazardous waste and materials on the Project site would be mitigated below
10 a level of significance, and the proposed Project would not conflict
11 with any disaster preparedness plans nor subject individuals to significant
12 risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, erosion, seismic
13 activity, blowsand, or flooding. The proposed Project is consistent with the
14 General Plan Safety Element, and is therefore consistent with the General
15 Plan.

16 E. Noise Element

- 17 1. Project construction and operational noise impacts would be less than
18 significant with mitigation incorporated. Mitigation is provided to reduce
19 noise impacts to below a level of significance. With implementation of the
20 recommendations provided in the noise impact analysis and the required
21 mitigation measures, the Project would be consistent with the General Plan
22 Noise Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

23 F. Healthy Communities Element

- 24 1. The proposed project is consistent with the Healthy Communities
25 element. More specifically the project has been placed along a major transit
26 corridor, and includes several trails to encourage walking, as prescribed for
27 in policies HC 3.2 and 3.3. These trails are designed to carry pedestrians
28

1 through the site and beyond, connecting to open space trails to the
2 northwest of the project site as prescribed for in policies HC 5.4 and
3 6.4. These include bike trails, horse trails, pedestrian trails and jogging
4 trails. Additionally, the project features residential and mixed use
5 designations intended to foster walking between retail, jobs, and residential
6 uses which is specifically prescribed for in policies HC 6.5, HC 2.2 and HC
7 4.2. High density apartments are included in the project as prescribed for in
8 policy HC 3.1 and 3.4.

9 G. Air Quality Element

- 10 1. Although the Specific Plan would include sustainable residential building
11 features, including the design of homes to be 15 percent above Title 24
12 requirements, the Project is required to implement mitigation measures
13 intended to reduce direct and cumulative air quality impacts to the greatest
14 feasible extent. Implementation of the mitigation measures would ensure
15 consistency with the Air Quality Element. Not unlike other development
16 projects in Riverside County, and as disclosed in the EIR No. 441 for the
17 General Plan, direct and cumulative impacts to air quality would remain
18 significant and unmitigable. Although the Project would have significant
19 direct air quality impacts and its contribution to air quality impacts would
20 be cumulatively considerable, mitigation measures presented would reduce
21 those impacts to the greatest extent possible, in accordance with SCAQMD,
22 EPA, and CARB requirements. Implementation of the mitigation measures
23 and recommendations provided in Section 5.3 of EIR No. 530, and in the air
24 quality technical study would ensure that the proposed Project would be
25 consistent with the Air Quality Element and General Plan.

1 H. Housing Element

- 2 1. The purpose of the General Plan Housing Element is to meet the needs of
3 existing and future residents in Riverside County through the establishment
4 of policies to guide County decision-making and to establish an action plan
5 to meet the County's housing goals in the next seven years. The Project
6 would further the goals of the General Plan Housing Element by reducing
7 the use of energy in residences and providing higher density residential
8 units that would contribute to meeting the County's housing needs.
9 Although the land uses proposed by the Project would require a GPA, there
10 are no characteristics of the Project that would inhibit the County's ability
11 to achieve the goals set forth by the General Plan Housing Element.
12 Accordingly, the proposed Project would be consistent with the General
13 Plan Housing Element and General Plan.

14 I. Administration Element

- 15 1. The Administration Element contains information regarding the structure of
16 the General Plan as well as general planning principles and a statement
17 regarding the vision for Riverside County. The General Plan Amendment
18 proposed by the Project would be consistent with the Administration
19 Element policies governing Foundation Amendments, as the proposed
20 Project would help to achieve the purposes of the General Plan through
21 compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

22 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Project would not conflict
23 with the conservation requirements of the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
24 (MSHCP) in that:

- 25 A. The Project site is not located within an MSHCP Criteria Area, but is located
26 approximately 125 feet southeast of Cell #3564 and Cell Group J. The off-site water
27 improvements are not located within a Cell, Cell Group or Subunit of the Elsinore or Mead
28

1 Valley Area Plans. At one point, the underground 12-inch water line will be located
2 approximately 265 feet west of Cell #3974 of the Ramsgate Subunit (5) of the Elsinore
3 Area Plan (no Cell Group). The off-site sewer improvements are located within Cells 3974
4 and 4078 of the Ramsgate Subunit (5) of the Elsinore Area Plan (no Cell Group). The
5 underground 6-inch force sewer main will be located beneath the existing edges of
6 pavement of SR 74 and Wasson Canyon Road. The off-site sewer improvements will be
7 located in the northern and western portions of the Cell, and avoid the areas proposed for
8 conservation. The same conclusions would apply to any natural gas facilities.

9 The Project will have direct effects on 0.622 acres of Riparian/Riverine Areas (refer to
10 Riparian/Riverine Areas Impacts Map of the DBESP). Direct effects will result from (1)
11 the removal of all 0.440 acres of the Southern willow scrub vegetation and habitat growing
12 along the upland swales (100 percent), and (2) the removal of 0.180 acres the upland
13 swales (82 percent). The Project will also result in indirect impacts on Riparian/Riverine
14 Areas. The tree removal phase of the project would have indirect effects on some of the
15 common wildlife species that use the trees growing on the site. A predatory bird species,
16 like the red-tailed hawk that perches in trees while resting or foraging will likely exclude
17 the site from its range, and relocate to other suitable habitat available in the vicinity.
18 Perching bird species would either move into the conserved areas of the site or abandon the
19 entire site and relocate to other suitable habitat available in the vicinity. To mitigate the
20 direct effects on 0.622 acres of onsite Riparian/Riverine Areas, prior to the issuance of a
21 grading permit, the applicant shall purchase 1.244 acres (or at a ratio determined by the
22 appropriate resource agency(s) of compensatory mitigation credits. Mitigation Measure
23 5.4-1 has been added to require mitigation to impacts to 0.66 acre of onsite
24 Riparian/Riverine Areas at a ratio of 2:1, or at a ratio determined by the appropriate
25 resource agency(s). Accordingly, the proposed Project would not conflict with the MSHCP
26 policy related to required protection of species associated with riparian/riverine areas and
27 vernal pools (MSHCP Section 6.1.2).

- 1 B. Based on Figure 6-1 of the MSHCP, the site is not located within a Narrow Endemic Plant
2 Species Survey Area, the off-site water improvements are not located within a Narrow
3 Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, and the off-site sewer (and natural gas) improvements
4 are not located within a Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area. (MSHCP Section
5 6.1.3).
- 6 C. The site has no direct physical relationship to the assembly of Proposed Linkage 3 or to
7 Proposed Core 1. Development in the northwest portion of the site will be located over
8 1,000 feet from a proposed MSHCP Conservation Area. 1,000 feet is four times the 250-
9 foot buffer used in the MSHCP to complete an edge analysis. As such, development on
10 that portion of the parcel will not adversely affect biological resources within the proposed
11 MSHCP Conservation Area. Off-site water improvements have no relationship to the
12 assembly of Proposed Core 1. The construction of the underground water service
13 improvements (12-inch and 20-inch water lines) will not adversely affect biological
14 resources within the proposed MSHCP Conservation Area, nor will the permanent water
15 service improvements (reservoirs and pump station). The water service improvements will
16 not be subject to Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface for the
17 management of edge effects as presented in Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP, Volume 1, The
18 Plan. Off-site sewer improvements have no relationship to the assembly of Proposed Core
19 D. The construction of the underground sewer service improvements (6-inch forced main)
20 will not adversely affect biological resources within the proposed MSHCP Conservation
21 Area. Off-site sewer improvements will not be subject to Guidelines Pertaining to the
22 Urban/Wildlands Interface for the management of edge effects as presented in Section
23 6.1.4 of the MSHCP, Volume 1, The Plan. The same conclusions would apply to any
24 natural gas facilities (MSHCP Section 6.1.4).
- 25 E. Based on Figures 6-2 (Criteria Area Species Survey Areas) and 6-3 (Amphibian Species
26 Survey Areas) of the MSHCP, the site is not located in an area where additional surveys
27
28

1 are needed for certain species in conjunction with MSHCP implementation in order to
2 achieve coverage for these species.

3 The site is located within the Burrowing Owl Survey Area (Figure 6-4 of the MSHCP). As
4 such, a Nesting Season Survey following the Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for
5 Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Area was completed on
6 July 1, 2013. While conducting surveys for the Nesting Season Survey, burrowing owls
7 were not observed. Critical burrowing owl habitats capable of being used for roosting or
8 nesting were not being used on the site (i.e., natural burrows). And, animal signs diagnostic
9 of burrowing owls were not discovered anywhere on the site (i.e., molted feathers, cast
10 pellets, prey remains, eggshell fragments, and/or excrement at or near a burrow entrance).
11 There was no evidence of either active habitats presently being used by burrowing owls, or
12 habitats abandoned within the last three years on the site or in the buffer zone.

- 13 F. Based on Figure 6-5 (Mammal Species Survey Areas) of the MSHCP, the site is not
14 located in an area where additional surveys are needed for certain species in conjunction
15 with MSHCP implementation in order to achieve coverage for these species.

16 The Project site was also assessed for potentially suitable habitat for plant species not
17 covered by the MSHCP. The following species were considered to have potential to occur
18 on the Project site: chaparral sand-verbena (*Abronia villosa* var. *aurita*) (California Native
19 Plant Society (CNPS) List 1B.1)2, Plummer's mariposa lily (*Calochortus plummerae*)
20 (CNPS List 1B.2), and Parry's spineflower (*Chorizanthe parryi* var. *parryi*) (CNPS List
21 1B.1). Two of the species, Plummer's mariposa lily and Parry's spineflower, may be
22 covered by the MSHCP in the future. These species are not Federal- or State listed, but
23 impacts to them if they are present in substantial numbers would be considered significant
24 by Riverside County and the CNPS in accordance with the California Environmental
25 Quality Act.

1 A focused survey was then conducted during the appropriate blooming periods to
2 determine whether these species are present or absent on the project site. The surveys were
3 negative.

- 4 G. Based on Figures 6-2 (Criteria Area Species Survey Areas), 6-3 (Amphibian Species
5 Survey Areas) and 6-5 (Mammal Species Survey Areas) of the MSHCP, the off-site water
6 improvements are not located in an area where additional surveys are needed for certain
7 species in conjunction with MSHCP implementation in order to achieve coverage for these
8 species.

9 The off-site water improvements are located within the Burrowing Owl Survey Area
10 (Figure 6-4 of the MSHCP). Based on Step I, Habitat Assessment, of the Burrowing Owl
11 Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
12 Area (March 29, 2006), an independent assessment was made of the presence of suitable
13 burrowing owl habitat along the alignments of the underground off-site water
14 improvements and at the sites of the permanent off-site water improvements. Most of the
15 areas located on both sides of the roadway alignments were developed and occupied.

16 Suitable burrowing owl habitats consisting of large open expanses of relatively sparsely
17 vegetated annual grassland and lowland scrub on gentle rolling and level terrain with an
18 abundance of active small mammal burrows are not present within or adjacent to the
19 proposed water service improvement areas. Excluding the existing paved rights-of-way,
20 most of the off-site water improvements survey areas are located within the front yards of
21 single-family residences. These areas were either landscaped in a variety of ways or
22 maintained as bare ground. Either way, they were not providing suitable burrowing owl
23 habitats. The burrow survey conducted in these areas was negative.

24 Undeveloped and unoccupied areas along approximately 665 feet of the paved right-of-
25 way of Kimes Lane were relatively undisturbed. Non-native grassland and remnant
26 Riversidean sage scrub were growing in these areas. Although the open spaces

1 were somewhat confined by chain-link fences, marginal habitat was provided. The burrow
2 survey conducted in these areas was negative.

3 During the survey, burrowing owls were not observed. Critical burrowing owl habitats
4 capable of being used for roosting or nesting were not being used (i.e., manmade structures
5 such as culverts). Animal signs diagnostic of burrowing owls were not discovered
6 anywhere (i.e., molted feathers, cast pellets, prey remains, eggshell fragments, and/or
7 excrement at or near a burrow entrance). There was no evidence of either active habitats
8 presently being used by burrowing owls, or habitats abandoned within the last three years
9 along the alignments of the underground off-site water improvements or at the sites of the
10 permanent off-site water improvements.

11 H. Based on Figures 6-2 (Criteria Area Species Survey Areas), 6-3 (Amphibian Species
12 Survey Areas) and 6-5 (Mammal Species Survey Areas) of the MSHCP, the off-site sewer
13 improvements are not located in an area where additional surveys are needed for certain
14 species in conjunction with MSHCP implementation in order to achieve coverage for these
15 species.

16 Proposed sewer service improvements are located within the Burrowing Owl Survey Area
17 (Figure 6-4 of the MSHCP). Based on Step I, Habitat Assessment, of the Burrowing Owl
18 Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
19 Area (March 29, 2006), an independent assessment was made of the presence of suitable
20 burrowing owl habitat along the alignment of the 6-inch force sewer main. Burrowing owl
21 habitat is not present along the alignment of the 6-inch force sewer main. The alignment is
22 located within the existing edges of pavement of SR 74 and Wasson Canyon Road. Step II,
23 Locating Burrows and Burrowing Owls, of the instructions is not necessary. The same
24 conclusions would apply to any natural gas facilities (MSHCP Section 6.3.2).

25 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that Specific Plan No. 364 is
26 consistent with the Riverside County General Plan.

1 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and considered
2 EIR No. 530 in evaluating Specific Plan No. 364, that EIR No. 530 is an accurate and objective statement
3 that complies with the California Environmental Quality Act and reflects the County's independent
4 judgment, and that EIR No. 530 is incorporated herein by this reference.

5 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **CERTIFIES** EIR No. 530
6 and **ADOPTS** the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan specified therein. In the event of any
7 inconsistencies between the mitigation measures as set forth herein and the Mitigation Monitoring and
8 Reporting Program, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program shall control.

