

special-status species are very limited. The vegetation community found on the site is a mix of native and non-native grasses and forbs. Nearby occurrence records provided by the CNDDDB and CNPS indicate the following special-status species have the potential to occur on the project site: burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), orange throated whiptail (*Aspidoscelis hyperythrya*), and San Diego horned lizard, (*Phrynosoma coronatum*). A burrowing owl survey was performed at the project site on August 31, 2009; no burrowing owls or sign of burrowing owls were observed during the survey. Similarly, due to the high level of disturbance, there is very low potential for the site to support other ground dwelling special-status species that may occupy non-native grassland habitats.

Although the Revised Project would disturb more land area as compared to the Original Project, the additional land area consists of disturbed land that does not currently provide nesting or foraging habitat for any sensitive species. In addition, although the Revised Project would remove the bioswale located in the southeast corner of the project site, this feature is manmade, is considered non-jurisdictional, and does not provide significant nesting or foraging habitat for any sensitive species. The mitigation measures prescribed for the Original Project would also apply to the Revised Project, thus reducing any potentially significant impacts. With the incorporation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-2, as discussed above, impacts to biological resources associated with the Revised Project would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation: The Revised Project shall be required to implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, as found the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

Monitoring: Riverside County shall verify that the above surveys as outlined in Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 have occurred, plans submitted as necessary, and follow-up actions taken accordingly.

6. (b-c) Findings of Fact: *No Impact.* *The topography of the site is generally flat. The project site does not contain drainage features. This swale apparently conveys storm water runoff during heavy precipitation events. No evidence of hydrophytic vegetation that would indicate jurisdictional consideration from the state or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) was observed (Riverside County Environmental Program Department, 2009.). No riparian or other sensitive habitats exist within the project site. No federally protected wetlands are present.*

Mitigation: *None required.*

Monitoring: *None required.*

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on the land surrounding the existing RCRMC. As stated above, the topography of the project site is generally flat and contains no significant drainage features. The bioswale located in the southeastern portion of the site is manmade and does not contain hydrophytic vegetation that would indicate jurisdictional consideration from the state or

the USACE. No riparian or other sensitive habitats exist within the project site and no protected wetlands are present. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not have the ability to adversely affect any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

6. (d) Findings of Fact: **No Impact.** *Wildlife corridors are pathways or habitat linkages that connect discrete areas of natural open space otherwise separated or fragmented by topography, changes in vegetation, and other natural or human-induced factors, such as urbanization. Construction of new facilities at the RCRMC would be within the fenced boundaries of a previously graded and mowed site. The site does not contain any linkages to adjacent open spaces or native habitats that would be used as movement passages by terrestrial wildlife species. Therefore, construction activities would not impact any wildlife movement corridors.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Construction of the Revised Project would take place within the fenced boundaries of a previously graded and mowed site. The project site does not contain any linkages to adjacent open spaces or native habitats that would be used as movement passages by terrestrial wildlife species. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, construction activities associated with the Revised Project would not impact any wildlife movement corridors. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

6. (e) Findings of Fact: **No Impact.** *Local policy is established by the MSHCP (Riverside County Transportation and Land Management, 2003). The project is located within a fenced, previously graded and mowed area and does not contain native habitats. The proposed project would not remove or encroach upon any trees or other plants listed for special consideration by the MSHCP.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. As discussed above, the project is located within a fenced, previously graded and mowed area and does not contain native habitats. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not remove or encroach upon any trees or other plants listed for special consideration by the MSHCP and there would be no impact. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

6. (f) Findings of Fact: *Less Than Significant Impact.* The MSHCP covers the area including the project site (Riverside County Transportation and Land Management, 2003). The project site is not located within a criteria cell of the MSHCP and does not otherwise conflict with it. The County is required to pay MSHCP fees on a per acre basis (Riverside County Transportation and Land Management, 2003). A mitigation fee would be paid per the MSHCP Local Development Mitigation fee schedule.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above, the project site is within a fenced, previously graded and mowed area and does not contain native habitats. Although the project site is located on land covered by the MSHCP, the project site is not located within a criteria cell of the MSHCP. The County is required to pay MSHCP fees on a per acre basis. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, a mitigation fee for the Revised Project would also be paid, per the MSHCP Local Development Mitigation fee schedule. With payment of this fee, impacts from the Revised Project would be less than significant. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	---	---	----------------------

CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

7. Historic Resources

a) Alter or destroy an historic site?

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: University of California, Riverside, 2009; Eastern Archeological Information Center (EIC) Archival Record Search, 2009; ESA, 2009b.

7. (a-b) Findings of Fact: *No Impact.* *No recorded historical resources (defined as a property listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, or a local register) exist within the project area. The RCRMC building currently on site was constructed in 1998 and is therefore not old enough to be considered a historical resource under CEQA. Three properties within one mile of the project area are listed on the National Register of Historic Places; however, these are not within the project area and would not be impacted by the proposed project. Therefore, no historical resources would be impacted from construction or operation of the proposed project.*

Mitigation: *None required.*

Monitoring: *None required.*

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on the land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site is the same for the Original Project and the Revised Project, potential impacts to historic resources resulting from each project would also be the same. As discussed above, no recorded historical resources exist within the project site or in the immediate vicinity. Three properties within one mile of the project site are listed on the National Register of Historic Places; however, these would not be impacted by the Revised Project. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, no historical resources would be impacted from construction or operation of the Revised Project. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
8. Archaeological Resources				
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: University of California, Riverside, 2009; Eastern Archeological Information Center (EIC) Archival Record Search, 2009; ESA site survey March 2009.

