activities in the immediate area which indicates that there is presently insufficient demand for any resources that may exist within the Project area. Thus, the proposed Project has no potential to adversely impact mineral resources in any manner.
2. Mitigation.

No mitigation is required for direct Project impacts, and no mitigation is required for cumulative impacts related to mineral resources.

## L. Noise

1. Impacts.

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

The Project site is located within the French Valley Airport Influence Area; the site will be exposed to noise levels ranging from 55 to 65 CNEL. The light industrial and business uses proposed for the Project site are considered Conditionally Acceptable up to 70 dBA CNEL. The removal of the second runway at the Airport ensures that aircraft noise will not be increased due to closer proximity of future aircraft operations on the second runway. To ensure that the employees and patrons of future businesses will not be subject to noise levels beyond acceptable levels, an acoustical analysis will be required prior to building permit issuance. If the analysis indicates noise levels within the structures will not be acceptable, the building design must then incorporate noise attenuation design features to control noise levels to an acceptable CNEL for business operations. Future building occupants must be notified of periodic loud noise associated with aircraft operations.

As described below, mitigation was added that will substantially lessen the
potentially significant impacts associated with future aircraft operations on future businesses occupying structures near the Airport to a level of less than significant and no unavoidable adverse impacts would occur.

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

The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Project cannot expose people to noise from such operations. There are no railroads located in the vicinity of the Project site. Therefore, no adverse railroad noise impact can affect future development on the Project site.

The Project site is located approximately $1 / 2$ mile from the nearest highway. Therefore, no adverse highway noise impact can affect future development on the Project site.

No other sources of noise have been identified near the Project site. Therefore, no adverse noise impact can affect future development on the Project site.

Would the Project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project; in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project; or, in an exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Based on the evaluation presented in the noise sections of the FEIR, the proposed Project will not result in any Project specific significant adverse noise impacts during future construction or operations. All Project-related noise impacts, including cumulative contributions, can be controlled to less
than significant levels with implementation of proposed mitigation.
The mitigation measures identified are feasible and would avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant impacts associated with future construction noise impacts to a level of less than significant and no unavoidable adverse impacts would occur.

The mitigation measure identified is feasible and would avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant impacts associated with future occupancy noise impacts to a level of less than significant and no unavoidable adverse impacts would occur.

The Project site is exposed to conditionally acceptable levels of noise (up to 70 dBA CNEL) for industrial and business park uses. Thus, future exposure will not exceed the thresholds established by the Riverside County General Plan with implementation of adequate noise attenuation within the structures. Since this is a standard condition, no mitigation is required to achieve a less than significant impact level.

Would the Project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

The Project site is not adjacent to any sensitive noise or ground-borne vibration land uses and the remaining activities, fine grading and building construction do not involve activities that generate excessive ground-borne vibration. Thus, the potential adverse vibration impact from future construction and operation activities will be less than significant.

Regarding cumulative impacts, based on the cumulative impact significance criteria described in Section 4.4.3.1 and summarized in Table 4.4-1 of this document, the Project contributions to the cumulative noise environment are as follows. The future construction noise impacts can be controlled to a less than significant impact with implementation of standard Conditions of Approval and recommended mitigation measures. Thus, a less than
significant cumulative noise impact is expected during construction activity. The proposed Project contribution to on-site noise levels can also be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the recommended mitigation measure. Finally, the off-site roadway noise level increases will not cause any significant impacts to any existing or future sensitive noise receptors. The analysis in Chapter 4.4 Noise of this DEIR shows that the Project will NOT create a substantial permanent increase in traffic-related noise levels or expose persons to noise levels in excess of the exterior noise level standards, and therefore, no mitigation is required. Consequently, construction and implementation of the proposed Project would not result in cumulatively significant noise impacts.

## 2. Mitigation.

The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts by the following mitigation measure:
a. MM4.4-1: Prior to approval of grading plans and/or issuance of building permits, plans shall include a note indicating that noisegenerating Project construction activities shall not occur between the hours of 6:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. during the month of June through September, and between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. during the months of October through May.
b. MM4.4-2: During all Project site construction, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers` standards. The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the Project site.
c. MM4.4-3: The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between
construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the Project site during all Project construction. A review of the Project site and the location of nearby noise sensitive receptors indicate that construction equipment staging shall be concentrated in the southeastern corner of the site, or along the southern property boundary in the eastern portion of the site.
d. MM4.4-4: Prior to grading permit issuance, the County shall review and approve a Construction Haul Route Exhibit prepared by the Project Applicant that identifies all public and private roadways that will be used for haul truck deliveries. Haul routes shall minimize passage by noise-sensitive land uses. A requirement to comply with the Construction Haul Route Exhibit shall be noted on all grading and building plans and also shall be specified in bid documents issued to perspective construction contractors.
e. MM4.4-5: All employees that will be exposed to noise levels greater than 75 dB over an 8 -hour period shall be provided with adequate hearing protection devices to ensure no hearing damage will result from construction activities.
f. MM4.4-6: Utilize construction methods or equipment that will provide the lowest level of noise impact, i.e., use newer equipment that will generate lower noise levels.
g. MM4.4-7: Maintain good relations with the local community where construction is scheduled, such as keeping people informed of the schedule, duration, and progress of the construction, to minimize the public objections of unavoidable noise. Communities should be notified in advance of the construction and the expected temporary and intermittent noise increases during the construction period.
h. MM4.4-8: To satisfy the Noise Level Reduction requirements all windows shall provide a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 31 . The interior noise analysis shows that the French Valley Airport Center business park land use will satisfy the County of Riverside 45 dBA CNEL interior noise level standard with a minimum STC window rating of 31 .

## M. Population and Housing

## 1. Impacts.

Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing. necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The proposed Project site is graded and currently vacant. Therefore, the Project will not displace any housing.

Would the Project create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning $80 \%$ or less of the County's median income?

At full development the proposed Project is estimated to provide jobs for between approximately 1,509 to 3,772 employees. These new jobs have a potential to create demand for additional housing; however, due to the type of jobs envisioned by this Project, a high percentage of demand for affordable housing is not anticipated. Given the current housing market and related availability of housing and high unemployment, the increase in jobs is not forecast to cause a significant demand for additional housing.

Would the Project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The proposed Project will not displace any people or housing. No adverse impact to such human resources can result from Project implementation. Would the Project affect a County Redevelopment Project Area? The Project is not located in a County Redevelopment Project Area.

Therefore, no potential exists to adversely impact any such area. Would the Project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

The Project does not provide housing; thus, it has no potential to cause a cumulative exceedance in local or regional population projections. Would the Project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

The Project will provide between about 1,500 and 3,772 new jobs over several years of development. Based on this job forecast, the proposed Project will enhance the jobs/housing balance for the southwest portion of Riverside County. This number of new jobs may induce limited population growth within the Project area, but it is not anticipated that the demand for future housing will induce substantial population growth. No indirect growth would be induced as local infrastructure will not be extended to other potential areas that could support development.
2. Mitigation.

No mitigation is required for direct Project impacts, and no mitigation is required for cumulative impacts related to population and housing resources.

## N. Public Services

1. Impacts.

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

The Project area is served by the Riverside County Fire Department. When the original approval was granted by the County in 2008, the developer was required to offset demand by this Project through payment of development impact fees (DIF) for fire enforcement service. Since this requirement has already been imposed on the Project, the potential impact to fire services is considered a less than significant impact. Specific fees to be paid will depend upon the amount of the fee at the time of actual building occupancy. Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for sheriff services?

The Project area is served by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. When the original approval was granted by the County in 2008, the developer was required to offset demand by this Project through payment of development impact fees (DIF) for law enforcement service. Since this requirement has already been imposed on the Project, the potential impact to such services is considered a less than significant impact. Specific fees to be paid will depend upon the amount of the fee at the time of actual building occupancy.

Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools?

The Project area is served by the Temecula Valley Unified School District.