9 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Specific Plan No. 364, on
10 file with the Clerk of the Board, including the final conditions of approval and exhibits, is hereby adopted
11 as the Specific Plan of Land Use for the real property described and shown in the plan, and said real
12 property shall be developed substantially in accordance with the plan, unless the plan is amended by the
13 Board.

14 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that copies of the Specific Plan No.
15 364 shall be placed on file in the Clerk of the Board, in the Office of the Planning Director, and in the
16 Office of the Building and Safety Director, and that no applications for other development approvals shall
17 be accepted for real property described and shown in the Project, unless such applications are
18 substantially in accordance herewith.

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

2 **RESOLUTION NO. 2015-205**
3 **CERTIFYING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 540**
4 **AND ADOPTING SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 265, AMENDMENT NO. 1**
5 **(BOREL AIRPARK CENTER SPECIFIC PLAN)**

6 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65450 et. seq., public
7 hearings were held before the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in Riverside, California on July 21,
8 2015, to consider Amendment No. 1 to Specific Plan No. 265, Borel Airpark Center Specific Plan,
9 adopted by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Resolution No. 94-240 on October 4, 1994; and,

10 **WHEREAS**, all the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and
11 Riverside County CEQA implementing procedures have been satisfied, and Environmental Impact Report
12 (EIR) No. 540, prepared in connection with Specific Plan No. 265, Amendment No. 1, and related cases
13 (referred to alternatively herein as "the Project"), is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially
14 significant effects of the Project on the environment and measures necessary to avoid or substantially
15 lessen such effects have been evaluated in accordance with CEQA and Riverside County procedures; and,

16 **BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Board of Supervisors
17 of the County of Riverside, in regular session assembled on September 22, 2015 that:

- 18 A. Specific Plan No. 265, Amendment No. 1 ("SP No. 265 A1") modifies the Specific Plan to
19 remove the parcel containing the Rancho California Water District reservoir and the area
20 containing the extended runway for the French Valley Airport. Additionally, SP No. 265
21 A1 allows residential and recreational uses in the southeasterly portion of the Specific Plan
22 and revises the Circulation Plan.
- 23 B. SP No. 265 A1 is associated with General Plan Amendment No. 1123 (GPA No. 1123),
24 which was considered concurrently at the public hearing before the Board of Supervisors.
25 GPA No. 1123 would change the land use designation on the parcel owned by the Rancho
26 California Water District from Restricted Light Industrial and Open Space to Community
27 Development, Public Facilities (CD:PF). Additionally, the land use designations on the

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: MICHELLE CLACK
DATE: 9/24/15

1 parcels identified as APNs 957-320-018 and 957-320-014 would be changed from
2 Industrial Park and Restricted Light Industrial to Community Development, Public
3 Facilities (CD:PF).

4 C. SP No. 265 A1 is also associated with Change of Zone No. 7806, which was considered
5 concurrently at the public hearing before the Board of Supervisors. Change of Zone No.
6 7806 proposes the following: revise the Specific Plan Zoning Ordinance as it pertains to
7 the renumbering of all Planning Areas, add new Planning Areas 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21 and
8 22 (related to TTM 36546), delete Planning Areas 6.2, 10.0, 20.0, and 33.0 , revise the
9 Specific Plan boundary to accommodate the runway extension to the French Valley
10 Airport, delete the Rancho California Water District reservoir site from the Specific Plan
11 Boundary, remove property from the Specific Plan’s boundary which is now in the City of
12 Murrieta (PA’s 10.0, 20.0 and 33.0), and formalize the boundaries for the Specific Plan’s
13 Planning Areas.

14 D. SP No. 265 A1 is associated with Tentative Tract Map No. 36546 (TTM 36546), which
15 proposes a subdivision of 161.8 acres into 271 residential lots and 37 lettered lots, 13 of
16 which are for public streets, 10 for water quality basins, 8 designated as HOA, 2 are
17 designated for open space, and 4 designated for parks.

18 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental
19 impacts associated with the Project are potentially significant unless otherwise indicated, but each of these
20 impacts will be avoided or substantially reduced to a level that is less-than-significant with the
21 implementation of the proposed design features; mandatory compliance with federal, state, and local
22 regulations; and by the identified mitigation measures. Cumulative impacts were analyzed for the
23 proposed Project through a “summary of projections” approach, based on information contained in long-
24 range planning documents for the Project’s vicinity.

25 A. Air Quality

26 1. Impacts:

27 As analyzed in Section 4.2.4 of the Final EIR No. 540, the Project-specific

1 evaluation of emissions demonstrates that after implementation of the
2 recommended mitigation measures, construction of the proposed Project
3 would not result in exceedances of regional air quality thresholds. Thus,
4 construction activity is not projected to result in unavoidable significant
5 adverse impacts. Once construction is completed the site will be occupied
6 by future residents. The emission forecast for the Project, once occupied
7 (over the long-term), do not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds; however,
8 mitigation is identified to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that also reduce
9 overall energy consumption and related criteria air pollutants.

10 There are no substantial point source emitters located within one mile of the
11 Project site. Therefore, the Project does not include any sensitive receptors
12 exposed to such emissions and it will not be exposed to any significant local
13 sources of pollution. No mitigation is required.

14 During construction activities of the proposed Project there will be odors
15 associated with equipment and materials such as diesel fuel odors from
16 construction equipment. These odors are normally not considered so
17 offensive as to cause sensitive receptors to complain and they will be short-
18 term. Over the long-term a portion of the future residential activities that
19 typically do not include activities that generate substantial odors.
20 Residential odors from vehicles and activities such as outdoor barbecues are
21 common components of the overall residential experience and do not pose a
22 significant odor exposure for future residents. Odors may emanate from the
23 industrial and commercial uses within the proposed Project during
24 operations that could affect the proposed residential development. Any
25 impacts are considered less than significant.

26 Cumulatively, the SCAQMD has recognized that there is typically
27 insufficient information to quantitatively evaluate the cumulative

1 contributions of multiple projects because each project applicant has no
2 control over nearby projects. Nevertheless, the potential cumulative impact
3 from the Project is discussed below.

4 Projects in the vicinity of the proposed Project could contribute to an
5 existing or projected air quality exceedance because the Basin is currently
6 nonattainment for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5. With regard to determining the
7 significance of the contribution from the proposed Project, the SCAQMD
8 recommends that any given project's potential contribution to cumulative
9 impacts should be assessed using the same significance criteria as for
10 project-specific impacts. Therefore, this analysis assumes that individual
11 projects that do not generate operational or construction emissions that
12 exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project specific
13 impacts would also not cause a cumulatively considerable increase in
14 emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment, and,
15 therefore, would not be considered to have a significant, adverse air quality
16 impact. This assumption included in the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality
17 Handbook that establishes the thresholds of significance for both project
18 specific and cumulative projects. Refer to the criteria contained in Table
19 4.2-5 of EIR No. 540.

20 Maximum daily construction activity emissions would be below SCAQMD
21 CEQA thresholds with or without mitigation. Mitigation is included to
22 reduce impacts associated with pollutants for which the air basin is not in
23 air quality compliance. Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) impacts
24 are less-than-significant even without application of available mitigation
25 and will not result in a cumulative impact. After application of the non-
26 discretionary mitigation measures (allow only gas hearths, low flow faucets,
27 toilets and showerheads), ROG emissions will not exceed the SCAQMD

1 operational threshold. Thus, operational emissions would be below
2 SCAQMD CEQA thresholds with implementation of the non-discretionary
3 mitigation measures and will be at a less than significant level and will not
4 be considered cumulative. Micro-scale air quality impacts are not
5 significant and will not be considered cumulative.

6 The zone of strong diesel odor impact from construction equipment is
7 typically 160 feet or less. Except where heavy equipment operations occur
8 in very close proximity to occupied dwellings or other odor-sensitive uses
9 (health care, outdoor restaurants, etc.) set-back distances are typically
10 adequate to preclude significant diesel odor impact potential. The Project
11 site would not be developed with land uses that are typically associated with
12 odor complaints.

13 2. Mitigation:

14 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
15 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

- 16 a. 4.2-1: Construction Equipment Emission Mitigation: utilize well-
17 tuned off-road construction equipment; establish a preference for
18 contractors using Tier 3 or cleaner heavy equipment; and, enforce 5-
19 minute idling limits for both on-road trucks and off-road equipment.
- 20 b. 4.2-2: Operational Emissions Mitigation: To reduce energy demand
21 associated with potable water conveyance, the Project shall be
22 designed to comply with the mandatory reductions in indoor water
23 usage contained in the incumbent CalGreen Code and the mandated
24 reduction in outdoor water usage contained in the County's water
25 efficient landscape requirements. Additionally, the Project shall
26 implement the following: landscaping palette emphasizing drought
27 tolerant plants; use of water-efficient irrigation techniques; and, U.S.

1 EPA Certified WaterSense labeled or equivalent faucets, high-
2 efficiency toilets (HETs), and water-conserving shower heads.

- 3 c. 4.2-3: Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project
4 proponent shall submit energy usage calculations to the Planning
5 Division verifying that the Project is designed to achieve 20%
6 efficiency beyond the 2015 California Building Code Title 24
7 requirements. Examples of measures that reduce energy
8 consumption include, but are not limited to, the following (it being
9 understood that the items listed below are not all required and
10 merely present examples; the list is not all-inclusive and other
11 features that reduce energy consumption also are acceptable):
12 increase in insulation such that heat transfer and thermal bridging is
13 minimized; limit air leakage through the structure and/or within the
14 heating and cooling distribution system; installation of electrical
15 hook-ups at loading dock areas; installation of dual-paned or other
16 energy efficient windows; use of interior and exterior energy
17 efficient lighting that exceeds then incumbent California Title 24
18 Energy Efficiency performance standards; installation of automatic
19 devices to turn off lights where they are not needed; application of a
20 paint and surface color palette that emphasizes light and off-white
21 colors that reflect heat away from buildings; design of buildings
22 with “cool roofs” using products certified by the Cool Roof Rating
23 Council, and/or exposed roof surfaces using light and off-white
24 colors; design of buildings to accommodate photo-voltaic solar
25 electricity systems or the installation of photo-voltaic solar
26 electricity systems; and installation of ENERGY STAR-qualified
27 energy-efficient appliances, heating and cooling systems, office

1 equipment, and/or lighting products.

2 In addition to the above discretionary mitigation measures, the
3 developer is also required to implement the following mandatory
4 measures established in SCAQMD rules and regulations.
5 Construction activities are not forecast to cause dust emissions to
6 exceed SCAQMD CEQA thresholds. Nevertheless, enhanced dust
7 control measures are required because of the particulate non-
8 attainment status of the air basin. These include: apply soil
9 stabilizers or moisten inactive disturbed areas; prepare and
10 implement a high wind dust control plan; stabilize previously
11 disturbed areas if subsequent construction is delayed; apply water
12 three times daily, or non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manu-
13 facturers' specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas,
14 unpaved road surfaces, and active construction areas; cover all stock
15 piles with tarps at the end of each day or as needed; provide water
16 spray during loading and unloading of earthen materials; minimize
17 in-out traffic from construction zone; cover all trucks hauling dirt,
18 sand, or loose material or require all trucks to maintain at least two
19 feet of freeboard; sweep streets daily if visible soil material is
20 carried out from the construction site; the contractor or builder shall
21 designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program
22 and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of
23 dust offsite; and post a publicly visible sign with the telephone
24 number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This
25 person shall respond and take corrective action within 24 hours.

26 To reduce air quality emissions associated with wood burning
27 fireplaces, the Project shall be designed to comply with the

1 mandatory SCAQMD Rule 445: utilize SCAQMD approved Rule
2 445 devices rather than wood burning fireplaces for any residential
3 use.

4 B. Biological Resources

5 1. Impacts:

6 The Project may result in impacts that may exceed thresholds of
7 significance for the following six issue areas: The proposed Project may
8 conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan,
9 Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or
10 state conservation plan; The proposed Project may have a substantial
11 adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on an
12 endangered, or threatened species; The proposed Project has the potential to
13 interfere substantially with the movement of native resident or migratory
14 fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife
15 corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; The proposed
16 Project may have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through
17 habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or
18 special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or
19 by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Wildlife Service;
20 The proposed Project may have a direct substantial adverse effect on any
21 riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or
22 regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of
23 Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; or The proposed
24 Project may have a direct substantial adverse effect on federally protected
25 wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but
26 not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal,
27 filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

1 As analyzed in Section 4.3.4 of the Final EIR No. 540, development of the
2 project will contribute to the change of the general area with an
3 intensification of development substantially greater than that which
4 presently occurs on the site; however, industrial and commercial
5 development, of a larger acreage and scale that the project is currently
6 permitted on the site. With the incorporation of mitigation, the project will
7 not cause adverse cumulative effects related to the reduction of sensitive
8 vegetation communities present in western Riverside County because there
9 are no such species located within the project area and the project can be
10 implemented consistent with the criteria identified in the MSHCP, the
11 planning document that defines cumulative biological resource values for
12 the Southwest Area Plan planning area. Due to the preservation/avoidance
13 of significant biological resources within the project site, and full mitigation
14 of any project-specific impacts, the proposed project is not forecast to cause
15 any direct or indirect significant unavoidable adverse impact to sensitive
16 biological resources.

17 The mitigation measures identified are feasible and in conjunction with the
18 developers commitment to permanently conserve approximately 94 acres
19 within MSHCP Core 2 area the proposed project would avoid or
20 substantially lessen the potentially significant impacts associated with
21 project biology resource impacts to a level of less than significant and no
22 unavoidable adverse or cumulatively considerable biology resource impacts
23 would occur.

24 With the incorporation of mitigation, the Project will not cause adverse
25 cumulative effects related to the reduction of sensitive vegetation
26 communities present in western Riverside County because there are no such
27

1 species located within the Project area and the Project can be implemented
2 consistent with the criteria identified in the MSHCP.