8. (a-b) Findings of Fact: *Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.* A project-specific cultural resource record search was conducted at the California Historical Resources Information System-Eastern Information Center (CHRIS-EIC) on March 12, 2009. This records search included an examination of previous survey coverage and reports, and known cultural resources within a one mile radius of the project site. Other sources that were reviewed included the California Points of Historical Interest (PHI), the California Historical Landmarks (CHL), the California Register of Historic Places (California Register), the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), and the California Historic Resources Inventory (HRI).

Results of the CHRIS-EIC search indicate that the project site has not been surveyed by a qualified archaeologist. Sixteen studies had been conducted within one mile of the project site. No cultural resources have been recorded within or adjacent to the project area. Nineteen cultural resources have been recorded within one mile of the project area.

A Sacred Lands Search for the project site was requested from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in March 2009. The results of this search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. The NAHC results also noted, however, that the "absence of specific site information in the sacred lands file does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area."

Follow-up consultation was conducted with all individuals and groups indicated by the NAHC as having affiliation with the project site and its immediate vicinity. Follow-up

consultation consisted of a letter sent via certified mail describing the proposed project and a map indicating the project site. Recipients were requested to reply with any information they are able to share about Native American resources that might be affected by the proposed project. To date, no responses have been received.

The project area appears to have been devoid of structures prior to the construction of the RCRMC. The 1943 Perris 15' and 1901 Elsinore 30' historic USGS topographic maps do not show any structures, roads, or other human-made features present within the project area. This indicates that the likelihood of uncovering previously unknown historic archaeological deposits is low.

An archaeological site survey was performed on June 10, 2009 by an ESA archaeologist. Previously undisturbed and unpaved areas were surveyed using no greater than 50-foot wide transects. The project area was found to be in general highly disturbed and was largely covered with thick vegetation. No cultural resources were observed.

No cultural resources are known to exist in the project area, which has been previously disturbed by grading and the construction of the existing RCRMC. The sensitivity of the project site for both prehistoric and historic-era archaeological resources is low. However, since the nature of the proposed project will involve ground-disturbing activities that will extend into undisturbed soil, it is possible that such actions could unearth, expose, or disturb subsurface archaeological resources that were not observable on the surface. Therefore, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** is recommended.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1:

Any accidental discovery of cultural resources during construction shall be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist, defined as an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Qualification Standards for professional archaeology. If the find is determined to be potentially significant, the archaeologist, in consultation with the County and appropriate Native American group(s), shall develop a treatment plan. All work in the immediate vicinity of the unanticipated discovery shall cease until the qualified archaeologist has evaluated the discovery, or the treatment plan has been implemented.

Monitoring: The construction foreman shall be responsible for appropriate action in the case of accidental discovery of cultural resources.

With the incorporation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, impacts to archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land adjacent to, and surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site is the same for the Original Project and the Revised

Project, potential impacts to archaeological resources resulting from each project would also be similar. As stated above, an archaeological survey of the project site was performed on June 10, 2009; no cultural resources were observed. Therefore, it was concluded that the sensitivity of the project site for both prehistoric and historic-era archaeological resources is low. However, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would also involve ground-disturbing activities that could unearth, expose, or disturb subsurface archaeological resources that were not observable on the surface. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is also recommended for the Revised Project. With implementation of mitigation, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

Mitigation: The Revised Project shall be required to implement Mitigation Measure CUL-1, as found the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

Monitoring: The construction foreman shall be responsible for appropriate action in the case of accidental discovery of cultural resources.

8. (c) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** *The discovery of human remains on the project site is unlikely. However, since the nature of the proposed project would involve ground-disturbing activities, it is possible that such actions could unearth, expose, or disturb previously unknown human remains. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is recommended:*

Mitigation Measure CUL-2:

If human remains are unearthed during construction activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 require that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent of the deceased Native American, who shall then help determine what course of action shall be taken in dealing with the remains.

Monitoring: *The construction foreman shall be responsible for appropriate action in the case of accidental discovery of cultural resources.*

With the incorporation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2, impacts to human remains would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Because the project site is the same for the Original Project and the Revised Project, potential impacts to human remains resulting from each project would be similar. As stated above, the discovery of human remains on the project site is considered to be unlikely. However, since the

Revised Project would also involve ground-disturbing activities, it is possible that such actions could unearth, expose, or disturb previously unknown human remains. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is also recommended for the Revised Project. With implementation of mitigation, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

Mitigation: The Revised Project shall be required to implement Mitigation Measure CUL-2, as found the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

Monitoring: The construction foreman shall be responsible for appropriate action in the case of accidental discovery of cultural resources.