The proposed Project will not generate any direct demand for school capacity, but may indirectly generate students due to a local increase in population from new employees. When the original approval was granted by the County in 2008, the developer was required to offset this potential indirect demand by this Project through payment of school impact fees for industrial and business park development. Since this requirement has already been imposed on the Project, the potential impact to such services is considered to a less than significant impact. Specific fees to be paid will depend upon the amount of the fee at the time of actual building occupancy. Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for libraries?

The Project area is served by the Riverside County library resources. When the original approval was granted by the County in 2008, the developer was required to offset demand by this Project through payment of development impact fees (DIF) for library services. Since this requirement has already been imposed on the Project, the potential impact to such services is considered to a less than significant impact. Specific fees to be paid will depend upon the amount of the fee at the time of actual building occupancy. Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for health services?

Health services are provided by the County and private health care providers. The proposed Project does not place any direct demand on such services, with the exception of an accident that could occur during construction or at one of the future businesses during operation. Recent construction of the Loma Linda Center in Murrieta and Temecula Valley Rancho Springs in Temecula ensures adequate emergency capacity within the Project area. No adverse impact on demand for health services will result from implementing the proposed Project.
2. Mitigation and/or Conditions.

No mitigation is required for direct Project impacts, and no mitigation is required for cumulative impacts related to public services resources. Standard conditions shall apply to the Project and any impacts will remain less than significant.

## O. Recreation

1. Impacts.

Would the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment; or, would the Project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

The proposed Project does not include any recreational facilities nor will it directly include the use of existing parks which might experience substantial physical deterioration of such facilities. No adverse impact to recreation resources will result from Project implementation.

Is the Project located within a C.S.A. or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?

The Project site is not located within a CSA or park district with

Community Parks and Recreation Plan fees. Therefore, no adverse effect on such a district will result from Project implementation. Additionally, no County designated trails are shown on the Project site. Therefore, the proposed Project has no potential to adversely impact such trails.

## 2. Mitigation and/or Conditions.

No mitigation is required for direct Project impacts, and no mitigation is required for cumulative impacts related to recreation resources. Standard conditions shall apply to the Project and any impacts will remain less than significant.

## P. Transportation and Traffic

1. Impacts.

Would the Project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment); cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads; cause an effect upon circulation during the Project's construction; result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses: or, conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

The proposed Project would not result in any Project specific significant circulation system effects during future construction with implementation of the identified construction mitigation measures. The mitigation measures identified are feasible and would avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant circulation system impacts associated with
construction activities impacts to a level of less than significant and no unavoidable adverse impacts would occur.

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

Would the Project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

The proposed Project does not include any activities or actions that could change air traffic patterns at the French Valley Airport. Based on the revisions to the airport land use plan for the Airport, the Project will not constrain either existing or future Airport operations. No impact is forecast and no mitigation is required.

Would the Project alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?
The proposed Project has no potential to adversely impact or conflict with existing or future air operations. Since there are no waterborne or rail transportation facilities in the Project vicinity, the proposed Project has no potential to adversely impact waterborne or rail traffic activities.

Additionally, the Project is not located adjacent to any County designated bike trails. Therefore, the proposed Project has no potential to adversely impact such trails.

Regarding cumulative impacts, the circulation system impact analysis in Chapter 4.5 Transportation and Traffic evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project Development of the proposed Project as described in Chapter 3 of this Draft EIR would result in the creation of short-term construction-related circulation system impacts and construction related generation of additional short-term traffic which could adversely affect local circulation systems. After development, the proposed Project would contribute to localized traffic impacts. A summary of the cumulatively impacted study area intersections and recommended improvements to reduce cumulative impacts to less-than-significant are described in detail within Section 7.0 EAPC (2016 \& 2019) Traffic Analysis of the TIA Report provided in Appendix 3. Cumulative impacts are deficiencies in the transportation network's LOS that would not be directly caused by the Project. The Project, along with other cumulative development projects, would contribute traffic to these deficient facilities,
resulting in a cumulatively considerable impact.
A summary of off-site improvements needed to address cumulative traffic impacts for EAPC (2019) traffic conditions, with Clinton Keith Road Extension, is included in Table 4.5-6 of the EIR. Improvements found to be included in Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF), County Development Impact Fee (DIF) and Southwest Road and Bridge Benefit District (RBBD) programs have been identified as such. Payment of fees to these programs may be considered as mitigation for these improvements. For improvements that do not appear to be in the TUMF, DIF or RBBD programs, a fair share financial contribution based on the Project's fair share impact may be imposed in order to mitigate the Project's share of impacts in lieu of construction. These fees are collected as part of a funding mechanism aimed at ensuring that regional highways and arterial expansions keep pace with the projected vehicle trip increases.

Additional information related to the Fair Share Calculation, TUMF, DIF and RBBD programs are contained in Section 9.0 Local and Regional Funding Mechanisms of the TIA Report provided in Appendix 3 where the current fee schedule and project transportation impacts fees are shown on Table 9-2. Since payment of TUMF, DIF and RBBD fees is mandatory to offset a project's fair share contribution to cumulative demand for circulation system capacity, no mitigation is required. Payment of fair share fees is generally deemed to be sufficient to reduce a project's contributions to cumulative impacts to a less than significant level. Specifically, Section 15130(a)(3) states: "An EIR may determine that a project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable and thus is not significant. A project's contribution is less than cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the
cumulative impact. The lead agency shall identify facts and analysis supporting its conclusion that the contribution will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable."

For two reasons this finding may not apply to the proposed project. First, three intersections on the affected circulation system cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant impact, even though the project's contribution does not cause the cumulatively considerable adverse impact. Second, although a plain reading of Section 15130(a)(3) indicates that payment of fair share to required improvements is sufficient to reduce a specific project's contribution to a less than cumulatively considerable contribution, there is a timing factor that cannot be ignored. Fair share contributions to circulation system impacts often cannot be immediately implemented. Thus, there is a short-term cumulatively significant impact between the time when an impact occurs (2019) and the actual completion of the requisite improvement. Thus in an abundance of caution in interpreting the level of cumulative impact, this document finds that the proposed project has a potential to cause a contribution to cumulatively significant impacts on the area circulation system, at least in the period between full development and the completion of all required circulation system improvements identified in Subchapter 4.5 of this EIR.
2. Mitigation.

The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts by the following mitigation measure:
a. MM4.5-1: Prior to initiating roadway impacts, a construction traffic management plan must be developed, approved by the County or City and fully implemented by the construction contractor to minimize adverse effects on the flow of traffic during construction. At a minimum this plan shall address, but is not limited to, such

## items as:

- How to minimize disruption of vehicle and alternative modes of traffic at all times, but particularly during periods of high traffic volumes.
- Provision of adequate access to meet safety and emergency vehicle access.
- Adequate signage and other controls, including flag persons, to ensure that traffic can flow adequately during construction.
- The identification of alternative routes that can meet the traffic flow requirements of a specific area, including communication (signs, webpages, etc.) with drivers and neighborhoods where construction activities will occur.
- Time of construction activities (e.g., off-peak hours).
- Truck/Haul routes.
- Construction employee parking.
- Construction equipment staging.
- Potential lane closures.
- Work zone traffic control.
- Control of traffic at any location where short-term hazards cannot be avoided.