3 Cumulative biological impacts are defined as those impacts resulting from
4 the development within the MSCHP Plan Area as a result of build out of the
5 Cities and County's General Plans (MSHCP EIR/IES). Development of the
6 Project will contribute to the change of the general area with an
7 intensification of development substantially greater than that which
8 presently occurs on the site; however, industrial and commercial
9 development, of a larger acreage and scale that the project is currently
10 permitted on the site. With the incorporation of mitigation, the project will
11 not cause adverse cumulative effects related to the reduction of sensitive
12 vegetation communities present in western Riverside County because there
13 are no such species located within the project area and the project can be
14 implemented consistent with the criteria identified in the MSHCP, the
15 planning document that defines cumulative biological resource values for
16 the Southwest Area Plan planning area.

17 2. Mitigation:

18 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
19 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

- 20 a. 4.3-1: The construction of wildlife crossings will be done pursuant
21 to Section 6.6.2 E(2) of Volume 1 of the MSHCP (Joint
22 Project/Acquisition Review Process(Initial Project Review)).
23 Wildlife crossings will be sized, shaped, placed, constructed, and
24 landscaped pursuant to Section 7.5.2 of Volume 1 of the MSHCP
25 (Guidelines for Construction of Wildlife Crossings).
- 26 b. 4.3-2: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, any impacts to
27 CDFW jurisdiction will require a Lake and Streambed Alteration

1 Agreement (SAA) pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the California
2 Fish and Game Code. Due to the low quality waters of the State on
3 the project site, the preservation of the several acres of habitat in
4 Tualota Creek is considered sufficient mitigation to compensate for
5 the loss of less than one acre of these waters. This mitigation may
6 be altered through the conditions established in the SAA, but shall
7 not be less than identified in this measure.

8 c. 4.3-3: Pursuant to Objective 6 and Objective 7 of the Species
9 Account for the Burrowing Owl included in the Western Riverside
10 County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, within 30 days
11 prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a pre-construction
12 presence/absence survey for the burrowing owl shall be conducted
13 by a qualified biologist and the results of this presence/absence
14 survey shall be provided in writing to the Environmental Programs
15 Department. If it is determined that the project site is occupied by
16 the Burrowing Owl, take of "active" nests shall be avoided pursuant
17 to the MSHCP and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. However, when
18 the Burrowing Owl is present, relocation outside of the nesting
19 season (March 1 through August 31) by a qualified biologist shall be
20 required. The County Biologist shall be consulted to determine
21 appropriate type of relocation (active or passive) and translocation
22 sites. Occupation of this species on the project site may result in the
23 need to revise grading plans so that take of "active" nests is avoided
24 or alternatively, a grading permit may be issued once the species has
25 been actively relocated. If the grading permit is not obtained within
26 30 days of the survey a new survey shall be required.

27 d. 4.3-4: In order to avoid violation of the MBTA and California Fish

1 and Game Code, site-preparation activities (removal of trees and
2 vegetation) shall be avoided, to the greatest extent possible, during
3 the nesting season (generally February 1 to August 31) of potentially
4 occurring native and migratory bird species. If vegetation must be
5 removed during the nesting season, a qualified biologist will
6 conduct a nesting bird survey of potentially suitable nesting
7 vegetation prior to removal. Surveys will be conducted no more
8 than 3 days prior to scheduled removals. If active nests are
9 identified, the biologist will recommend buffers around the
10 vegetation containing the active nests. The vegetation containing
11 the active nest will not be removed, and no grading will occur within
12 the established buffer, until a qualified biologist has determined that
13 the nest is no longer active (i.e., the juveniles are surviving
14 independent from the nest). If clearing is not conducted within three
15 days of a negative survey, the nesting survey must be repeated to
16 confirm the absence of nesting birds.

- 17 e. 4.3-5: Non-native invasive plant species shall not be used in the
18 public property landscape palette and the HOA shall provide
19 homeowners with a copy of Table 6.2 of the MSHCP with a
20 prohibition against homeowners installing any plants on the list on
21 their property.

22 C. Cultural Resources

23 1. Impacts:

24 The Final EIR No. 530 explains the thresholds of significance in great detail
25 in section 4.4.3. Based on the information contained in the Phase I Report
26 and Phase II Report, implementation of the Project will not result in cultural
27 resource impacts that will exceed the established thresholds of significance.

1 Because the implementation of the Project is not forecast to cause any
2 direct, significant adverse impact to cultural resources, with implementation
3 of identified mitigation measures, the Project has no potential to make a
4 cumulatively considerable contribution to cultural resource impacts, in the
5 Project area or Riverside County in general. Based on the information
6 contained above, all potential cultural resource impacts would be limited
7 and with mitigation incorporated will remain at a less than significant level.
8 As a result, there will not be any unavoidable project specific or cumulative
9 adverse impacts to cultural resources from implementing the project as
10 proposed.

11 Cumulatively, based on the information contained in the Phase I Report and
12 Phase II Report, implementation of the Project will not result in cultural
13 resource impacts that will exceed the established thresholds of significance.
14 Because the implementation of the Project is not forecast to cause any
15 direct, significant adverse impact to cultural resources, with implementation
16 of identified mitigation measures, the Project has no potential to make a
17 cumulatively considerable contribution to cultural resource impacts, in the
18 Project area or Riverside County in general.

19 2. Mitigation:

20 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
21 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures or conditions of
22 approval:

- 23 a. 10.Planning.19: County Archaeological Report (PDA) No. 4871
24 submitted for this project (TR36546) was prepared by Jean Keller,
25 Ph.D., Cultural Resources Consultant and is entitled: "An Updated
26 Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of Cultural Resource
27 Properties CA-RIV-4640, CA-RIV-4661, CA-RIV-6912, and 33-

1 23915, located within Tract Map 36546," dated July 2014. This
2 document was signed and certified by the consultant on August 25,
3 2014.

4 (PDA) No. 4871 concluded: CA-RIV-4661 and P-33-23915 are
5 located within an open space area and will not be adversely
6 impacted by development of this Project. 2. The previously mapped
7 location of CA-RIV-4640 and site CA-RIV-6912 are both situated in
8 areas that will be impacted by development of this Project.

9 (PDA) No. 4871 recommends: 1.A Phase II testing and evaluation
10 program shall be conducted for sites CA-RIV-4640 and CA-RIV-
11 6912. Should future development be proposed in the area of P-33-
12 23915, Phase II testing and evaluation should be conducted for this
13 resource. If any ground disturbing activities are conducted within
14 100' of CA-RIV-4661, temporary protective orange fencing shall be
15 installed and earthmoving activities shall be monitored by a
16 qualified archaeologist and a tribal representative. All earthmoving
17 activities associated with development of Tentative Tract Map
18 36546 are monitored by a qualified archaeologist and a tribal
19 representative. Phase II work is required as described elsewhere in
20 this conditions set. This study has been incorporated as part of this
21 Project, and has been accepted.

- 22 b. 60.Planning.24: The landowner agrees to relinquish ownership of all
23 cultural resources, including all Luiseño sacred items, burial goods
24 and all archaeological artifacts that are found on the Project area to
25 the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians for proper treatment and
26 disposition.
27

1 If any human remains are encountered, all ground disturbing
2 activities in the vicinity of the discovery shall be immediately
3 terminated and the County Coroner's office contacted. If the
4 remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the
5 Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians shall be contacted concerning the
6 management and permanent disposition of the remains.

7 Tribal monitors from the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians shall be
8 allowed to monitor all initial grading, excavation, and
9 groundbreaking activities, including further surveys, to be
10 compensated by the Project Applicant/Developer. The Pechanga
11 Tribal monitors will have the authority to stop and redirect grading
12 activities to evaluate the significance of any archaeological
13 resources discovered on the property, in conjunction with the
14 archaeologist and the Planning Department.

15 Tribal monitors from the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians shall be
16 allowed to monitor all grading, excavation, and groundbreaking
17 activities, including further surveys, to be compensated by the
18 Project Applicant/Developer. The Pechanga Tribal monitors will
19 have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities to evaluate
20 the significance of any archaeological resources discovered on the
21 property, in conjunction with the archaeologist and the Planning
22 Department.

23 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the developer/permit
24 applicant shall enter into a contract with a Tribal monitor(s) from the
25 appropriate Native American Tribe(s) who, at the tribe's discretion,
26 shall be on-site during ground disturbing activities. The developer
27 shall submit a copy of a signed contract between the appropriate

1 Tribe and the developer/permit holder for the monitoring of the
2 Project, and which addresses the treatment of cultural resources, to
3 the Planning Department and the County Archaeologist. The Native
4 American Monitor(s) shall have the authority to temporarily divert,
5 redirect or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow recovery of
6 cultural resources. Native American groups shall be given a
7 minimum notice of two weeks that a monitor is required. If a
8 monitor is not available, work may continue without the monitor.
9 The Project Archaeologist shall include in the Phase IV
10 Archaeological Monitoring report any concerns or comments that
11 the monitor has regarding the Project and shall include as an
12 appendix any written correspondence or reports prepared by the
13 Native American monitor.

14 Native American monitoring does not replace any Cultural
15 Resources monitoring required by a County-approved
16 Archaeologist, but rather serves as a supplement for coordination
17 and advisory purposes for all groups' interests only.

18 The developer/permit applicant shall not be required to further
19 pursue any agreement for Native American monitoring of this
20 Project if after 60 days from the initial attempt to secure an
21 agreement the developer/permit applicant, through demonstrable
22 good faith effort, has been unable to secure said agreement from the
23 Tribe. A good faith effort shall consist of no less than 3 written
24 attempts from the developer/permit applicant to the tribe to secure
25 the required special interest monitoring agreement and appropriate
26 e-mail and telephone contact attempts. Documentation of the effort
27

1 made to secure the agreement shall be submitted to the County
2 Archaeologist for review and consideration.

3 Should repatriation of collected cultural items be preferred, it shall
4 not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been
5 submitted to the Riverside County Archaeologist. Should curation
6 be preferred, the developer/permit applicant is responsible for all
7 costs and the repository and curation method shall be described in
8 the Phase IV monitoring report.

- 9 c. 60.Planning.25: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the
10 developer/permit holder shall retain and enter into a monitoring and
11 mitigation service contract with a qualified Archaeologist for
12 services. The Project Archaeologist (Cultural Resource
13 Professional) shall develop a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan
14 which must be approved by the County Archaeologist prior to
15 issuance of grading permits. The Project Archaeologist shall be
16 included in the pre-grade meetings to provide Construction Worker
17 Cultural Resources Sensitivity Training including the establishment
18 of set guidelines for ground disturbance in sensitive areas with the
19 grading contractors and special interest monitors. A sign-in sheet
20 for attendees of this training shall be included in the Phase IV
21 Monitoring Report. The Project Archaeologist shall manage and
22 oversee monitoring for all initial ground disturbing activities and
23 excavation of each portion of the Project site including clearing,
24 grubbing, tree removals, grading, trenching, stockpiling of materials,
25 rock crushing, structure demolition and etc. The Project Monitor
26 shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect or halt the
27 ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and

1 potential recovery of cultural resources in coordination with the
2 special interest monitors. The developer/permit holder shall submit
3 a fully executed copy of the contract and a wet-signed copy of the
4 Monitoring Plan to the Riverside County Planning Department to
5 ensure compliance with this condition of approval.

6 d. 60.Planning.01: This site is mapped in the County's General Plan as
7 having a High potential for paleontological resources (fossils).
8 Proposed project site grading/earthmoving activities could
9 potentially impact this resource. HENCE: PRIOR TO ISSUANCE
10 OF GRADING PERMITS: The applicant shall retain a qualified
11 paleontologist approved by the County of Riverside to create and
12 implement a project-specific plan for monitoring site
13 grading/earthmoving activities (project paleontologist). The Project
14 paleontologist retained shall review the approved development plan
15 and grading plan and shall conduct any pre-construction work
16 necessary to render appropriate monitoring and mitigation
17 requirements as appropriate. These requirements shall be
18 documented by the Project paleontologist in a Paleontological
19 Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP). This PRIMP shall
20 be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior
21 to issuance of a Grading Permit.

22 Information to be contained in the PRIMP, at a minimum and in
23 addition to other industry standards and Society of Vertebrate
24 Paleontology standards, are as follows:

- 25 1. Description of the proposed site and planned grading
26 operations.

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

2. Description of the level of monitoring required for all earth-moving activities in the Project area.
3. Identification and qualifications of the qualified paleontological monitor to be employed for grading operations monitoring.
4. Identification of personnel with authority and responsibility to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for recovery of large specimens.
5. Direction for any fossil discoveries to be immediately reported to the property owner who in turn will immediately notify the County Geologist of the discovery.
6. Means and methods to be employed by the paleontological monitor to quickly salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays.
7. Sampling of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates.
8. Procedures and protocol for collecting and processing of samples and specimens.
9. Fossil identification and curation procedures to be employed.
10. Identification of the permanent repository to receive any recovered fossil material. *Pursuant the County of Riverside "SABER Policy", paleontological fossils found in the County of Riverside should, by preference, be directed to the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet. A written agreement between the property owner/developer and the repository must be in place prior to site grading.
11. All pertinent exhibits, maps and references.

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

12. Procedures for reporting of findings.

13. Identification and acknowledgement of the developer for the content of the PRIMP as well as acceptance of financial responsibility for monitoring, reporting and curation fees. The property owner and/or applicant on whose land the paleontological fossils are discovered shall provide appropriate funding for monitoring, reporting, delivery and curating the fossils at the institution where the fossils will be placed, and will provide confirmation to the County that such funding has been paid to the institution.