The construction traffic management plan is viewed as mitigation for short-term circulation system impacts and must be designed to minimize many of the anticipated impacts associated with the construction activities of the Project.
b. MM4.5-2: The construction contractor will ensure that traffic safety hazards, such as uncovered or unfilled open trenches, will not be left in roadways during period of time when construction personnel are not present, such as nighttime and weekends.
c. MM4.5-3: The construction contractor will repair all roads adequately after construction to ensure that traffic can move in the same manner as before construction.
d. The following mitigation measures are necessary to reduce impacts to "less-than-significant" for Phase 1-2016 with Clinton Keith Road extension traffic conditions (EAP).
4.5.1-1 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Benton Road

- Construct a northbound left turn lane, 3rd through lane and modify the traffic signal to implement overlap phasing on the right turn lane.
- Construct a 3rd southbound shared through-right turn lane.
- Construct an eastbound left turn lane, two through lanes and right turn lane.
- Construct 2 westbound through lanes and modify the traffic signal to implement overlap phasing on the right turn lane.
4.5.1-2 Margarita Road / Murrieta Hot Springs Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.2-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Thompson Road
- Construct a 2 nd northbound left turn lane.
- Modify the traffic signal and implement overlap phasing on the eastbound right turn lane.
4.5.3-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.3-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.4-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Murrieta Hot Springs Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.4-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.5-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Nicolas Road
- Mitigation Measure $4.5 .5-1$ shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.


### 4.5.6-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Margarita Road <br> - Mitigation Measure $4.5 .6-1$ shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.

4.5.7-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Ynez Road

- Mitigation Measure 4.5.7-1 shall apply. No additional
mitigation is required.

4.5.8-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / I-15 Northbound Ramps

- Mitigation Measure 4.5.8-1 shall apply. No additional
mitigation is required.
4.5.9-2 Briggs Road / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.9-1 shall apply.
- Modify the traffic signal and implement overlap phasing on the northbound right turn lane.
4.5.10-2 Industry Way / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.10-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.


### 4.5.11-2 Pourroy Road-West / Auld Road

- Mitigation Measure 4.5.11-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
e. The following mitigation measures are necessary to reduce impacts to "less-than-significant" for Phase 2-2019 without Clinton Keith Road extension traffic conditions (EAP).
4.5.13-1 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Willows Avenue
- Stripe a northbound right turn lane and modify the traffic signal to implement overlap phasing on the northbound right turn lane.


### 4.5.14-1 Pourroy Road-East / Auld Road

- Install a traffic signal.
- Construct an eastbound left turn lane.
4.5.1-3 Margarita Road / Murrieta Hot Springs Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.2-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Thompson Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.2-1 shall apply.
- Construct a 3rd southbound through lane.
4.5.3-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.3-1 shall apply.
- Construct a 3rd northbound through lane.
- Construct a 2 nd southbound left turn lane and 3 rd shared through-right turn lane.
4.5.4-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Murrieta Hot Springs Road
- Mitigation measure 4.5.4-1 shall apply.
- Construct a 4th northbound through lane.
- Construct a 2 nd southbound right turn lane and modify the traffic signal to implement overlap phasing.
4.5.5-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Nicolas Road
- Mitigation measure 4.5.5-1 shall apply.
- Construct a 2 nd southbound right turn lane.
4.5.6-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Margarita Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.6-1 shall apply.
- The PM peak hour intersection delay is anticipated to
exceed the City of Temecula's significance threshold of 2.0 seconds over pre-Project conditions with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.6-1. In order to achieve acceptable peak hour intersection operations: Construct a 2 nd westbound right turn lane with overlap phasing. This improvement may not be feasible due to right-of-way constraints.
4.5.7-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Ynez Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.7-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.8-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / I-15 Northbound Ramps
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.8-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.9-3 Briggs Road / Auld Road
- Mitigation measure 4.5.9-1 shall apply.
- Construct a 2 nd northbound right turn lane and modify the traffic signal to implement overlap phasing on the northbound right turn lanes.
4.5.10-3 Industry Way / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.10-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.11-3 Pourroy Road-West / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.11-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
f. The following mitigation measures are necessary to reduce impacts to "less-than-significant" for Phase 2-2019 with Clinton Keith Road extension traffic conditions (EAP).


### 4.5.1-4 Margarita Road / Murrieta Hot Springs Road

- Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.2-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Thompson Road
- Mitigation Measure $4.5 .2-1$ shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.3-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.3-3 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.4-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Murrieta Hot Springs Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.4-3 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.5-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Nicolas Road
- Mitigation Measure $4.5 .5-3$ shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.6-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Margarita Road
- Mitigation Measure $4.5 \cdot 6-3$ shall apply. No additional mitigation is required. Please note, a portion of the improvements required under Measure 4.5.6-3 to reduce impacts to a less than significant level may not be feasible due to right-of-way constraints.
4.5.7-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Ynez Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.7-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.8-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / I-15 Northbound Ramps
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.8-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.9-4 Briggs Road / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.9-3 shall apply. No additional
mitigation is required.
4.5.10-4 Industry Way / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.10-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.11-4 Pourroy Road-West / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.11-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.12-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Benton Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.12-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.13-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Willows Avenue
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.13-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.14-2 Pourroy Road-East / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.14-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.


## Q. Utilities and Service Systems

1. Impacts.

Would the Project require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects; or, have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

According to the Plan of Service Summary compiled by the Project engineer and Eastern Municipal Water District, the proposed Project is forecast to create a demand for up to 167,200 gallons of water per day at buildout. This includes both the proposed land use and the site landscaping. According to EMWD, this volume of water supply is available and the
demand will be primarily supplied by imported water, supplemented by local groundwater resources. A review of the EMWD 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (2011) documents the water availability for this Project and the whole EMWD service area, when the water shortage contingency plan and demand management measure are taken into account. Based on these substantiating data, provision of domestic water supply can be accomplished without causing significant impacts on the existing water system or existing entitlements.

The mitigation measures identified are feasible and would avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant impacts associated with future Project-related water consumption impacts to a level of less than significant and no unavoidable adverse impacts would occur.
Would the Project require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects; or, result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

According to the Plan of Service Summary compiled by the Project engineer and Eastern Municipal Water District, the proposed Project is forecast to generate up to 102,000 gallons of wastewater per day (gpd) at buildout. This wastewater will be delivered to the Temecula Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility. According to the EMWD website this facility currently has typical daily wastewater flows of 12 million gallons per day. The plant's capacity is 18 mgd. The Project's 0.12 mgd generation of wastewater would consume two percent of the remaining capacity. This consumption of capacity will not cause the construction of
new wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the EMWD (the wastewater treatment provider) indicates in the Plan of Service Summary in Appendix 2 that the Temecula Valley Facility has adequate capacity to serve the Project in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Thus, the proposed Project will consume some capacity of the existing Water Reclamation Facility, but the level of adverse impact is considered less than significant.

Is the Project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs; or, does the Project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)? The Project site is located about 20 miles south of two County regional municipal landfills, El Sobrante and Lamb Canyon. The Lamb Canyon Landfill is located between the City of Beaumont and City of San Jacinto at 16411 Lamb Canyon Road (State Route 79). The landfill property encompasses approximately 1,189 acres, of which 580.5 acres encompass the current landfill permit area. Of the 580.5-acre landfill permit area, approximately 144.6 acres are permitted for waste disposal. The landfill is currently permitted to receive about 5,000 tons of refuse per day and had an estimated total disposal capacity of approximately 15.646 million tons as of June 30, 2009. As of January 2011, the landfill had a total remaining capacity of approximately 8.647 million tons. The current landfill remaining disposal capacity is estimated to last, at a minimum, until approximately 2021. During 2010 the Lamb Canyon Landfill accepted daily average volume of 1,703 tons and a period total of approximately 529,744 tons. Landfill expansion potential exists at this landfill site.

The El Sobrante Landfill is located east of Interstate 15 and Temescal Canyon Road to the south of the City of Corona and Cajalco Road at 1910

Dawson Canyon Road. The landfill is owned and operated by USA Waste of California, a subsidiary of Waste Management, Inc. It encompasses 1,322 acres, of which 645 acres are permitted for landfill operations. According to the El Sobrante operating permit, the Landfill has a total disposal capacity of approximately 209.91 million cubic yards and can receive up to 70,000 tons per week of refuse. The operating permit allows a maximum of 16,054 tons per day of waste to be accepted at the landfill, due to limitations on the number of vehicle trips per day. As of January 2011, the landfill had a remaining in-County disposal capacity of approximately 38.506 million tons. In 2010, the El Sobrante Landfill accepted a total of 694,963 tons, or approximately 0.695 million tons of waste generated within Riverside County. The daily average for in-County waste was 2,235 tons during 2010. The landfill is expected to reach capacity in approximately 2045.

The County evaluates solid waste generation based on a per capita generation rate. Therefore, a review of solid waste generation rates published by CalRecycle was performed to obtain a reasonable rate of waste generation for the mixed business park/industrial Project. An industrial waste generation rate of $5 \mathrm{lbs} . / 1,000$ square feet per day is identified in the CalRecycle Waste Characterization sheets for the Industrial uses. For comparison, an office generation rate of $6 \mathrm{lbs} . / 1,000$ square feet per day is also identified in the CalRecycle Waste Characterization sheets for the Commercial sector. Therefore, an average $5.5 \mathrm{lbs} . / 1,000$ square feet per day will be used for the French Valley Airport Center. Based on the aggregate 755,000 square feet of business park and industrial space, $4,252.5 \mathrm{lbs}$. of solid waste will be generated per day by the Center. Assuming a mandatory $50 \%$ recycling rate, daily solid waste generation if forecast to be 2,126 $\mathrm{lbs} /$ day for disposal at either the El Sobrante Landfill or the Lambs Canyon

Landfill. This is approximately one ton per day or an increase in solid waste disposal of about $0.05 \%$ at either landfill. Thus, the proposed Project will consume some capacity of the existing landfills, but the level of adverse impact is considered less than significant. There is adequate capacity at the area landfills to accommodate the solid waste generated by the proposed Project, and the Project will comply with all laws and regulations in managing solid waste.

Would the Project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effect.s to electricity?
The proposed Project will consume electricity. A daily and annual electricity consumption rate for the total 754,411 square feet of business park and industrial park has been calculated. The total estimated daily electricity consumption has been estimated at 22 megawatts (MW). The annual estimated annual electricity consumption has been estimated at 8,218 MW.
Would the Project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects to natural gas? The proposed Project will not be connected to the natural gas distribution system. Therefore, no requirement to install additional natural gas infrastructure will result from implementing the proposed Project.

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

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

Would the Project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects to storm water drainage?

The drainage system consists of the collection system within the developed area; a water quality basin that will limit flows to the existing natural channel to historic levels; and the discharge culverts to the natural stream channel retained on the Project site. This system will require maintenance by the property owner, but this Project will not place a substantial demand on the regional storm water drainage system.

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

New street lights will be installed by the proposed Project in accordance with standard requirements and County Ordinance No. 655. The installation of these lighting improvements are part of the proposed Project and with compliance with Ordinance No. 655, the installation and future operation of these street lights can be accomplished without causing significant adverse environmental impact.

Would the Project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities: the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects to maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

The Project will add new roads and circulation system improvements to the

County's circulation system. Other Project features, such as street lights. will also require future maintenance by the County. Ongoing maintenance costs will be covered by annual property taxes of the proposed Project and the future maintenance of public facilities will not cause significant adverse environmental impacts in the future.

Would the Project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects to other governmental services?

No demand for any other specific governmental services has been identified. However, as is the case with all large business parks or industrial areas, there may be random demand for emergency services or inspections by fire personnel in the future. No follow-on construction or permanent demand for any other governmental services has been identified. Would the Project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects to conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?

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

## 2. Mitigation.

The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts by the following mitigation measure:
a. Native and ornamental drought resistant plants shall be used in the common landscaped area and no invasive plant species listed in

Table 6-2 of the MSHCP shall be planted within the landscaped areas.
b. The Project landscape areas shall be plumbed with purple pipe. If and when reclaimed water becomes available at the Project site, the site landscape shall be watered with reclaimed water.
c. Low water consuming plumbing fixtures (toilets, etc.) shall be installed in the Project residences.
d. The applicant shall provide evidence to Building and Safety during the final inspection of all residential structures that demonstrates that low water consuming plumbing fixtures (toilets, etc.) were installed in the Project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that all applicable regulatory requirements and feasible mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts have been considered and are applied as conditions of the Project approval, yet the following impacts potentially resulting from the approval of Plot Plan No. 25183 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 33691 (Revision No. 1) cannot be fully mitigated and will be only partially avoided or lessened by the mitigation measures hereinafter specified: a statement of overriding findings is therefore included herein:

## A. Air Quality

1. Impacts.

Would the Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
The proposed Project operational-source emissions would exceed SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for VOCs during operation of Phase 1 (2016) and for VOCs and NOx during operation of Phase 2 (2019).
Operational air emissions associated with the proposed Project are not
anticipated to exceed applicable air quality standards for any other criteria pollutant.
2. Mitigation.

The proposed Project cannot be fully mitigated below a level of significance for this issue area. The following mitigation measures can reduce, but not eliminate, air pollution emissions generated during long-term occupancy of the Project. Nonetheless, the following mitigation measures are provided to reduce operational emissions to the extent feasible.
a. MM4.2-5: Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project proponent shall submit energy usage calculations to the Planning Division showing that the Project is designed to achieve $20 \%$ efficiency beyond the 2008 California Building Code Title 24 requirements (in the aggregate). Example of measures that reduce energy consumption include, but are not limited to, the following (it being understood that the items listed below are not all required and merely present examples; the list is not all-inclusive and other features that reduce energy consumption also are acceptable):

- Increase in insulation such that heat transfer and thermal bridging is minimized;
- Limit air leakage through the structure and/or within the heating and cooling distribution system;
- Use of energy-efficient space heating and cooling equipment;
- Installation of electrical hook-ups at loading dock areas;
- Installation of dual-paned or other energy efficient windows;
- Use of interior and exterior energy efficient lighting that exceeds the 2008 California Title 24 Energy Efficiency performance standards;
- Installation of automatic devices to turn off lights where they are
not needed;
- Application of a paint and surface color palette that emphasizes light and off-white colors that reflect heat away from buildings;
- Design of buildings with "cool roofs" using products certified by the Cool Roof Rating Council, and/or exposed roof surfaces using light and off-white colors; and
- Design of buildings to accommodate photo-voltaic solar electricity systems or the installation of photo-voltaic solar electricity systems.
b. MM4.2-6: To reduce energy consumption, the Project shall install Energy Star-rated appliances.
c. MM4.2-7: To reduce energy demand associated with potable water conveyance, the Project shall implement U.S. EPA Certified WaterSense labeled or equivalent faucets, high-efficiency toilets (HETs), and water-conserving shower heads.
d. MM4.2-8: In order to reduce vehicle reliance for short trips, the Project shall include a master-planned design that creates an urban center setting, enhancing walkability and connectivity as well as incorporating bicycle lanes and paths, and improving the on-site pedestrian network and connecting off-site.
e. MM4.2-9: The Project will reduce vehicle miles traveled and emissions associated with trucks and vehicles by implementing the following measure: Inform future building owners and recommend that they implement a trip reduction program, for which all employees shall be eligible to participate.
f. MM4.2-10: The Project will designate one parking space per building for a future EV charging station and provide an EV charging circuit conduit to this space.
g. MM4.2-11: The Project will provide natural gas lines in the public streets inside PM33691R1 to facilitate installation of future natural gas fueling stations at individual buildings.
h. MM4.2-12: The developer will strengthen the roofs of all structures to support installation of future solar panels by future building owners.


## B. Traffic/Transportation

1. Impacts.

Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? The proposed Project would not result in any Project specific significant circulation system effects during construction with implementation of the identified construction mitigation measures. The Project's contribution to the TUMF program as a fair share contribution is considered sufficient (refer to Section 15130(a)(3) to address the Project's fair share toward a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate any potential cumulative impacts; however, with implementation of the identified operational mitigation measures, the proposed Project can be implemented without causing any unavoidable adverse circulation system effects over the long-term with the following caveats and exceptions. This finding may not apply to the operation of the proposed Project. Three intersections on the affected circulation system cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant impact, or the proposed mitigation would itself result in a significant adverse impact, even though the Project's contribution does not
cause the cumulatively considerable adverse impact.