All reports shall be signed by the Project paleontologist and all other professionals responsible for the report's content (e.g. Professional Geologist), as appropriate. Two wet-signed original copies of the report(s) shall be submitted to the office of the County Geologist along with a copy of this condition and the grading plan for appropriate case processing and tracking. These documents should not be submitted to the Project Planner, the Plan Check staff, the Land Use Counter or any other County office. In addition, the applicant shall submit proof of hiring (i.e. copy of executed contract, retainer agreement, etc.) a Project paleontologist for the in-grading implementation of the PRIMP.

e. 70.Planning.01: Prior to grading final, the applicant shall submit to the County Geologist one wet-signed copy of the Paleontological Monitoring Report prepared for site grading operations at this site. The report shall be certified by the professionally-qualified Paleontologist

1 responsible for the content of the report. This Paleontologist must be on
2 the County's Paleontology Consultant List. The report shall contain a
3 report of findings made during all site grading activities and an
4 appended itemized list of fossil specimens recovered during grading (if
5 any) and proof of accession of fossil materials into the pre-approved
6 museum repository. In addition, all appropriate fossil location
7 information shall be submitted to the Western Center, the San
8 Bernardino County Museum and Los Angeles County Museum of
9 Natural History, at a minimum, for incorporation into their Regional
10 Locality Inventories.

11 D. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

12 1. Impacts:

13 The proposed Project would exceed the SCAQMD suggested GHG
14 threshold of 3,000 MT/year with implementation of all reasonably available
15 mitigation measures related to Energy Efficient Project Design. The Project
16 would have a significant cumulative adverse impact with respect to GHG
17 emissions. Further, the inability to achieve CAP compliance with feasible
18 measures is considered a conflict with applicable plans, policies and
19 regulations. As such, the proposed Project would result in a significant
20 unavoidable adverse impact with respect to GHG emissions.

21 Cumulatively, the proposed Project would exceed the SCAQMD suggested
22 GHG threshold of 3,000 MT/year with implementation of all reasonably
23 available mitigation measures related to Energy Efficient Project Design.
24 The Project would have a significant cumulative adverse impact with
25 respect to GHG emissions. Therefore, CEQA requires Riverside County to
26 adopt a statement of overriding considerations set forth in this resolution.

27 ///

1 2. Mitigation:

2 a. The Mitigation Measures for potential Air Quality Impacts set forth
3 in section A above are incorporated herein by this reference.

4 E. Hydrology and Water Quality

5 1. Impacts:

6 One watercourse (Tucalota Creek) traverses the Project site generally from
7 north to southwest, and two small, ephemeral creek channels originate on
8 the property but do not flow in channels. The Tucalota Creek channel will
9 be permanently conserved on the Project site. Also, as part of the
10 permanent mitigation on the north side of the property, the other two
11 channels are being preserved. The northern portion of the property will be
12 retained with the existing natural habitat.

13 However, after development of the proposed residential Project the drainage
14 in the central portion of the Project site will be substantially altered. The
15 flows will be collected and delivered to a drainage system that will be
16 installed in conjunction with the proposed Project. The Project incorporates
17 water quality/water management basins that will collect the local runoff
18 ultimately, for discharge back into Tucalota Creek. Surface runoff will be
19 treated before released to the drainage pipes to remove first flush suburban
20 pollutants and the basins will detain flows sufficiently to prevent a
21 substantial increase in the storm water discharged from the Project site.
22 Thus, even though the drainage pattern will be modified onsite, the
23 proposed drainage system will not substantially alter the flow or course of a
24 stream or river in a manner that could result in substantial erosion or
25 siltation on- or off-site. The Project's potential impact to onsite or
26 downstream erosion or siltation is considered to be less than significant.

27 As described in the previous section, the proposed Project is a residential

1 subdivision that is proposed to occupy the south-central portion of the
2 Project site. The two potential sources of water quality degradation from a
3 residential subdivision consist of domestic wastewater generation and non-
4 point source storm water runoff from the future development. The
5 wastewater from this Project site will be delivered to Eastern Municipal
6 Water District (EMWD's) Temecula Valley Regional Water Reclamation
7 Facility (WRF). According to the EMWD website this facility currently has
8 typical daily wastewater flows of 12 million gallons per day. The plant's
9 capacity is 18 MGD. Given the ongoing operation of this WRF in
10 conformance with the permits issued by the San Diego Regional Water
11 Quality Control Board (Regional Board), the discharge of wastewater by the
12 future population occupying the Project site will not cause the violation of
13 any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

14 The second source of potential water quality degradation is the storm water
15 runoff from the proposed suburban development, both during construction
16 and after occupancy. During construction the Project site will be exposed to
17 rainfall and have a potential to cause erosion and generate sediment.
18 Although implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
19 (SWPPP) is required by the State when an area greater than one acre will be
20 disturbed by construction activities, mitigation is provided below to require
21 implementation of the SWPPP during construction and identification of
22 some preliminary best management practices (BMPs). Regarding long term
23 storm water management, the Project design already incorporates a set of
24 long-term BMPs, including basins to treat future storm water runoff from
25 the developed Project. Mechanical treatment at the outlets will further
26 reduce non-point source runoff potential to a less than significant impact
27 level. Therefore, the potential to violate any water quality standards or

1 waste discharge requirements will be controlled by the surface runoff
2 treatment system incorporated into the design of the Project. No further
3 mitigation is required to address this issue.

4 Because of the onsite detention, the proposed Project will not substantially
5 interfere with groundwater recharge that may have occurred on the site
6 historically. Recharge will be partially maintained through the Project
7 implementation. The groundwater table is well below the ground surface
8 within the Project development area as indicated by the bed of Tualota
9 Creek which is not always flowing and serves as the base elevation for
10 water in the Project area. Therefore, there is no potential to encounter the
11 groundwater table during grading, unless a small, localized perched water
12 table is encountered. Regarding regional groundwater resources, Eastern
13 Municipal Water District's Urban Water Management Plan indicates that
14 with appropriate management, the groundwater resources within its service
15 area can be maintained through a mix of judicious groundwater extractions
16 and percolation of imported water to offset any substantial declines in the
17 groundwater table. Based on these factors, the potential to adversely impact
18 groundwater resources is considered to be a less than significant impact.

19 Due to the Project increasing the amount of impervious surface on the
20 Project site, onsite runoff will be increased. However through a
21 combination of the detention basins and porous landscaped areas on the
22 Project site, the volume of runoff will not be substantially increased from
23 the Project and the proposed Project will not exceed the capacity of the
24 downstream drainage system, which consists of an existing drainage pipe
25 along Calistoga Road and then discharge into Tualota Creek where these
26 two features intercept each other. The capacity of the drainage system will
27 not be exceeded and the water quality treatment provided by the basins and

1 the pre-discharge treatment system equipment will ensure that the Project
2 will not create a substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

3 The proposed Project has no potential to place housing within a 100-year
4 flood hazard boundary. The proposed Project has no potential to place
5 structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that could then impede or
6 redirect flood flows. No impact will occur under this issue.

7 No other potential sources of water quality degradation have been identified
8 in conjunction with this proposed Project.

9 This Project does include new onsite treatment facilities that could
10 adversely impact other environmental resource issues, such as odors and
11 vectors. A mitigation measure is provided below to ensure funding is
12 provided to maintain the onsite water quality/detention basins to ensure
13 their effectiveness and control potential to generate odors or sustain vectors.
14 This can be accomplished by ensuring that anaerobic conditions do not
15 develop within the basins and by allowing the basins to dry periodically or
16 be treated to control vectors. With this mitigation the potential
17 environmental impacts from these hydrology/water quality facilities can be
18 controlled to a less than significant level.

19 2. Mitigation:

20 With the following Project conditions of approval there is no impact or the
21 impacts are less than significant to hydrology and water quality:

- 22 a. 10.BS Grade.06: Construction activities including clearing,
23 stockpiling, grading or excavation of land which disturbs less than 1
24 acre and requires a grading permit or construction Building permit
25 shall provide for effective control of erosion, sediment and all other
26 pollutants year-round. The permit holder shall be responsible for the
27 installation and monitoring of effective erosion and sediment

1 controls. Such controls will be evaluated by the Department of
2 Building and Safety periodically and prior to permit Final to verify
3 compliance with industry recognized erosion control measures.
4 Construction activities including clearing, stockpiling, grading or
5 excavation of land which disturbs less than 1 acre and requires a
6 grading permit or construction Building permit shall provide for
7 effective control of erosion, sediment and all other pollutants year-
8 round. The permit holder shall be responsible for the installation and
9 monitoring of effective erosion and sediment controls. Such controls
10 will be evaluated by the Department of Building and Safety
11 periodically and prior to permit Final to verify compliance with
12 industry recognized erosion control measures.

13 Construction activities including but not limited to clearing,
14 stockpiling, grading or excavation of land, which disturbs 1 acre or
15 more or on-sites which are part of a larger common plan of
16 development which disturbs less than 1 acre are required to obtain
17 coverage under the construction general permit with the State Water
18 Resources Control Board. You are required to provide proof of
19 WDID# and keep a current copy of the storm water pollution
20 prevention plan (SWPPP) on the construction site and shall be made
21 available to the Department of Building and Safety upon request.

22 Year-round, Best Management Practices (BMP's) shall be
23 maintained and be in place for all areas that have been graded or
24 disturbed and for all material, equipment and/or operations that need
25 protection. Stabilized Construction Entrances and Project perimeter
26 linear barriers are required year round. Removal BMP's (those
27 BMP's which must be temporarily removed during construction

1 activities) shall be in place at the end of each working day.
2 Monitoring for erosion and sediment control is required and shall be
3 performed by the QSD or QSP as required by the Construction
4 General Permit. Stormwater samples are required for all discharge
5 locations and projects may not exceed limits set forth by the
6 Construction General Permit Numeric Action Levels and/or
7 Numeric Effluent Levels. A Rain Event Action Plan is required
8 when there is a 50% or greater forecast of rain within the 48 hours,
9 by the National Weather Service or whenever rain is imminent. The
10 QSD or QSP must print and save records of the precipitation
11 forecast for the Project location area from
12 (<http://www.srh.noaa.gov/forecast>) and must accompany monitoring
13 reports and sampling test data. A Rain gauge is required on site. The
14 Department of Building and Safety will conduct periodic National
15 Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) inspections of the
16 site throughout the recognized storm season to verify compliance
17 with the Construction General Permit and Stormwater ordinances
18 and regulations.

- 19 b. 60.BS GRADE 001: Prior to issuance of any grading or construction
20 permits - whichever comes first - the applicant shall provide the
21 Building and Safety Department evidence of compliance with the
22 following: "Effective March 10, 2003 owner operators of grading or
23 construction projects are required to comply with the NPDES
24 requirement to obtain a construction permit from the State Water
25 Resource Control Board (SWRCB). The permit requirement applies
26 to grading and construction sites of "ONE" acre or larger. The owner
27 operator can comply by submitting a "Notice of Intent" (NOI),

1 develop and implement a STORM WATER POLLUTION
2 PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and
3 reporting plan for the construction site. Additionally, at the time the
4 County adopts regulations specific to the NPDES, this Project (or
5 subdivision) shall comply with them.

6 F. Land Use and Planning

7 1. Impacts:

8 Implementation of the Project will result in change of the land uses and
9 planning designations of the general Project area. Approval of the Project
10 will cause an intensification of development greater than that which
11 presently occurs on the site, as the residential site is currently vacant. It
12 should be noted that the site currently has commercial, industrial and open
13 space designations. Implementation of the Project will also result in
14 cumulative impacts to the existing zoning; however, the Project will be
15 consistent with the proposed zoning with the approval of the Project's
16 General Plan Amendment (GPA), Change of Zone (CZ) and Specific Plan
17 (SP) and will not be considered cumulative. However, the proposed Project
18 continues a cumulative pattern of development within the Southwest Area
19 Plan planning area of low density, suburban development. Aspects of this
20 proposed Project are consistent with Regional Transportation Plan/
21 Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) objectives and policies, but
22 the proposed Project continues a pattern of development that has significant
23 conflicts with key regional policies. This is considered a cumulatively
24 considerable adverse impact of the Project.

25 The existing land use and planning setting of the Project site and
26 surrounding area will be permanently altered as a result of Project
27 implementation. The intensification of development is different than that

1 which would be allowed under the current SP 265; however, it is consistent
2 with most adjacent land uses to the south and east (single-family
3 residential). Based on the data and analysis presented in this subchapter,
4 implementation of the Project will not cause significant adverse land use
5 and planning impacts to these community characteristics, but the
6 cumulative contribution to conflicts with regional policies is considered an
7 unavoidable significant adverse impact of the proposed Project.

8 Cumulatively, development of the Project will result in change of the land
9 uses and planning designations of the general Project area. Approval of the
10 Project will cause an intensification of development greater than that which
11 presently occurs on the site, as the site is currently vacant. It should be
12 noted that the site currently has commercial, industrial and open space
13 designations. Implementation of the Project will also result in cumulative
14 impacts to the existing zoning; however, the Project will be consistent with
15 the proposed zoning with the approval of the Project's General Plan
16 Amendment (GPA), Change of Zone (CZ) and Specific Plan (SP) and will
17 not be considered cumulative for the reasons discussed above. However, the
18 proposed Project continues a cumulative pattern of development within the
19 Southwest Area Plan planning area of low density, suburban development.
20 Aspects of this proposed Project are consistent with regional RTP/SCS
21 objectives and policies, but the proposed Project continues a pattern of
22 development that has significant conflicts with key regional policies. This is
23 considered a cumulatively considerable adverse impact of the Project.
24 Therefore, CEQA requires Riverside County to adopt a statement of
25 overriding considerations set forth in this resolution.

26 2. Mitigation:

27 No mitigation is required for direct Project impacts, and no mitigation is

1 available for cumulative impacts related land use and planning resources,
2 with the exception of regional planning conflicts. No measures are
3 available to address the regional planning conflicts.