## 2. Mitigation.

The proposed Project cannot be fully mitigated below a level of significance for this issue area. The following mitigation measures can reduce, but not eliminate, traffic/transportation impacts generated during long-term occupancy of the Project. Nonetheless, the following mitigation measures are provided to reduce operational impacts to the extent feasible.
a. The following mitigation measures are necessary to reduce impacts to "less-than-significant" for Phase 1-2016 without Clinton Keith Road extension traffic conditions (EAP):

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 4.5.1-1 } & \text { Margarita Road / Murrieta Hot Springs Road } \\
\text { - } & \text { Construct a 3rd eastbound through lane. } \\
\text { - } & \text { Remove the southbound (west leg) cross walk. }
\end{array}
$$

4.5.2-1 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Thompson Road

- Construct a 2 nd northbound left turn lane.
- Modify the traffic signal and implement overlap phasing on the eastbound right turn lane.
- Construct a 2 nd westbound left turn lane.


### 4.5.3-1 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Auld Road

- Modify the traffic signal and implement overlap phasing on the northbound right turn lane.
- Construct a 2 nd westbound left turn lane and a right turn lane.
4.5.4-1 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Murrieta Hot Springs Road
- Modify the traffic signal and implement overlap phasing on the southbound right turn lane.
- Remove the southbound (west leg) cross walk.
4.5.5-1 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Nicolas Road
- Modify the traffic signal and implement overlap phasing on the northbound right turn lane.
4.5.6-1 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Margarita Road
- Stripe a dedicated southbound right turn lane and modify the traffic signal to implement overlap phasing on the southbound right turn lane.
4.5.7-1 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Ynez Road
- Modify the traffic signal and implement overlap phasing on the eastbound right turn lane.
4.5.8-1 Winchester Road (SR-79) / I-15 Northbound Ramps
- Construct a southbound free-right turn lane.
4.5.9-1 Briggs Road / Auld Road
- Install a traffic signal.
- Modify the northbound free-right turn lane as a dedicated northbound right turn lane.
- Construct a southbound left turn lane.
- The existing intersection is skewed, and as such, improvements to this intersection should also include improving its alignment.
4.5.10-1 Industry Way / Auld Road
- Install a traffic signal.
4.5.11-1 Pourroy Road-West / Auld Road
- Install a traffic signal.
b. The following mitigation measures are necessary to reduce impacts to "less-than-significant" for Phase 1-2016 with Clinton Keith Road extension traffic conditions (EAP).


### 4.5.1-1 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Benton Road

- Construct a northbound left turn lane, 3rd through lane
and modify the traffic signal to implement overlap phasing on the right turn lane.
- Construct a 3 rd southbound shared through-right turn lane.
- Construct an eastbound left turn lane, two through lanes and right turn lane.
- Construct 2 westbound through lanes and modify the traffic signal to implement overlap phasing on the right turn lane.
4.5.1-2 Margarita Road / Murrieta Hot Springs Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.2-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Thompson Road
- Construct a 2 nd northbound left turn lane.
- Modify the traffic signal and implement overlap phasing on the eastbound right turn lane.
4.5.3-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.3-1 shall apply. No additional
mitigation is required.
4.5.4-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Murrieta Hot Springs Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.4-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.5-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Nicolas Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.5-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.6-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Margarita Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.6-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.

4.5.7-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Ynez Road

- Mitigation Measure 4.5.7-1 shall apply. No additional
mitigation is required.
4.5.8-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / I-15 Northbound Ramps
- Mitigation Measure $4.5 .8-1$ shall apply. No additional
mitigation is required.
4.5.9-2 Briggs Road / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.9-1 shall apply.
- Modify the traffic signal and implement overlap phasing on the northbound right turn lane.
4.5.10-2 Industry Way / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.10-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.


### 4.5.11-2 Pourroy Road-West / Auld Road

- Mitigation Measure 4.5.11-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
c. The following mitigation measures are necessary to reduce impacts to "less-than-significant" for Phase 2-2019 without Clinton Keith Road extension traffic conditions (EAP).
4.5.13-1 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Willows Avenue
- Stripe a northbound right turn lane and modify the traffic signal to implement overlap phasing on the northbound right turn lane.
4.5.14-1 Pourroy Road-East / Auld Road
- Install a traffic signal.
- Construct an eastbound left turn lane.
$\begin{aligned} \text { 4.5.1-3 } & \text { Margarita Road / Murrieta Hot Springs Road } \\ & \text { - Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-1 shall apply. No additional }\end{aligned}$
mitigation is required.

$$
\begin{array}{cl}
\text { 4.5.2-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Thompson Road } \\
\text { - Mitigation Measure 4.5.2-1 shall apply. } \\
\text { - } \quad \text { Construct a 3rd southbound through lane. } \\
\text { 4.5.3-3 } & \text { Winchester Road (SR-79) / Auld Road } \\
\text { - Mitigation Measure 4.5.3-1 shall apply. } \\
\text { - Construct a 3rd northbound through lane. } \\
\text { - Construct a 2nd southbound left turn lane and 3rd } \\
& \text { shared through-right turn lane. }
\end{array}
$$

4.5.4-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Murrieta Hot Springs Road

- Mitigation measure 4.5.4-1 shall apply.
- Construct a 4 th northbound through lane.
- Construct a 2 nd southbound right turn lane and modify the traffic signal to implement overlap phasing.
4.5.5-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Nicolas Road
- Mitigation measure 4.5.5-1 shall apply.
- Construct a 2 nd southbound right turn lane.
4.5.6-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Margarita Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.6-1 shall apply.
- The PM peak hour intersection delay is anticipated to exceed the City of Temecula's significance threshold of 2.0 seconds over pre-Project conditions with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.6-1. In order to achieve acceptable peak hour intersection operations: Construct a 2 nd westbound right turn lane with overlap phasing. This improvement may not be feasible due to right-of-way constraints.
4.5.7-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Ynez Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.7-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.


### 4.5.8-3 Winchester Road (SR-79) / I-15 Northbound Ramps <br> - Mitigation Measure 4.5.8-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.

### 4.5.9-3 Briggs Road / Auld Road

- Mitigation measure 4.5.9-1 shall apply.
- Construct a 2 nd northbound right turn lane and modify the traffic signal to implement overlap phasing on the northbound right turn lanes.
4.5.10-3 Industry Way / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.10-1 shall apply. No additional
mitigation is required.


### 4.5.11-3 Pourroy Road-West / Auld Road

- Mitigation Measure $4.5 \cdot 11-1$ shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
d. The following mitigation measures are necessary to reduce impacts to "less-than-significant" for Phase 2-2019 with Clinton Keith Road extension traffic conditions (EAP).

| 4.5.1-4 | Margarita Road / Murrieta Hot Springs Road |
| :--- | :--- |
| • | Mitigation Measure 4.5.1-1 shall apply. No additional |
|  | mitigation is required. |

4.5.2-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Thompson Road

- Mitigation Measure 4.5.2-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.3-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.3-3 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.4-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Murrieta Hot Springs Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.4-3 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.


### 4.5.5-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Nicolas Road

- Mitigation Measure 4.5.5-3 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.6-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Margarita Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.6-3 shall apply. No additional
mitigation is required. Please note, a portion of the
improvements required under Measure 4.5.6-3 to
reduce impacts to a less than significant level may not
be feasible due to right-of-way constraints.


### 4.5.7-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Ynez Road

- Mitigation Measure 4.5.7-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.8-4 Winchester Road (SR-79) / I-15 Northbound Ramps
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.8-1 shall apply. No additional
mitigation is required.
4.5.9-4 Briggs Road / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.9-3 shall apply. No additional
mitigation is required.
4.5.10-4 Industry Way / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.10-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.11-4 Pourroy Road-West / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.11-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.12-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Benton Road
- Mitigation Measure $4.5 .12-1$ shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.


### 4.5.13-2 Winchester Road (SR-79) / Willows Avenue

- Mitigation Measure 4.5.13-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.
4.5.14-2 Pourroy Road-East / Auld Road
- Mitigation Measure 4.5.14-1 shall apply. No additional mitigation is required.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126, (g)), requires an EIR to discuss how a proposed Project could directly or indirectly lead to economic, population, or housing growth. The following growth-inducing impacts were considered in relation to the proposed Project:
A. The proposed Project would provide business park and light industrial development in a manner consistent with the land use and circulation objectives contained in the County's planning documents. The development would not require a significant extension of infrastructure to support the proposed Project. Infrastructure would be extended from adjacent properties to serve the site. Only the immediate access roads to the site would require expansion to serve the site. The Project would not provide infrastructure or service capacity that accommodates growth beyond the levels currently permitted by local or regional land use plans.

The proposed Project is not in an isolated area and would not extend substantial urban infrastructure into a new area that might cause new or additional development pressure on the intervening and surrounding land. Plot Plan No. 21163 was originally approved in 2008. As originally approved, the proposed Project would have resulted in the construction of approximately 121,520 square feet of business park development and 632,891 square feet of industrial park development on approximately 63 acres in two separate phases. A primary reason for the request to consider the proposed Plot Plan No. 25183 is that the French Valley Airport Master Plan deleted a previously planned (but
never built) secondary runway which led to a revision to the French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). The change in the ALUCP allows for development on a portion of the previously approved Plot Plan (Parcel 2) where development had not been allowed due to potential runway incompatibilities.

If Plot Plan No. 25183 is approved as proposed, the only changes to the development of structures proposed by Plot Plan No. 21163 would occur on Parcels 2, 4 and 5. The arrangement of the structures on Parcels 4 and 5 proposed as Plot Plan No. 25183 are slightly altered from that which was approved as Plot Plan No. 21163. Within Parcel 2, which is located on the west side of the proposed Project, the plot plan is proposing 15 single story light industrial structures between 3,000 and 30,000 square feet, consisting of 33 individual units, 6 basins, parking, trash enclosures and access drive isles. Within Parcels 4 and 5, which are located on the east side of the of the proposed Project, the applicant is proposing 10 single-story light-industrial structures between 3,000 and 30,000 square feet, consisting of 26 individual units, 4 basins, parking, trash enclosures and access drive isles. Most of the development of the Project site has already been approved, and the modified development proposed by the Project would expand development to encompass additional area, but it would not add square footage to the total development.
B. The proposed Project is not a large-scale project, relative to the surrounding area, that would have the potential of producing a "multiplier effect" resulting in substantial indirect community growth. Existing development within the Project vicinity includes the Southwest Justice Center located north of the Project site, the French Valley Airport located west of the site and single-family small agricultural uses located east of the site. While there is some vacant agricultural land to the south of the Project site, the proposed Project does not include any changes to the underlying land use designations. Thus, any future development proposed on adjacent or nearby lands would be required to be consistent with the land use designations for the location or would require approvals to alter land use designations that would require future environmental review. No growth beyond that which is provided for in the County and/or City land use policies and plans
could occur without subsequent review, including a separate environmental analysis, of land use policy. To reiterate, any future development that might be proposed for the land adjacent to the proposed Project would require subsequent environmental review, including review for consistency with the general plan. Similarly, any change in land use designations that might be proposed for land adjacent to the proposed Project would require subsequent environmental review.
C. Due to the nature and scale of the proposed Project, it will not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing a substantial number of new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure.)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered the following alternatives identified in EIR No. 539 in light of the environmental impacts which cannot be fully mitigated or substantially lessened and has rejected those alternatives as infeasible for the reasons described below:

## A. Alternative 1-No Project Alternative

1. The No Project Alternative would also allow the Project site to be developed with the same overall land uses and density. The actual Project submitted to the County for approval does not include any change in the net square footage of the approved Project, only a slight change in the total acreage within the Project area and a modification of some conditions of approval related to the manner in which the Project contributes to area circulation system improvements.
2. Denial of the proposed Project (Plot Plan No. 25183 and TTM No. 33691) would not alter the potential development impacts of the Project on the circulation system or on the air quality environment affected by the proposed Project.
3. The significant adverse impacts of implementing the No Project Alternative will be exactly the same as approval of the proposed Project.
4. The No-Project Alternative, while feasible, is less than desirable than the proposed Project due to the accommodation of the proposed Project to the elimination of the
second runway at the French Valley Airport.

## B. Alternative 2-Big Box Warehouse Alternative

1. Based on the area available at the Project site, approximately 63 acres, it is assumed that a total of $1,100,000$ square feet of high cube warehouse(s) could be constructed at the existing site adjacent to French Valley Airport.
2. This would substantially reduce the number of persons employed at the site from between 1,500-3,772 for the proposed Project to about 200-300 for the warehouse alternative.
3. Approximately 1.1 million square feet of large box warehouse would reduce the VOC emissions to a less than significant impact level, but NOx emissions would still exceed the SCAQMD threshold, primarily due to emissions from large trucks.
4. Vehicle trips would be substantially reduced on the area circulation system under the large box warehouse alternative; however, due to cumulative traffic increases in the Project area traffic impacts on the circulation system would remain unavoidably significant under this alternative.
5. Based on the general reduction in air emissions, except for NOx, the large box warehouse would be environmentally superior to the proposed Project.
6. Large box warehouses are typically located near major regional transportation corridors (motor vehicle and rail) to ensure that material can be easily delivered to and from the warehouse. The French Valley Airport is not located in a major regional transportation corridor.
7. The primary objective of the proposed Project (French Valley Airport Center) is to create a major employment center. A large box warehouse or warehouses is not a major employment center. It generate jobs, but substantially less than envisioned by the Center, 200-300 jobs versus the estimated $1,500-3,772$ jobs forecast to be generated by the Center.
8. A large box warehouse project, although a plausible alternative on the property, cannot feasibly meet the overall Project objective.

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

## A. Land Use Element

1. Analysis of applicable policies of the Land Use Element is presented throughout EIR No. 539 and concludes that the Project would not conflict with any applicable policy of the General Plan Land Use Element. Furthermore the proposed Project complies with all design standards for the various land use designation and considers the unique characteristics and features of the Project site and surrounding community. The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

## B. Circulation Element

1. The Project will construct or contribute its fair share of the costs associated with the improvement of roadways and certain intersections. The Project will implement mitigation measures that address Project-specific and cumulative transportation and traffic impacts, and based thereon, the Board of Supervisors finds that the Project is consistent with the General Plan Circulation Element. All required improvements that are directly attributable to the Project would be constructed as part of the Project and fair share costs would be contributed for improvements to affected off-site roadways through payment of the TUMF, and County's Development Impact Fee. There is no bus service adjacent to the Project. The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan Circulation Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

## C. Multipurpose Open Space Element

1. The Multipurpose Open Space Element of the General Plan describes an open space system which includes methods for the acquisition, maintenance, and operation of a variety of open spaces. The County's open
spaces are utilized for visual relief, natural resources protection, habitat protection, recreational uses, and protection from natural hazards for public health and safety. The Project site is located within Criteria Cell No. 5879 of the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). Accordingly, per Section 6.2 of the MSHCP, the proposed Project underwent the Habitat Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS) process and Joint Project Review $(J P R)$ review process. As a result of these review procedures, the property owner was required to conserve 8.3 acres of the Project site. This acreage has been set aside and the property was dedicated to the County under the MSHCP process.
2. Under the 2008 approval, the Project site has been mass graded and there are no remaining natural habitat values on the property. Thus, under the current site conditions the proposed Project cannot have any conflicts with the MSHCP or any other habitat or natural community conservation plan.
3. Implementation of the Project will not result in cultural resource impacts (including paleontological resources), that will exceed the established thresholds of significance. Nonetheless, as part of mitigation for potential impacts to unknown cultural resources, all ground-disturbing activities would be monitored.
4. The proposed Project does not include any recreational facilities nor will it directly include the use of existing parks which might experience substantial physical deterioration of such facilities. No adverse impact to recreation resources will result from Project implementation. The Project site is not located within a CSA or park district with Community Parks and Recreation Plan fees. Therefore, no adverse effect on such a district will result from Project implementation. No County designated trails are shown on the Project site. Therefore, the proposed Project has no potential to adversely impact such trails. The proposed Project is consistent with the