4 G. Noise

5 1. Impacts:

6 The Project area is close to the French Valley Airport. With the exception
7 of the proposed residential subdivision, the proximity to the Airport does
8 not expose any sensitive land uses to potentially significant adverse noise
9 impacts. After careful review it was determined that at full buildout the
10 forecast noise level at the subdivision will be at or below 60 dBA CNEL.
11 Thus, the proposed subdivision will not be exposed to significant aircraft
12 noise now or in the future. Also, since there are no railroads located within
13 the Project area, the site will not be exposed to any adverse railroad noise
14 impacts. Since the Project site is located within the French Valley Airport
15 Influence Area; the site will be exposed to noise levels ranging from 60 to
16 65 CNEL. The removal of the second runway at the French Valley Airport
17 ensures that aircraft noise will not be increased due to closer proximity of
18 future aircraft operations on the second runway. Future building occupants
19 must be notified of periodic loud noise associated with aircraft operations.
20 The existing noise setting of the Project site will be permanently altered.
21 Through the analysis contained in the Draft EIR No. 540, it was determined,
22 that implementation of the proposed Project would not result in or expose
23 people to highway noise that exceeds established thresholds, with the
24 incorporation of mitigation measures. The Noise Analysis evaluated
25 General Plan build-out traffic noise levels and found that the Project would
26 not contribute to adverse noise impacts when combined with other projects
27 in the area. Because Project impacts are below established thresholds for

1 these issue areas, the Project would not contribute to adverse noise impacts
2 when combined with other projects in the area, it will not result in any
3 cumulative impacts.

4 The intensification of development greater than that which presently occurs
5 on the site results in an unavoidable adverse noise impact of the Project in
6 terms of impacts to the immediate adjacent uses and the existing site
7 zoning. Based on the data and analysis presented in EIR No. 540,
8 implementation of the Project will cause an adverse noise impact, for which
9 mitigation has been added. All other Project- related noise impacts can be
10 controlled to less than significant levels with implementation of proposed
11 mitigation.

12 Cumulatively, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial
13 Study/Environmental Assessment, implementation of the proposed Project
14 would not result in impacts that would expose people residing or working in
15 the Project area to excessive noise levels (for a project within the vicinity of
16 a private airstrip); result in or expose people to railroad noise; result in or
17 expose people to other noise; in a substantial permanent increase in ambient
18 noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project;
19 in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the
20 Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project; exposure of
21 persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in
22 the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other
23 agencies; and/or, exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-
24 borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. Through the analysis
25 contained in the Draft EIR No. 540, it was determined, that implementation
26 of the proposed Project would not exceed established thresholds that would
27 expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise

1 levels (or a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a
2 plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use
3 airport would the Project) under existing aircraft operation noise conditions
4 or projected aircraft operation noise conditions in Year 2030. Through the
5 analysis contained in the Draft EIR, it was determined, that implementation
6 of the proposed Project would not result in or expose people to highway
7 noise that exceeds established thresholds, with the incorporation of
8 mitigation measures. The Noise Analysis evaluated General Plan build-out
9 traffic noise levels and found that the Project would not contribute to
10 adverse noise impacts when combined with other projects in the area.
11 Because Project impacts are below established thresholds for these issue
12 areas, the Project would not contribute to adverse noise impacts when
13 combined with other projects in the area, it will not result in any cumulative
14 impacts.

15 2. Mitigation:

16 The proposed Project has been modified to partially avoid or lessen
17 significant impacts; and, impacts shall be fully mitigated below a level of
18 significance with the following mitigation measures and conditions of
19 approval:

- 20 a. 4.7-1: Prior to the issuance of building permits for residential uses
21 within the 2030 60 dB CNEL contour of the Airport, the Project
22 property owner/developer should submit a final acoustical report.
23 The report shall show that the development will include mitigation
24 measures to ensure that the Project is sound-attenuated against
25 present and projected noise levels to meet the 45 dB CNEL interior
26 noise standard in any habitable room.
- 27 b. 4.7-2: Anyone buying or leasing a residential property within the

1 Project site should be notified that their home is within an “airport
2 influence area” and informed of the associated noise implications.

3 c. 4.7-3: Future traffic noise levels at sensitive uses adjacent to
4 Calistoga Drive could result in exterior noise levels greater than 65
5 dB CNEL based on General Plan build-out traffic noise. In order to
6 reduce potential noise levels below the Riverside County exterior
7 noise compatibility guideline (65 dB CNEL) at the lots closest to
8 Calistoga Drive, one or more of the following mitigation measures
9 will be required to ensure residential uses adjacent to Calistoga
10 Drive are adequately protected from roadway noise sources prior to
11 the issuance of a building permit: sensitive uses adjacent to Calistoga
12 Drive will be setback a minimum of 85 feet from Project access
13 roadways, or a 5’-0” foot high perimeter wall or berm will be
14 installed at homes backing up to or abutting Calistoga Drive,
15 providing up to 5 dB attenuation. When the road is elevated above
16 the pad elevation, the barrier shall extend to the recommended height
17 above the highest point between the residential home and the road.
18 The barrier must present a solid face from top to bottom.
19 Unnecessary openings or decorative cutouts should not be made. All
20 gaps (except for weep holes) should be filled with grout or caulking.

21 d. 4.7-4: In order to meet the County of Riverside 45 dBA CNEL
22 interior noise standards the Project shall provide the following or
23 equivalent noise mitigation measures: all windows and sliding glass
24 doors shall be well fitted, well weather-stripped assemblies and shall
25 have a minimum sound transmission class (STC) rating of 27; all
26 exterior doors shall be well weather-stripped solid core assemblies at
27 least one and three-fourths-inch thick; roof sheathing of wood

1 construction shall be well fitted or caulked plywood of at least one-
2 half inch thick. Ceilings shall be well fitted, well sealed gypsum
3 board of at least one-half inch thick. Insulation with at least a rating
4 of R-19 shall be used in the attic space; attic vents should be oriented
5 away from Calistoga Drive. If such an orientation cannot be avoided,
6 then an acoustical baffle shall be placed in the attic space behind the
7 vents; supplemental ventilation, in conjunction with air conditioning,
8 is required in any livable space where window closure to shut out
9 roadway noise is needed to meet interior standards. Arrangements
10 for any habitable room shall be such that any exterior door or
11 window can be kept closed when the room is in use. A forced air
12 circulation system (e.g. air conditioning) shall be provided which
13 satisfies the requirements of the Uniform Mechanical Code. Wall
14 mounted air conditioners shall not be used.

15 This shall be reflected on plans prior to building permit issuance, and
16 inspected for compliance, prior to building final inspection.

17 e. 10.Planning.20: The applicant shall provide evidence that the
18 following was implemented during construction activities:

- 19 1. All construction equipment shall be required to minimize
20 noise from construction activities. Equipment mufflers shall
21 be maintained in proper operating order. All equipment shall
22 be operated in the quietest manner feasible.
- 23 2. To the extent feasible, the noisiest operations shall be
24 scheduled to occur simultaneously in the construction
25 program to avoid prolonged periods of annoyance.
- 26 3. The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging
27 in areas that will create the greatest distance between

1 construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive
2 receptors nearest the Project site during all Project
3 construction.

4 4. No music or electronically reinforced speech from
5 construction workers shall be audible at noise-sensitive
6 property.

7 5. All Project workers exposed to noise levels above 80 dBA
8 shall be provided with personal protective equipment for
9 hearing protection (i.e., earplugs and/or earmuffs); areas
10 where noise levels are routinely expected to exceed 80 dBA
11 shall be clearly posted with signs requiring hearing
12 protection be worn.

13 6. If blasting is required, blasts should be restricted to the
14 hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

15 H. Transportation and Traffic

16 1. Impacts:

17 The proposed Project has no potential to alter flight operations at French
18 Valley Airport and will not adversely impact any waterborne or rail traffic
19 as none occurs within the Project area.

20 The Project's contribution to the TUMF program as a fair share contribution
21 is considered sufficient to address the Project's fair share toward a
22 mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate any potential
23 cumulative impacts. According to the traffic analysis, with adherence to
24 standard conditions, and incorporation of mitigation measures, the Project
25 will not exceed established thresholds related to transportation/traffic. The
26 thresholds have been established to address Project-specific impacts, as well
27 as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Since the Project is below the

1 established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant.
2 Implementation of the Project will not conflict with an applicable plan,
3 ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the
4 performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of
5 transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant
6 components of the circulation system, including but not limited to
7 intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths,
8 and mass transit; conflict with an applicable congestion management
9 program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel
10 demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion
11 management agency for designated roads or highways; substantially
12 increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous
13 intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment); cause an effect
14 upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads; cause an effect
15 upon circulation during the Project's construction; result in inadequate
16 emergency access or access to nearby uses; and/or, conflict with adopted
17 policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian
18 facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of
19 such facilities. County application materials, site-specific analysis,
20 mitigation measures, standard conditions, and conditions of approval will
21 ensure that impacts to transportation/traffic resources are fully addressed.
22 Any impacts are considered less than significant. No unavoidable
23 significant adverse traffic or circulation system impacts will result from
24 implementing the proposed Project.

25 2. Mitigation:

26 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
27 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

- 1 a. 4.8-1: Prior to building final, the applicant shall pay Project Fair
2 Share contributions, as reflected in Table 5-1 Project Fair Share
3 Contribution to Study Area Intersections, of the TIA.
- 4 b. 4.8-2: Construction of the following on-site improvements shall
5 occur in conjunction with adjacent Project development activity or
6 as needed for Project access purposes: construct the proposed
7 alignment of Calistoga Drive through the Project site as a collector
8 roadway from the existing terminus of Calistoga Drive in the south
9 to the proposed on-site roundabout; construct the proposed
10 alignment of Calistoga Drive from the on-site roundabout to the
11 Promontory Parkway terminus in the east as a 28 foot paved
12 roadway; provide stop sign control at the Project driveways; on-site
13 traffic signing and striping should be implemented in conjunction
14 with detailed construction plans for the Project; and, verify that
15 minimum sight distance is provided at the Project access points.
- 16 c. 4.8-3: Prior to any construction of any Project components within
17 any existing roadway right- of-way, the developer shall submit a
18 traffic control plan (TCP) for review and approval by the
19 appropriate agency that has jurisdiction over that roadway. The
20 TCP shall provide specific measures that ensure adequate
21 emergency access to all parcels of land during construction and
22 property owner access to occupied parcels during construction.

23 I. Utilities and Service Systems

24 1. Impact:

25 According to the Plan of Service Summary compiled by the Project
26 engineer and Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), the proposed
27 Project is forecast to create a demand for up to 243,900 gallons of water per

1 day at buildout. This includes both the proposed land use and the site
2 landscaping. According to EMWD, this volume of water supply is
3 available and the demand will be primarily supplied by imported water,
4 supplemented by local groundwater resources. A review of the EMWD
5 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (2011) documents the water
6 availability for this Project and the whole EMWD service area, when the
7 water shortage contingency plan and demand management measure are
8 taken into account. Based on these substantiating data, provision of
9 domestic water supply can be accomplished without causing significant
10 impacts on the existing water system or existing entitlements. However, to
11 minimize water demand during the drought the following mitigation
12 measures will be implemented.

13 According to the data for wastewater treatment plants in the Southwest Area
14 Planning area, a daily wastewater generation rate is about 250 gallons per
15 day (gpd) per unit. Assuming 271 units at build-out, the proposed Project is
16 forecast to generate up to 67,750 gallons of wastewater per day. This
17 wastewater will be delivered to Eastern's Temecula Valley Regional Water
18 Reclamation Facility. According to the EMWD website this facility
19 currently has typical daily wastewater flows of 12 million gallons per day.
20 The plant's capacity is 18 MGD. The Project's 0.067 MGD generation of
21 wastewater would consume 0.1 percent of the remaining capacity. This
22 consumption of capacity will not cause the construction of new wastewater
23 treatment facilities. Thus, the proposed Project will consume some capacity
24 of the existing Water Reclamation Facility, but the level of adverse impact
25 is considered less than significant.

26 A residential solid waste generation rate of 13 lbs./residential unit per day
27 was selected to forecast the daily and annual capacity of solid waste

1 generation at full development, 271 single family residences. Average daily
2 solid waste generation would be about 3,523 lbs. per day (1.76 tons).
3 Annual average solid waste generation would be about 1,285,895 lbs. or
4 about 643 tons per year. Assuming a mandatory 50% recycling rate, daily
5 solid waste generation is forecast to be about 0.88 tons per day for disposal
6 at either the El Sobrante Landfill or the Lambs Canyon Landfill. This is
7 approximately one ton per day or an increase in solid waste disposal of
8 about 0.05% at either landfill. Thus, the proposed Project will consume
9 some capacity of the existing landfills, but the level of adverse impact is
10 considered less than significant. There is adequate capacity at the area
11 landfills to accommodate the solid waste generated by the proposed Project,
12 and the Project will comply with all laws and regulations in managing solid
13 waste.

14 Annual estimated electricity consumption based on SCAQMD values for
15 single-family residential units is 5626 Kw per year. For the proposed 281
16 single-family residential units, annual energy consumption is estimated to
17 be about 1,524,646 Kw per year or about 1,525 Mw per year. Adequate
18 commercial electricity supplies are presently available in southern
19 California to meet this forecast demand.

20 According to SCAQMD consumption data, new single-family units
21 consume 6,665 cubic feet per month. Annual consumption of natural gas
22 by the proposed 271 residential units is forecast to be about 21,675 MCF
23 (the term MCF equals 1,000 cubic feet) per year. Adequate commercial
24 natural gas supplies are available to meet this forecast demand.

25 The communication system is provided by Verizon. Verizon is a private
26 company that provides connection to the communication system on an as
27 needed basis. No expansion of facilities will be necessary to connect the

1 Project to the communication system located adjacent to the Project site.
2 New streetlights will be installed by the proposed Project in accordance
3 with standard requirements and County Ordinance No. 655. The
4 installation of these lighting improvements are part of the proposed Project
5 and with compliance with Ordinance No. 655, the installation and future
6 operation of these street lights can be accomplished without causing
7 significant adverse environmental impact.