General Plan's Multipurpose Open Space Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

## D. Safety Element

1. The Project complies with all applicable building codes, County Ordinances, and State and Federal laws. The Project complies with all applicable provisions of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and as concluded by the Project geotechnical study, the Project site is not subject to significant hazards associated with earthquake induced liquefaction, land sliding, or settlement (assuming the implementation of mitigation). In addition, the proposed Project would not be subject to significant flood or dam inundation. The Project also would comply with all applicable standards for fire safety and be consistent with the Riverside County Fire Protection Master Plan. Furthermore, Project impacts associated with hazardous waste and materials on the Project site would be mitigated below a level of significance, and the proposed Project would not conflict with any disaster preparedness plans nor subject individuals to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, erosion, seismic activity, blow sand, or flooding. The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan Safety Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.
E. Noise Element
2. Project construction and operational noise impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Mitigation is provided to reduce noise impacts to below a level of significance. With implementation of the recommendations provided in the noise impact analysis and the required mitigation measures, the Project would be consistent with the General Plan Noise Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

## F. Air Quality Element

1. The Project-specific evaluation of emissions presented in the FEIR analysis demonstrates that after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, operational of the proposed Project would result in exceedances of regional air quality thresholds. Construction activity is not projected to result in unavoidable significant adverse impacts. Once construction is completed the site will be occupied by future businesses. Implementation of the mitigation measures enhancement of the area's jobs/housing balance, and recommendations provided in Section 4.2 of EIR No. 539, and in the air quality technical study, would ensure that the proposed Project would be consistent with the Air Quality Element and General Plan.

## G. Housing Element

1. The purpose of the General Plan Housing Element is to meet the needs of existing and future residents in Riverside County through the establishment of policies to guide County decision-making and to establish an action plan to meet the County's housing goals in the next seven years. The Project is industrial and does not include any housing. Therefore, the Project would not impede the goals of the General Plan Housing Element. Accordingly, the proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan Housing Element and General Plan.

## H. Administration Element

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

## I. Healthy Communities Element

1. The proposed project is consistent with the Healthy Communities element. More specifically the project includes trails to encourage walking, as prescribed for in policy HC 3.2. These trails are designed to carry pedestrians through the site and beyond, connecting to existing trail in existing residential communities surrounding the site as prescribed for in policies HC 5.4 and 6.4. These include bike trails and pedestrian trails. Additionally, the project is within a Specific Plan that places residential uses close to large job centers including business parks, office, and retail uses intended to foster walking between retail, jobs, and residential uses which is specifically prescribed for in policies HC 6.5 , HC 2.2 and HC 4.2 .

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that the Project would not conflict with the conservation requirements of the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) in that:
A. The Project site is located within Criteria Cell No. 5879 of the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). Accordingly, per Section 6.2 of the MSHCP, the proposed Project underwent the Habitat Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS) process and Joint Project Review (JPR) review process. As a result of these review procedures, the property owner was required to conserve 8.3 acres of the Project site. This acreage has been set aside and the property was dedicated to the County under the MSHCP process.
B. Under the 2008 approval, the Project site has been mass graded and there are no remaining natural habitat values on the property. Thus, under the current site conditions the proposed Project cannot have any conflicts with the MSHCP or any other habitat or natural community conservation plan.
C. No special status species, endangered or threatened or otherwise protected, were identified on the Project site prior to the original project approval in 2008. Since the 2008 approval. the site has been mass graded and the sensitive habitat (a riparian stream through the property) has been preserved for conservation purposes. The area proposed for
development has no natural habitat and therefore cannot support special status species. No potential exists to adversely impact special status species.
D. The sensitive habitat within the Project site has been preserved and transferred to the County for long-term management. The remainder of the site has been mass graded and contains no habitat that could support any sensitive species.
E. The stream channel on the Project site that could support wildlife movement has been preserved. The remainder of the site has been mass graded and does not support wildlife movement. Thus, approval of the proposed Project has no potential to adversely impact wildlife movement through the Project area.
F. The riparian habitat onsite was preserved through the HANS process. No other riparian habitat exists on this mass graded site. Therefore, the proposed Project has no potential to adversely impact any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.
G. All wetlands subject to jurisdiction have been preserved on the property, and the remainder of the site has been mass graded. The proposed Project has no potential exists to adversely impact such resources.
H. With the exception of the stream channel preserved onsite, the site has been mass graded and no biological resources subject to local policies or ordinances exist onsite. Therefore, no potential for conflict with such policies can occur through approval of the proposed Project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that it has balanced the economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project, against the unavoidable adverse environmental effects thereof, and has determined that the following benefits outweigh and render acceptable those environmental effects:
A. The proposed Project will provide an estimated 1,500-3,772 new jobs within the Southwest Area Plan region and 400 man-years of interim construction jobs.
B. The proposed Project will enhance the region's jobs/housing balance a major objective of the County Board of Supervisors.
C. The proposed Project contributes to regional infrastructure without in and itself causing
any adverse impacts to the area circulation system.
D. The proposed Project is expected to increase the property tax base exceeding $\$ 100$ million.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that Plot Plan No. 25183 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 33691 (Revision No. 1) is consistent with the Riverside County General Plan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and considered EIR No. 539 in evaluating Plot Plan No. 25183 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 33691 (Revision No. 1), that EIR No. 539 is an accurate and objective statement that complies with the California Environmental Quality Act and reflects the County's independent judgment, and that EIR No. 539 is incorporated herein by this reference.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that it CERTIFIES EIR No. 539 and ADOPTS the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan specified therein. In the event of any inconsistencies between the mitigation measures as set forth herein and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program shall control.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that it APPROVES Plot Plan No. 25183 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 33691 (Revision No. 1), on file with the Clerk of the Board, subject to the final conditions of approval and exhibits.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that copies of Plot Plan No. 25183 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 33691 (Revision No. 1) shall be placed on file in the Clerk of the Board, in the Office of the Planning Director, and in the Office of the Building and Safety Director, and that no applications for other development approvals shall be accepted for real property described and shown in the Project, unless such applications are substantially in accordance herewith.

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

Agenda Item No.:<br>Area Plan: Southwest Area Plan Zoning Area: Rancho California Supervisorial District: Third Project Planner: Matt Straite Board of Supervisors: November 3, 2015

## COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

PLOT PLAN NO. 25183 proposes the development of a business/industrial park for single-story light industrial office buildings, comprised of 57 units and ranging from 3,000 to 30,000 square feet and with a combined gross floor area of 331,003 square feet. As shown in Exhibit A, parcel 2 is proposing 15 single-story light industrial structures between 3,000 and 30,000 square feet, consisting of 33 individual units, 6 basins, parking, trash enclosures and access drive isles. On Parcels 4 and 5 (the east side of the of the project), the applicant is proposing 10 single-story light industrial structures between 3,000 and 30,000 square feet, consisting of 26 individual units, 4 basins, parking, trash enclosures and access drive isles.

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 33691R1 proposes a Schedule E subdivision to divide 82.74 acres into 11 parcels for office/business and resides within Planning Area (PA) No. 2 of the Borel Airpark Center Specific Plan (SP265A1). The map is divided into two phases, phase 1 consists of parcels 2, 3, 5 and 6, phase two are parcels $1,4,7,8,9,10,11$, and 12. NOTE: Phase 1 is proposed to be for condominium purposes, phase 2 is intended to be fee simple.

The project is located northerly of Jolyn Road, southerly of Auld Road, easterly of Sky Canyon Road, and westerly of Leon Avenue.