8 The Project will add new roads and circulation system improvements to the
9 County's circulation system. Other Project features, such as street lights,
10 will also require future maintenance by the County. Ongoing maintenance
11 costs will be covered by annual property taxes of the proposed Project and
12 the future maintenance of public facilities will not cause significant adverse
13 environmental impacts in the future.

14 The proposed Project must incorporate all of the current energy
15 conservation design measures established by State law under Title 24.
16 These requirements will be met for the new structures that will be installed
17 if the proposed Project is approved. Therefore, the proposed Project will
18 not have any conflict with energy conservation plans.

19 2. Mitigation:

20 With the following Project conditions of approval there is no impact or they
21 are less than significant to utilities and service systems.

- 22 a. 10.Planning.21: Native and ornamental drought resistant plants shall be
23 used in the common landscaped area and no invasive plant species listed
24 in Table 6-2 of the MSHCP shall be planted within the landscaped
25 areas.
- 26 b. 10.Planning.22: The Project landscape areas shall be plumbed with
27 purple pipe. If and when reclaimed water becomes available at the

1 Project site, the site landscape shall be watered with reclaimed water.

2 c. 10.Planning.23: The applicant shall provide evidence to Building and
3 Safety during the final inspection of all residential structures that
4 demonstrates that low water consuming plumbing fixtures (toilets, etc.)
5 were installed in the Project residences.

6 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that all applicable regulatory
7 requirements and feasible mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts have been considered and
8 are applied as conditions of the Project approval, yet the following impacts potentially resulting from the
9 Project cannot be fully mitigated and will be only partially avoided or lessened by the mitigation
10 measures hereinafter specified; a statement of overriding findings is therefore included herein:

11 A. Greenhouse Gas

12 1. Impacts:

13 The proposed Project would exceed the SCAQMD suggested GHG
14 threshold of 3,000 MT/year with implementation of all reasonably available
15 mitigation measures related to Energy Efficient Project Design. The Project
16 would have a significant cumulative adverse impact with respect to GHG
17 emissions. Further, the inability to achieve CAP compliance with feasible
18 measures is considered a conflict with applicable plans, policies and
19 regulations. As such, the proposed Project would result in a significant
20 unavoidable adverse impact with respect to GHG emissions.

21 2. Mitigation:

22 The proposed Project cannot be fully mitigated below a level of significance
23 for this issue area. There is no mitigation that is applicable.

24 B. Land Use/Planning

25 1. Impacts:

26 Implementation of the Project will result in change of the land uses and
27 planning designations of the general Project area. Approval of the Project

1 will cause an intensification of development greater than that which
2 presently occurs on the site, as the residential site is currently vacant. It
3 should be noted that the site currently has commercial, industrial and open
4 space designations. Implementation of the Project will also result in
5 cumulative impacts to the existing zoning; however, the Project will be
6 consistent with the proposed zoning with the approval of the Project's
7 General Plan Amendment (GPA), Change of Zone (CZ) and Specific Plan
8 (SP) and will not be considered cumulative. However, the proposed Project
9 continues a cumulative pattern of development within the Southwest Area
10 Plan planning area of low density, suburban development. Aspects of this
11 proposed Project are consistent with regional RTP/SCS objectives and
12 policies, but the proposed Project continues a pattern of development that
13 has significant conflicts with key regional policies. This is considered a
14 cumulatively considerable adverse impact of the Project.

15 The existing land use and planning setting of the Project site and
16 surrounding area will be permanently altered as a result of Project
17 implementation. The intensification of development is different than that
18 which would be allowed under the current SP 265; however, it is consistent
19 with most adjacent land uses to the south and east (single-family
20 residential). Based on the data and analysis presented in this subchapter,
21 implementation of the Project will not cause significant adverse land use
22 and planning impacts to these community characteristics, but the
23 cumulative contribution to conflicts with regional policies is considered an
24 unavoidable significant adverse impact of the proposed Project.

25 2. Mitigation:

26 The proposed Project cannot be fully mitigated below a level of significance
27 for this issue area. There is no mitigation that is applicable.

1 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered the following
2 alternatives identified in EIR No. 540 in light of the environmental impacts which cannot be avoided or
3 substantially lessened and has rejected those alternatives as infeasible for the reasons described below:

4 A. Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

- 5 1. The No Project Alternative would allow the Project site to be developed
6 with more intense industrial and commercial uses based on the existing land
7 use designation.
- 8 2. Under the No Build Alternative, the construction of new residential
9 structures and recreational facilities would be prohibited. This alternative
10 would be infeasible because it fails to achieve any of the Project objectives.
- 11 3. Under the No Development Alternative, the project would be infeasible
12 because the infrastructure improvements that would benefit County
13 residents would not occur, including a community park site, the installation
14 of a regional trail and the preservation of 93.8 acres of permanent open
15 space.
- 16 4. Under the No Development Alternative, the project would be infeasible
17 because no permanent open space would be established, and therefore, no
18 formal protection of the on-site biological resources would occur.

19 B. Alternative 2 – Existing Specific Plan Alternative

- 20 1. This alternative assumes that there would be no General Plan Amendment
21 or Zone Change to allow development on the site as proposed under
22 Specific Plan No. 265, A1. This Alternative would allow up to 2,071,626
23 square feet of industrial uses and about 161,000 square feet of commercial
24 development. This alternative would not include the preservation of 93.8
25 acres of open space. No residential uses would be allowed.
- 26 2. Under the Existing Specific Plan Alternative, the project would be
27 infeasible because none of the residential Project objectives would be met.

1 3. This alternative would substantially increase the adverse impacts of site
2 development and result in significantly greater environmental effects. The
3 project would be infeasible because it is the least Environmentally Superior
4 Alternative and would not meet Project objectives.

5 C. Alternative 3 – Expanded Park Area Alternative

6 1. This alternative would also reduce the total number of developable lots.
7 The required park area for the proposed Project is 4.1 acres (based on 269
8 lots), but under this Alternative, a total of 5.7 acres of park area will be
9 developed. In order to accommodate the expanded park area within the
10 Project site, a small reduction in the total number of lots will occur. A total
11 of five lots will be eliminated, reducing the total number of units to 264
12 lots.

13 2. This Alternative would result in a minor reduction of impacts to air
14 emissions, direct noise impacts and transportation/traffic impacts. Impacts
15 of this Alternative would remain the same for biology resources and cultural
16 resources as the same footprint would be disturbed by this alternative. The
17 impacts to GHG and the regional planning issues would be reduced, but not
18 below a level of significant impact. Thus, the unavoidable significant
19 impacts would remain, but would be less significant than the proposed
20 Project.

21 3. Based on small reduction in overall impacts this Alternative would be
22 environmentally superior to the proposed Project but would be infeasible
23 because it would fail to meet the project goals.

24 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has balanced the “economic,
25 legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project, against the unavoidable adverse
26 environmental effects thereof, and has determined that the following benefits outweigh and render
27 acceptable those environmental effects:

- 1 A. The greenhouse gasses and land use/planning impacts are outweighed and rendered
2 acceptable because the proposed Project would provide for a variety of housing types
3 within the Project site, which would assist the County in meeting for the County's overall
4 housing needs.
- 5 B. The greenhouse gasses and land use/planning impacts are outweighed and rendered
6 acceptable because the proposed Project would preserve in perpetuity 93.8 acres of open
7 space.
- 8 C. The greenhouse gasses and land use/planning impacts are outweighed and rendered
9 acceptable because development of the Project will generate additional employment
10 opportunities (during and following construction) for skilled labor within Riverside
11 County. Environmentally superior Project alternatives would create a nominal increase
12 array of new employment opportunities to utilize the skilled labor pool within Riverside
13 County to the same extent as the proposed.
- 14 D. The greenhouse gasses and land use/planning impacts are outweighed and rendered
15 acceptable because the Project will create an aesthetically pleasing and distinct community
16 identity (sense of place) through the establishment of design criteria for architecture,
17 landscaping, walls, street improvements, signs, entry monuments, and other planning and
18 design features. Riverside County has determined and finds that it is more important in
19 this case to obtain the benefit of the Project's aesthetic enhancement for the community
20 than to forego the Project out of regard for the greenhouse gasses and land use/planning
21 impacts.
- 22 E. The greenhouse gasses and land use/planning impacts are outweighed and rendered
23 acceptable because the Project will construct regional and community trails which will
24 help to accommodate the recreational needs of both Project and nearby residents.
25 Riverside County has determined and finds that it is more important in this case to obtain
26 the benefit of the Project's contribution to recreational facilities within the Project area
27 than to forego the Project out of regard for the greenhouse gasses and land use/planning

1 impacts.

2 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that State CEQA Guidelines
3 (Section 15126, (g)), requires an EIR to discuss how a proposed Project could directly or indirectly lead to
4 economic, population, or housing growth. The following growth-inducing impacts were considered in
5 relation to the proposed Project:

6 A. The Project proposes single family residential units similar in scale and intensity to the
7 existing single family residential units located immediately south and east of TTM 36546.
8 The development would not require a significant extension of infrastructure to support the
9 proposed Project. Infrastructure would be extended from adjacent properties to serve the
10 site. Only the immediate access roads to the site would require expansion to serve the site.
11 The Project would not provide infrastructure or service capacity that accommodates
12 growth beyond the levels currently permitted by local or regional land use plans.

13 B. The proposed Project is not in an isolated area and would not extend substantial urban
14 infrastructure into a new area that might cause new or additional development pressure on
15 the intervening and surrounding land. Generally speaking, medium density residential
16 development exists surrounding the Project area. The Project site is an existing approved
17 Specific Plan and the proposed TTM 36546 would provide residential development in a
18 manner consistent with the adjacent land uses to the east and south of the site.

19 C. The proposed Project is not a large-scale project, relative to the surrounding area, that
20 would have the potential of producing a “multiplier effect” resulting in substantial indirect
21 community growth. Existing development within the vicinity of the Specific Plan includes
22 the Southwest Justice Center located north of the Project site, the French Valley Airport
23 located west of the site, single-family small agricultural uses located east of the site and
24 medium density single family development to the south and east of the area proposed for
25 the TTM. Any future development proposed on adjacent or nearby lands would be
26 required to be consistent with the land use designations for the location or would require
27 approvals to alter land use designations that would require future environmental review.

1 No growth beyond that which is provided for in the County and/or City land use policies
2 and plans could occur without subsequent review, including a separate environmental
3 analysis, of land use policy. To reiterate, any future development that might be proposed
4 for the land adjacent to the proposed Project would require subsequent environmental
5 review, including review for consistency with the general plan. Similarly, any change in
6 land use designations that might be proposed for land adjacent to the proposed Project
7 would require subsequent environmental review.

- 8 D. Due to the nature and scale of the proposed Project, it will not induce substantial
9 population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing a substantial
10 number of new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of
11 roads or other infrastructure.)

12 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Project will implement
13 applicable elements of the Riverside County General Plan as follows:

14 A. Land Use Element

- 15 1. The Project includes a GPA, Specific Plan, and Change of Zone to allow
16 development of the site with uses other than those planned in the General
17 Plan. These changes would allow residential an open space development of
18 the site. The proposed changes to the General Plan land use designations are
19 allowed pursuant to policies within the Administrative Element. With
20 approval of the proposed GPA, the Project would be consistent with land
21 use designations; therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with
22 this policy. Analysis of applicable policies of the Land Use Element is
23 presented throughout EIR No. 540 and concludes that the Project would not
24 conflict with any applicable policy of the General Plan Land Use Element.
25 Furthermore the proposed Project complies with all design standards for the
26 various land use designation and considers the unique characteristics and
27 features of the Project site and surrounding community. The proposed

1 Project is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element, and is
2 therefore consistent with the General Plan.

3 B. Circulation Element

4 1. The Project will construct or contribute its fair share of the costs associated
5 with the improvement of roadways and certain intersections. The Project
6 will implement mitigation measures that address Project-specific and
7 cumulative transportation and traffic impacts, and based thereon, the Board
8 of Supervisors finds that the Project is consistent with the General Plan
9 Circulation Element. All required improvements that are directly
10 attributable to the Project would be constructed as part of the Project and
11 fair share costs would be contributed for improvements to affected off-site
12 roadways through payment of the TUMF, and County's Development
13 Impact Fee. In addition, the Specific Plan would provide for a variety of
14 transportation options. The Specific Plan includes the provision of bike
15 lanes for bicyclists and trails and sidewalks for pedestrians. There is no bus
16 service adjacent to the Project. The proposed Project is consistent with the
17 General Plan Circulation Element, and is therefore consistent with the
18 General Plan.

19 C. Multipurpose Open Space Element

20 1. The Multipurpose Open Space Element of the General Plan describes an
21 open space system which includes methods for the acquisition,
22 maintenance, and operation of a variety of open spaces. The County's open
23 spaces are utilized for visual relief, natural resources protection, habitat
24 protection, recreational uses, and protection from natural hazards for public
25 health and safety. Approximately 93.8 acres of the Project site is proposed
26 for open space conservation. This area contains habitat targeted by the
27 MSHCP for preservation and contributes to a regional wildlife linkage for

1 various animal species. Implementation of the Project will not result in
2 cultural resource impacts (including paleontological resources), that will
3 exceed the established thresholds of significance. Nonetheless, as part of
4 mitigation for potential impacts to unknown cultural resources, all ground-
5 disturbing activities would be monitored.

6 Furthermore, the proposed Project would provide adequate on-site facilities
7 to meet the local parkland and open space requirements of Riverside County
8 Ordinance 460, Section 10.35, and State Quimby Act requirements. The
9 proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan's Multipurpose Open
10 Space Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

11 D. Safety Element

- 12 1. The Project complies with all applicable building codes, County
13 Ordinances, and State and Federal laws. The Project complies with all
14 applicable provisions of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act,
15 and as concluded by the Project geotechnical study, the Project site is not
16 subject to significant hazards associated with earthquake induced
17 liquefaction, landsliding, or settlement (assuming the implementation of
18 mitigation). In addition, the proposed Project would not be subject to flood
19 or dam inundation. The Project also would comply with all applicable
20 standards for fire safety and be consistent with the Riverside County Fire
21 Protection Master Plan. Furthermore, Project impacts associated with
22 hazardous waste and materials on the Project site would be mitigated below
23 a level of significance, and the proposed Project would not conflict with any
24 disaster preparedness plans nor subject individuals to significant risk of
25 loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, erosion, seismic activity,
26 blowsand, or flooding. The proposed Project is consistent with the General
27 Plan Safety Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

1 E. Noise Element

2 1. Project construction and operational noise impacts would be less than
3 significant with mitigation incorporated. Mitigation is provided to reduce
4 noise impacts to below a level of significance. With implementation of the
5 recommendations provided in the noise impact analysis and the required
6 mitigation measures, the Project would be consistent with the General Plan
7 Noise Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

8 F. Air Quality Element

9 1. The project-specific evaluation of emissions presented in the FEIR analysis
10 demonstrates that after implementation of the recommended mitigation
11 measures, construction of the proposed Project would not result in
12 exceedances of regional air quality thresholds. Thus, construction activity is
13 not projected to result in unavoidable significant adverse impacts. Once
14 construction is completed the site will be occupied by future residents. The
15 emission forecast for the project, once occupied (over the long-term), do not
16 exceed the SCAQMD thresholds; however, mitigation is identified to
17 reduce greenhouse gas emissions that also reduce overall energy
18 consumption and related criteria air pollutants. Implementation of the
19 mitigation measures and recommendations provided in Section 5.3 of EIR
20 No. 530, and in the air quality technical study would ensure that the
21 proposed Project would be consistent with the Air Quality Element and
22 General Plan.

23 G. Healthy Communities Element

24 1. The proposed project is consistent with the Healthy Communities
25 element. More specifically the project includes several trails to encourage
26 walking, as prescribed for in policy HC 3.2. These trails are designed to
27 carry pedestrians through the site and beyond, connecting to existing trail in

1 existing residential communities to the to the south of the project site as
2 prescribed for in policies HC 5.4 and 6.4. These include bike trails,
3 pedestrian trails and jogging trails. Additionally, the project is within a
4 Specific Plan that places residential uses close to large job centers including
5 business parks, office, and retail uses intended to foster walking between
6 retail, jobs, and residential uses which is specifically prescribed for in
7 policies HC 6.5, HC 2.2 and HC 4.2. High density apartments are included
8 in the project as prescribed for in policy HC 3.1 and 3.4.

9 H. Housing Element

- 10 1. The purpose of the General Plan Housing Element is to meet the needs of
11 existing and future residents in Riverside County through the establishment
12 of policies to guide County decision-making and to establish an action plan
13 to meet the County's housing goals in the next seven years. The Project
14 would further the goals of the General Plan Housing Element by reducing
15 the use of energy in residences and providing residential units that would
16 contribute to meeting the County's housing needs. Although the land uses
17 proposed by the Project would require a GPA, there are no characteristics of
18 the Project that would inhibit the County's ability to achieve the goals set
19 forth by the General Plan Housing Element. Accordingly, the proposed
20 Project would be consistent with the General Plan Housing Element and
21 General Plan.

22 I. Administration Element

- 23 1. The Administration Element contains information regarding the structure of
24 the General Plan as well as general planning principles and a statement
25 regarding the vision for Riverside County. The General Plan Amendment
26 proposed by the Project would be consistent with the Administration
27 Element policies governing Foundation Amendments, as the proposed

1 Project would help to achieve the purposes of the General Plan through
2 compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Project would not conflict
4 with the conservation requirements of the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
5 (MSHCP) in that:

6 A. Tentative Tract Map No. 36546 site is located within Criteria Cells Cell #5976 of Cell
7 Group V, Cell #6071 and Cell #6074 of Cell Group W in Cell Group W of the French
8 Valley/Lower Sedco Hills Sub Unit (5) of the Southwest Area Plan. 0.45 acres of the site
9 are located within Cell #5976, and 154.78 acres of the site are located within Cell #6074.
10 A Habitat Acquisition and Negotiation Strategy (HANS) Application was submitted to the
11 County Environmental Programs Department (EPD) in April 2013. The application was
12 assigned HANS Case No. 2112. In a letter dated September 30, 2014, the County
13 identified areas on the site where no development may occur and this property should be
14 conserved. The area, approximately 93.89 acres of the 161.62-acre site, is proposed for
15 conservation on the Project site. This area includes 2,500 lineal feet of Tualota Creek on
16 the site; all areas of the site located west and north of Tualota Creek will also be
17 conserved. Wildlife movement corridors will also be conserved along the site's south and
18 east property lines. Thus, proposed wildlife movement corridors will completely surround
19 the area of the site proposed for development.

20 B. The pertinent text of the JPR agreement for Reserve Assembly states: The project site is
21 located in the eastern portion of Cell Group W. The project will conserve 93.89 acres of
22 habitat, including Tualota Creek on site. The project has considered fragmentation and
23 edge effects in its Conservation design by including a 300-foot buffer from Tualota Creek
24 within the Conservation Area. Additionally, the Conservation Areas have been designed
25 to align with existing Conservation to the south and southeast of the site which meet the
26 Criteria for Cell Group W. Wildlife crossings will be installed along Calistoga Drive at the
27 eastern and southwestern ends of the project area, allowing for movement under the road

1 and to the Conservation Area on either side of the road in those two locations. Based on
2 the proposed Conservation configuration which links up existing Conservation and
3 provides connectivity between those areas, the project does not affect the Reserve
4 Assembly goals of the MSHCP.

5 C. Section 6.0 of the MSHCP, the MSHCP Implementation Structure, imposes all other terms
6 of the MSHCP, including but not limited to the protection of species associated with
7 riparian/riverine areas and vernal pools, narrow endemic plant species, urban/wildlands
8 interface guidelines, and additional survey needs and procedures set forth in Sections 6.1.2,
9 6.1.3, 6.1.4, and 6.3.2. After detailed analysis of each of these issues in a site biology
10 study, each issue was found to be consistent with the MSHCP. Thus, overall under the
11 current site conditions the proposed Project appears to not have any conflicts with the
12 MSHCP or any other habitat or natural community conservation plan.

13 D. In accordance with MSHCP requirements, appropriate habitat evaluation and field surveys
14 were conducted for all of the sensitive species that might occur on the Project site. The
15 Project site is located within the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Mitigation Fee Area
16 (Riverside County Ordinance 663) and the site is assumed to be occupied by this species.
17 Payment of the mandatory fee is considered adequate compensation for loss of habitat for
18 this species. During surveys coastal California gnatcatcher (a Federal Threatened Species)
19 was heard and observed within the Riversidean sage scrub. These are the only two listed
20 species that occupy a portion of the Project site. Due to the limited area of development,
21 payment of the SKR Fee, and the conservation of 93.89 acres of the 161.62-acre Project
22 site, primarily coastal sage scrub, the biology study for the Project site concluded that
23 neither species should experience a significant adverse impact. In addition, the proposed
24 Project will be required to pay the MSHCP Fee.

25 E. In accordance with MSHCP requirements, appropriate habitat evaluation and field surveys
26 were conducted for all of the sensitive species that might occur on the Project site. None
27 of the potential sensitive species identified in the MSHCP or other documents were found

1 to occupy the Project site. However, to ensure that the no burrowing owl inhabit the site
2 prior to future development of the site, a preconstruction survey will need to be conducted
3 and mitigation will be implemented if burrowing owl are found during this survey. This is
4 a contingency measure to protect this mobile species should it migrate to the Project site
5 prior to construction. Additional mitigation will be implemented to address the presence
6 of nesting birds on the Project site when construction proceeds in the future.

7 F. The primary stream channel on the Project site, Tocalota Creek (approximately 2,500 feet
8 in length on the property), will be conserved under the HANS 2112 – PAR 1343
9 agreement reached between the property owner and the County. The biology study
10 identifies Tocalota Creek and areas to the south and east as assumed wildlife movement
11 corridors. Based on the conservation of these corridors, the proposed Project should not
12 substantially interfere with the movement of native resident wildlife species or otherwise
13 impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

14 G. As noted, the primary stream channel on the Project site, Tocalota Creek (approximately
15 2,500 feet in length on the property), will be conserved under the HANS 2112 – PAR 1343
16 agreement reached between the property owner and the County. On the remainder of the
17 Project site, the biology study identified one ephemeral drainage and a “few small
18 washes.” The entire riparian habitat has been conserved on the Project site. None of the
19 other drainages contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. Of the
20 approximate 78 acres of Riversidean sage scrub on the property, approximately 60.27 acres
21 (~77%), will be conserved. About 18.3 acres of this habitat will be eliminated by the
22 proposed residential development.

23 H. All wetlands subject to Corps jurisdiction appear to have been preserved on the property.
24 The other channels on the Project site have no associated wetlands and are not considered
25 to be subject to Corps jurisdiction. These channels may be considered waters of the State
26 of California and appear to be subject to regulation by the California Department of Fish
27 and Wildlife. To offset the potential impact to these small washes will require mitigation

1 to be implemented. Due to the low quality waters of the State on the project site, the
2 preservation of the several acres of habitat in Tucalota Creek is considered sufficient
3 mitigation to compensate for the loss of less than one acre of these waters.

4 I. With approval of the Project and transfer of property to be conserved to the County, no
5 other areas on the property contain significant biological resources that require protection.
6 Therefore, no potential for conflict with such policies can occur through approval of the
7 proposed Project.

8 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that Specific Plan No. 265, A1 is
9 consistent with the Riverside County General Plan.

10 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and considered
11 EIR No. 540 in evaluating Specific Plan No. 265, A1 that EIR No. 540 is an accurate and objective
12 statement that complies with the California Environmental Quality Act and reflects the County's
13 independent judgment, and that EIR No. 540 is incorporated herein by this reference.

14 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **CERTIFIES** EIR No. 540
15 and **ADOPTS** the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan specified therein. In the event of any
16 inconsistencies between the mitigation measures as set forth herein and the Mitigation Monitoring and
17 Reporting Program, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program shall control.

18 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Specific Plan No. 265, A1,
19 on file with the Clerk of the Board, including the final conditions of approval and exhibits, is hereby
20 adopted as the Specific Plan of Land Use for the real property described and shown in the plan, and said
21 real property shall be developed substantially in accordance with the plan, unless the plan is amended by
22 the Board.

23 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that copies of the Specific Plan No.
24 265, A1 shall be placed on file in the Clerk of the Board, in the Office of the Planning Director, and in the
25 Office of the Building and Safety Director, and that no applications for other development approvals shall
26 be accepted for real property described and shown in the Project, unless such applications are
27 substantially in accordance herewith.

1 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the custodians of the
2 documents upon which this decision is based are the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and the County
3 Planning Department and that such documents are located at 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, California.
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

2 **RESOLUTION NO. 2015-214**
3 **AMENDING THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN**
4 **(Second Land Use Cycle and Second Circulation Cycle**
5 **of General Plan Amendments for 2015)**

6 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65350 et seq., notice was
7 given and public hearings were held before the Riverside County Board of Supervisors and the Riverside
8 County Planning Commission in Riverside, California to consider proposed amendments to the Southwest
9 Area Plan, Pass Area Plan and the Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan of the Riverside County General
10 Plan; and,

11 **WHEREAS**, all provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and Riverside
12 County CEQA implementing procedures have been satisfied; and,

13 **WHEREAS**, the proposed general plan amendments were discussed fully with testimony and
14 documentation presented by the public and affected government agencies; and,

15 **WHEREAS**, the proposed general plan amendments are hereby declared to be severable and if
16 any proposed amendment is adjudged unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, the remaining proposed
17 amendments shall not be affected thereby; now, therefore,

18 **BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED** by the Board of Supervisors
19 of the County of Riverside in regular session assembled on September 22, 2015 that:

- 20 **A. General Plan Amendment No. 743 (GPA No. 743)** is a proposal to amend the Land Use
21 Element by amending the Land Use Designation in the Elsinore Area Plan from
22 Community Development: Very Low Density Residential (CD:VLDR), and Rural: Rural
23 Mountainous (R:RM) to Specific Plan Land Use Designation of Medium Density
24 Residential (MDR), Medium High Density Residential (MHDR), Mixed Use (MU), Open
25 Space-Recreation (OS-R), and Rural Mountainous (RM) on an approximately 127.4 acre
26 site located on the southwest corner of Highway 74 and Ethanac Road, in the
27 Meadowbrook Zoning Area of the First Supervisorial District, as shown on the exhibit
28 titled "CZ07143 GPA00743 SP00364 Proposed General Plan, Exhibit 6" a copy of which
is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference. General Plan Amendment No. 743

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: MICHELLE CLACK
DATE: 9/22/15

1 is associated with Change of Zone No. 7143, Specific Plan No. 364, and Environmental
2 Impact Report No. 530, which were considered concurrently with this amendment at the
3 public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Change of
4 Zone No. 7143 proposes to change the zoning classification from Rural Residential (RR)
5 to Specific Plan (SP), in accordance with “CZ07143 GPA00743 SP00364 Proposed
6 Zoning, Exhibit 3” a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by
7 reference, on the approximately 127.4 acre site. Specific Plan No. 364 proposes a master
8 planned community of 126.4 acres for 490 single family homes on 59.8 acres, 11.3 acres
9 for mixed use development, 48.8 acres for open space, and 8.2 acres for infrastructure
10 development. The Planning Commission recommended approval of GPA No. 743 on April
11 15, 2015, and the Board of Supervisors tentatively approved GPA No. 743 on August 18,
12 2015.