## ISSUES OF POTENTIAL CONCERN:

There are two primary reasons for the request to consider the new Plot Plan. First, the French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) has been revised due to the elimination of the second runway at this airport. The consequence of this change in the ALUCP is that additional property owned by the developer of the French Valley Airport Center is available for development because the boundaries of the Airport Compatibility Zones have been modified to allow development on Parcel 2 of Planning Area 2, which was not previously available for development. The second reason is to obtain modifications to the conditions of approval regarding offsite circulation system improvements. The Developer seeks to pay for all required offsite intersection improvements instead of requiring the applicant to contract said improvements directly.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

1. Existing General Plan Land Use (Ex. \#5):
reflected on the land use plan for SP265A1.
2. Surrounding General Plan Land Use (Ex. \#5):
3. Existing Zoning (Ex. \#2):
4. Surrounding Zoning (Ex. \#2):
5. Existing Land Use (Ex. \#1):
6. Surrounding Land Use (Ex. \#1):
7. Project Data:
8. Environmental Concerns:

Business Park (BP) and Public Facilities (PF) to the north, Open Space Conservation (OS-C) and Light Industrial (LI) to the south, Open Space Conservation (OS-C) and Business Park (BP) to the east, Public Facilities (PF) to the west as reflected on the land use plan for SP265A1.

SP No. 265 A1.
Manufacturing Service Commercial (MS-C) and Light Agriculture - 10 acre minimum ( $\mathrm{A}-1-10$ ) to the north, Specific Plan to the south, Light Agriculture 5 acre minimum (A-1-5) and Light Agriculture - 10 acre minimum ( $\mathrm{A}-1-10$ ) to the east and Manufacturing Service Commercial (MS-C) to the west.

Existing graded and vacant property
Southwest Justice Center to the north, vacant open space and graded land utilized for dryland farming to the south, rural residences to the east, and French Valley Airport to the west.

Tract Map No. 33691R1:
Total Acreage: 82.74 acres
Total Proposed Lots: 11
Schedule: E

See attached environmental assessment

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

CERTIFY ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 539, based on the findings and conclusions in Environmental Assessment No. 42533;

ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 539 certifying Environmental Impact Report No. 539 based upon the findings and conclusions in the resolution and incorporated in the staff report; and,

APPROVE PLOT PLAN NO. 25183, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

APPROVE TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 33691R1, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

FINDINGS: The following findings are in addition to those incorporated in the summary of findings, and in the Environmental Impact Report which is incorporated herein by reference.

1. The project site is designated Community Development: Light Industrial (LI) within the Southwest Area Plan, as reflected on the Land Use Plan for Specific Plan No. 265 Amendment No. 1 (SP265A1).
2. The proposed use, the development of a business/industrial park for single-story light industrial office buildings, comprised of 57 units and ranging from 3,000 to 30,000 square feet and with a combined gross floor area of 331,003 square feet, as well as, a Schedule E subdivision to divide 82.74 acres into 11 parcels for office/business, is consistent with the Community Development: Light Industrial (LI), as reflected on the land use plan for SP265A1 designation, because this industrial use implements all aspects of the General Plan Land Use designation.
3. Plot Plan No. 25183, and Tentative Parcel Map No. 33691R1 are located within Specific Plan No. 265, Amendment No. 1 (SP00265A1) Planning Area Number 2 which is located within the Highway 79 Policy Area. SP00265A1 analyzed this policy area and was determined to be consistent with the requirements of Highway 79 Policy Area. The proposed project is in conformance with SP00265A1 and is therefore also in conformance with the Highway 79 Policy Area. The Policy area is specific to restrictions for residential projects. This project proposes no residential uses.
4. Based on the review of the project by staff and other County departments the project is consistent with all the requirements of Ordinance No 460, Schedule E because it conforms to all the standards and requirements.
5. The project site is surrounded by properties which are designated Business Park (BP) and Public Facilities (PF) to the north, Open Space Conservation (OS-C) and Light Industrial (LI) to the south, Open Space Conservation (OS-C) and Business Park (BP) to the east, Public Facilities (PF) to the west, as reflected on the Conditional Use Permit for SP265A1.
6. The zoning for the subject site is Specific Plan No. 265 A1 (SP265A1).
7. The proposed use, a business/industrial park for single-story light industrial office building, is permitted in the Specific Plan Zoning Ordinance for Planning Area No. 2 as permitted with a Plot Plan.
8. The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned Manufacturing Service Commercial (MS-C) and Light Agriculture - 10 acre minimum (A-1-10) to the north, Specific Plan to the south, Light Agriculture - 5 acre minimum (A-1-5) and Light Agriculture - 10 acre minimum (A-1-10) to the east and Manufacturing Service Commercial (MS-C) to the west.
9. Similar uses have been constructed and are operating in the project vicinity along the southern boundary of the Specific Plan.
10. This project is located within Criteria Cell Number 5879 of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, and as such will be required to dedicate 8.2 acres of conservation to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA). The area identified for conservation shall be offered in a fee title donation or in a conservation easement, of which will be decided upon by RCA. This project therefore fulfills those requirements.
11. This project is within the City Sphere of Influence of Temecula.
12. The proposed project is not located within a CAL FIRE state responsibility area or a very high fire hazard severity zone.
13. It was concluded that the proposed project could result in significant impacts to the following environmental issues: Air Quality and Traffic/Transportation (discussed below). All other potential impacts were determined to be less than significant without mitigation or can be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the DEIR.

## Air Quality:

The project-specific evaluation of emissions and analysis presented in the DEIR demonstrated that after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, construction of the proposed project would not result in exceedances of regional air quality thresholds. Thus, construction activity is not projected to result in unavoidable significant adverse impacts. After construction of the proposed project is completed, construction related air emissions will cease. Thus, no significant irreversible air quality impacts would occur as a result of project construction.

## Transportation/Traffic:

Based on the evaluation presented in the DEIR, the proposed project would not result in any project specific significant circulation system effects during construction with implementation of the identified construction mitigation measures. With implementation of the identified operational mitigation measures, the proposed project can be implemented without causing any unavoidable adverse circulation system effects over the long-term with three exceptions. These exceptions involve three intersections where the proposed mitigation is either infeasible or where the recommended mitigation itself would result in an adverse impact.

## CONCLUSIONS:

1. The proposed project is in conformance with the Community Development: Light Industrial (LI) Land Use Designation, and with all other elements of the Riverside County General Plan.
2. The proposed project is consistent with the Specific Plan 265A1 zoning classification of Ordinance No. 348, and with all other applicable provisions of Ordinance No. 348.
3. The proposed project is consistent with the Schedule E map requirements of Ordinance No. 460, and with other applicable provisions of Ordinance No. 460.
4. The public's health, safety, and general welfare are protected through project design.
5. The proposed project is conditionally compatible with the present and future logical development of the area.
6. The proposed project will have a significant effect on the environment.
7. The proposed project will not preclude reserve design for the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRCMSHCP).

## INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

1. As of this writing, no letters, in support or opposition have been received.
2. The project site is not located within:
a. County Service Area;
b. A Fault zone;
c. State responsibility or high fire hazard severity zone;
d. A 100-year flood plain, an area drainage plan, or dam inundation area; or,
e. An Agriculture Preserve.
3. The project site is located within:
a. The boundaries of the Southwest Area Plan;
b. City of Temecula Sphere of Influence;
c. An area of high paleontological sensitivity;
d. Stephens Kangaroo Rat Fee Area;
e. An area of low liquefaction;
f. A low potential for liquefaction;
g. An area of susceptibility for subsidence; and,
h. The Valley Wide Parks and Recreation District.

The subject site is currently designated as Assessor's Parcel Numbers 963-080-002.
Y:IPlanning Case Files-Riverside officelPP251831DH-PC-BOS HearingsIDH-PC
Date Prepared: 01/01/01
Date Revised: 09/15/15
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