13 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors, based on the evidence presented on
14 this matter, both written and oral, including Environmental Impact Report No. 530, that:

- 15 1. The site is located in the Elsinore Area Plan.
- 16 2. The Elsinore Area Plan Land Use Map determines the extent, intensity, and location of
17 land uses within the Elsinore Area.
- 18 3. The site is currently designated Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) and Rural
19 Mountainous (RM).
- 20 4. General Plan Amendment No. 743 is a Policy/Entitlement amendment.
- 21 5. General Plan Amendment No. 743 amends the Riverside County General Plan Land Use
22 Element from Community Development: Very Low Density Residential (CD:VLDR), and
23 Rural: Rural Mountainous (R:RM) to Specific Plan Land Use Designation of Medium
24 Density Residential (MDR), Medium High Density Residential (MHDR), Mixed Use
25 (MU), Open Space-Recreation (OS-R), and Rural Mountainous (RM) as shown on the
26 exhibit titled “CZ07143 GPA00743 SP00364 Proposed General Plan, Exhibit 6”, which is
27 attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.
- 28 6. Surrounding land use designations include Rural Community-Very Low Density

1 Residential (RC:VLDR) and Rural-Rural Mountainous (R:RM) to the north, Rural
2 Community-Very Low Density Residential (RC:VLDR) and Community Development-
3 Commercial Retail (CD:CR) to the east, Rural Community-Very Low Density Residential
4 (RC:VLDR) and Community Development-Commercial Retail (CD:CR) to the south, and
5 Rural-Rural Mountainous (R:RM), and Rural Community –Very Low Density Residential
6 (RC:VLDR) to the west.

- 7 7. The project site’s current zoning is Rural Residential (RR).
- 8 8. The site is surrounded by properties zoned Rural Residential (RR) to the north and west,
9 Rural Residential (RR) and Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) to the south and east.
- 10 9. Surrounding land uses include vacant lots to the west and north, and scattered single family
11 residential to the east and south.
- 12 10. New conditions or circumstances disclosed during the review process justify modifying the
13 General Plan, the modifications proposed by General Plan Amendment No. 743 do not
14 conflict with the Riverside County Vision and would not create an internal inconsistency
15 among the elements of the General Plan. Specifically, the Riverside County Vision calls
16 for a “family of special communities in a remarkable environmental setting, as articulated
17 in the General Plan Vision Statement.” (General Plan, p. V-3). The Project’s plan for a
18 residential community of homes in varying densities, recreational areas, open spaces,
19 streets, and other infrastructure based on the planning principles of clustered development,
20 protection of natural resources and buffering is consistent with the County’s vision. Other
21 Project attributes include the following:
 - 22 a. Land consumption has been minimized as a result of a clustered, more compact
23 development pattern.
 - 24 b. The clustered development would result in higher densities, up to 14 units per acre
25 on the Northeastern portion of the site, and more varied housing types than what is
26 typically found in Elsinore Area Plan.
 - 27 c. The Project will provide a wide range of pedestrian trails and interconnectivity.
 - 28 d. The project will also be bringing a range of residential and local-serving

1 commercial, educational, cultural, and recreational opportunities to the area, thus
2 being consistent with the Rural Village Area Policy which helps the project
3 implement the intent of the General Plan.

- 4 11. Further, the Project is consistent with the planning principles in General Plan Appendix B
5 for the reasons included in Draft EIR No. 530 Table.
- 6 12. General Plan Amendment No. 743 does not involve a conflict in any Foundation
7 Component because the existing Foundation Component of Rural will remain unchanged.
- 8 13. General Plan Amendment No. 743 also contributes to the purposes of the General Plan.
9 Specifically, the Project's plan for a residential community of homes in varying densities,
10 recreational areas, open spaces, streets, and other infrastructure based on the planning
11 principles of clustered development, protection of natural resources and buffering is
12 consistent with the County's Vision. Specifically, since the current proposal to preserve
13 the Northwestern Site as open space will help, in part, the County achieve MSHCP
14 conservation goals. Finally, the Project is consistent with the purposes of the General Plan
15 as analyzed in the Draft EIR No. 530.
- 16 14. Special circumstances or conditions have emerged that were unanticipated in preparing the
17 General Plan:
 - 18 a. General Plan Amendment No. 743 would allow the Project to be planned in a
19 comprehensive manner with clustered development such that the land uses and
20 development intensity proposed for the eastern portion of the site would be an
21 appropriate transition from the nonresidential uses to the west, while preserving
22 property within the western portion of the site to buffer the open spaces west of the
23 Project Site.
 - 24 b. New information about the Project Site's characteristics and the propriety of a
25 specific plan, including the proposal to preserve the hillsides, has emerged since the
26 General Plan was adopted. The General Plan recognized that specific plans are
27 highly customized policy or regulatory tools that provide a bridge between the
28 General Plan and individual development projects in a more area-specific manner

1 than is possible with community-wide zoning ordinances. The specific plan is a
2 tool that provides land use and development standards that are tailored to respond
3 to special conditions and aspirations unique to the area being proposed for
4 development.

5 c. A detailed examination of the Project Site has revealed valuable information about
6 the site's physical characteristics. The land plan created as a result of the site-
7 specific analysis would cluster development to provide substantial new local and
8 regional benefits as well as protect natural resources. The Specific Plan would
9 preserve the hillsides in order to ensure protection of habitat and the wildlife travel
10 route as well as to provide trails and passive recreational opportunities.
11 Development density would be clustered on the eastern portion of the site where
12 topography and access are most suitable for development and avoid the tailings
13 area of the mine that was previously located on the site. In order to do so, a
14 specific plan is necessary to implement the plan. The specific plan would allow for
15 a comprehensive plan that would help achieve the County's vision of coordinated
16 communities surrounded by aesthetically pleasing settings. Accordingly, the
17 detailed analysis of the Project Site's resources and the propriety of a specific plan
18 constitute new information that has emerged since the General Plan was adopted,
19 thereby warranting General Plan Amendment No. 743.

20 15. In accordance with Article II, Section 2.4 of Riverside County Ordinance No. 348 and the
21 Administration Element of the General Plan, for the reasons specified above, General Plan
22 Amendment No. 743 does not involve a change in or conflict with any General Plan
23 Principal, is consistent with the goals and policies of the Elsinore Area Plan and all
24 policies of the Riverside County General Plan, contributes to achieving the purposes of the
25 General Plan and new conditions or circumstances justify modifying the General Plan.

26 16. The proposed General Plan amendment will not be detrimental to public health, safety, and
27 welfare.
28

1 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **CERTIFIES** the
2 Environmental Impact Report No. 530 (“EIR”) and finds that the EIR had been completed in
3 compliance with CEQA and that the EIR was presented to, reviewed and considered by the Board of
4 Supervisors prior to rendering its decision and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis
5 of the Board of Supervisors.

6 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **ADOPTS** the findings
7 required by Public Resources Code Section 21081 with respect to each of the significant environmental
8 impacts of the project identified in the EIR, including the Statement of Overriding Considerations which
9 are set forth in Resolution No. 2015-108 and incorporated herein by reference.

10 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors, based on the evidence presented
11 on this matter, including EIR No. 530 that it **ADOPTS** General Plan Amendments No. 743 as described
12 herein and shown on Exhibit 6 titled “CZ07143 GPA00743 SP00364 Proposed General Plan, Exhibit 6”
13 attached hereto.

14 **B. General Plan Amendment No. 856 (GPA No. 856)** is a proposal to amend the Land Use
15 Element by establishing a general plan land use designation for APN 519-170-009, which
16 is currently undesignated, to Light Industrial (LI) and to modify Figure C-9, Scenic
17 Highway, of the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element. These revisions
18 reflect recent changes to Section 263.3 of the California Streets and Highway Code, which
19 removed from the state scenic highway system the portion of State Highway Route 10
20 between Route 38 near Redlands and Route 62 near Whitewater in the Counties of San
21 Bernardino and Riverside. The property is located northwesterly of Apache Trail in
22 Cabazon and southeasterly of the Interstate 10 freeway in the Pass and Desert Zoning Area
23 of the Fifth Supervisorial District, as shown on the exhibit entitled “GPA 856 Proposed
24 General Plan, Exhibit 6” a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by
25 reference. General Plan Amendment No. 856 is associated with Environmental Assessment
26 No. 41355, which was considered concurrently with this amendment at the public hearings
27 before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The Planning Commission
28 recommended approval of GPA No. 856 on December 3, 2014 and the Board of

1 Supervisors tentatively approved GPA No. 856 on March 10, 2015.

2 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors, based upon the evidence presented
3 on this matter, both written and oral, including Environmental Assessment No. 41355, that:

- 4 1. The site is located in the Riverside County Pass Area Plan.
- 5 2. The Riverside County Pass Area Plan Land Use Map determines the extent, intensity, and
6 location of land uses within the Riverside County Pass Area Plan.
- 7 3. Due to a mapping error, the site lacks a General Plan Land Use Designation or a General
8 Plan Foundation Component.
- 9 4. General Plan Amendment No. 856 amends the Riverside County General Plan Land Use
10 Element to establish a Community Development: Light Industrial (CD:LI) land use
11 designation for the site as shown on the exhibit titled "GPA00856 Proposed General Plan,
12 Exhibit 6", which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein.
- 13 5. General Plan Amendment No. 856 also amends Figure C-9 of the Riverside County
14 General Plan Circulation Element and Figure 9 of the Riverside County Pass Area Plan.
- 15 6. Surrounding land use designations include Rural Residential (R-R) to the West and South;
16 Commercial Retail (CR) to the North; and Light Industrial (LI) to the West.
- 17 7. The project site's current zoning is Manufacturing – Service Commercial (M-SC).
- 18 8. The site is surrounded by properties zoned Controlled Development (W-2-10) to the South,
19 East, West; Manufacturing – Service Commercial (M-SC) to the West, and Scenic
20 Highway Commercial (C-P-S) to the North.
- 21 9. Surrounding land uses include commercial retail and Tribal Lands uses to the north, a
22 surface mining operation to the south and the Interstate 10 freeway to the east and west.
- 23 10. General Plan Amendment No. 856 is considered a Policy/Entitlement and Technical
24 Amendment. A Technical Amendment involves changes in the General Plan of a technical
25 nature. A Technical Amendment shall include a finding that the amendment would not
26 change policy direction or the intent of the General Plan. General Plan Amendment No.
27 856 is consistent with policy direction and the General Plan's intent because the
28 Community Development: Light Industrial land use designation implements the jobs and

1 economy, transportation and financial realities of the Pass Area Plan. This land use
2 designation also promotes the highest and best use that can be associated with a railroad
3 right-of-way property.

4 11. General Plan Amendment No. 856 corrects an error or omission in the General Plan by
5 establishing the light industrial land use designation for the subject property. The land use
6 designation provides a well-defined transitional buffer between the existing commercial
7 retail north of Interstate 10 to surface mining operations to the south of the project site.

8 12. In accordance with Article II, Section 2.4 of Riverside County Ordinance No. 348, General
9 Plan Amendment No. 856 does not involve a change in or conflict with the Riverside
10 County Vision. Establishing a light industrial land use designation on the subject property
11 will not change or conflict with the Riverside County Vision to protect open space and
12 Scenic Resources because the subject site is within an area along Interstate 10 that was
13 eliminated from California's Scenic Highway list in 2013 pursuant to Senate Bill No. 169.
14 Additionally, the subject site is surrounded by existing retail services and outdoor
15 advertising displays. Therefore, impact to the Vision statements set forth in the County's
16 Multi-Purpose Open Space Element will not occur.

17 13. This amendment will not change or conflict with any General Planning Principle set forth
18 in General Plan Appendix B. The amendment is consistent with the Economic
19 Development Principles, the Land and Development Activity Principles and the
20 Community Design Principles of Appendix B which acknowledge that every community is
21 maturing in its own way. Additionally, Transportation Corridor Principles encourage the
22 need for new transportation corridors and their optimal modal mix. General Plan
23 Amendment No. 856 provides for comprehensive transportation system to operate at a
24 regional, countywide, community and neighborhood scale. As part of this transportation
25 system, corridors will serve as unifying connectors between communities, providing high
26 capacity linkages between jobs, residences, recreational opportunities, and offering
27 multiple modes of travel.

28 14. General Plan Amendment No. 856 is also consistent with the County General Plan

1 Circulation Element by optimizing existing transportation systems, transportation
2 corridors, mass transit, street standards, pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian friendly
3 communities and air transportation.

4 15. General Plan Amendment No. 856 does not involve a change or conflict with any
5 Foundation Component designation in the General Plan. Establishing the light industrial
6 land use designation and updating Figure C-9 of the Circulation Element and Figure 9 of
7 the County's Pass Area Plan does not include a Foundation Component. Therefore,
8 General Plan Amendment No. 856 will not impact a Foundation Component.

9 16. This amendment also contributes to the achievement of the General Plan's purposes or, at a
10 minimum, would not be detrimental to them. The amendment creates and achieves an
11 integrated mix of industrial and commercial development for the surrounding community.
12 Specifically, General Plan Amendment No. 856 contributes to the Efficient Use of Land
13 Concept which provides that new growth patterns no longer reflect a pattern of urban
14 sprawl. Rather, they follow a framework of transportation and open space corridors, with
15 concentrations of development that fit into that framework. General Plan Amendment No.
16 856 implements this concept by establishing the light industrial land use designation for
17 the subject site.

18 17. General Plan Amendment No.856 also makes changes to the General Plan to conform to
19 Senate Bill No. 169 that was signed into law in 2013. This legislation was not anticipated
20 or contemplated at the time the RCIP General Plan was developed and constitutes special
21 circumstances not anticipated during the development and adoption of the RCIP General
22 Plan. For the reasons set forth above, General Plan Amendment No. 856 is consistent with
23 the goals and policies of the Pass Area Plan and with all policies of the Riverside County
24 General Plan.

25 18. For the reasons set forth above, General Plan Amendment No. 856 does not involve a
26 change in or conflict with the Riverside County Vision and conforms to the fundamental
27 values stated in the Riverside County Vision.

28 19. General Plan Amendment No. 856 will not be detrimental to public health, safety, or