*8. (d) Finding of Fact: **No Impact.** No evidence exists that would indicate that the project area is a significant religious site or is a traditional cultural property. Further, the site has been heavily modified by previous grading activities and no longer retains any native features or landscape elements that would be associated with traditional religious beliefs or practices. No significant impact would occur from project construction or operation.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts to potentially religious or sacred sites resulting from each project would be similar. As stated above, no evidence exists that would indicate that the project site or the surrounding area is a significant religious site or a traditional cultural property. Furthermore, the project site has been heavily modified by previous grading activities and no longer retains any native features or landscape elements that would be associated with traditional religious beliefs or practices. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, no sacred or religious sites would be impacted from construction or operation of the Revised Project. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
---	---	---	----------------------

9. Paleontological Resources

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

SOURCE: Morton, Douglas M., and Matti, Jonathan C. , 2001, Geologic Map of the Sunnymead 7.5' Quadrangle, Riverside County, California: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 01-450, U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, California.

9. (a) Findings of Fact: *Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.* A significant impact would occur if the project caused a substantial adverse change to a paleontological resource through demolition, construction, or other activities that could disturb fossil remains. The project area is underlain by Late Pleistocene/Early Holocene Young Alluvial Fan Deposits and Early Pleistocene Very Old Alluvial Fan Deposits. These deposits could contain significant vertebrate fossils. In addition, the Riverside County General Plan designates the project area as an area of high sensitivity (High B) for paleontological resources, meaning that it could contain significant non-renewable paleontologic resources that are likely to be encountered at or below four feet of depth. Paleontological resources represent a limited, non-renewable, and impact-sensitive scientific and educational resource. If a paleontological resource is uncovered and inadvertently damaged, the impact to the resource could be substantial. In the event that a paleontological resource is encountered during project construction, implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-3**, which conforms with Riverside County General Plan Policy OS 19.9, would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure CUL-3:

In the event any unique paleontological resource is encountered during excavation, construction shall be halted in the area of discovery. The County Economic Development Agency would be notified and a qualified paleontologist monitor would inspect the findings within 24 hours of the discovery. If a paleontological resource is discovered the paleontologist would then salvage, recorded, and curate the resource.

Monitoring: *The County of Riverside Economic Development Agency shall be responsible for appropriate action in the case of accidental discovery of paleontological resources.*

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts to paleontological resources resulting from each project would be similar. As stated above, the project site is underlain deposits that could contain significant vertebrate fossils. In addition, the Riverside County General Plan designates the project site as an area of high sensitivity (High B) for paleontological resources, meaning that it could contain significant non-renewable paleontological resources. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would also be required to implement Mitigation Measure CUL-3. With implementation of mitigation, The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

Mitigation: The Revised Project shall be required to implement Mitigation Measure CUL-3, as found the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

Monitoring: The County of Riverside Economic Development Agency shall be responsible for appropriate action in the case of accidental discovery of paleontological resources.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones

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

SOURCE: *Riverside County Land Information System, 2009; City of Moreno Valley, 2009c; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2006b.*

10. (a-b) Findings of Fact: *Less Than Significant Impact.* A significant impact would occur if the project resulted in or exposed people to adverse effects involving fault rupture, such as from the placement of structures or infrastructure in areas of known or suspected geologic hazard. The project site is located within seismically active Southern

California and in an area where several of the faults and fault zones are considered to be active by the California Division of Mines and Geology. Accordingly, Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zones (A-P zones) have been established for the majority of the faults and fault zones located within the region and the state. The purpose of the creation of A-P zones is to prohibit the location of structures on the traces of active faults, thereby mitigating potential damage due to fault surface rupture. The most significant probable seismic events likely to affect the project site would be earthquakes associated with the San Jacinto fault zone, which is located approximately four miles northeast of the project site (City of Moreno Valley, 2009c). However, as provided by information from the Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS), the project site is not located within an A-P zone for the San Jacinto fault, or for any other active or potentially active faults in the region (RCLIS, 2009). Furthermore, the project site is not located within one-half mile of any active or potentially active faults located in the surrounding vicinity (RCLIS, 2009). Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of active rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent A-P earthquake fault zoning map. Construction of the proposed project would adhere to all geotechnical recommendations and policies as delineated in the most recent California Building Code (CBC) guidelines, further ensuring impacts from seismic activity would be minimized. Review of building plans prior to issuance of permits would ensure adherence to these recommendations. Impacts from the proposed project regarding fault rupture would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts from geologic hazards for each project would be similar. As previously stated, the project site is not located within an A-P zone for the San Jacinto fault, or for any other active or potentially active faults in the region. Furthermore, the project site is not located within one-half mile of any active or potentially active faults located in the surrounding vicinity. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would also not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of active rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent A-P earthquake fault zoning map. Construction of the Plant Operations/Warehouse facility and the diesel generator, as well as all new Revised Project components such as the cardboard baler and expanded parking areas, would be required to adhere to all geotechnical recommendations and policies as delineated in the most recent CBC guidelines, further ensuring impacts from seismic activity would be minimized. Review of building plans for the Revised Project prior to issuance of permits would ensure adherence to these recommendations. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, impacts from the Revised Project regarding fault rupture would be less than

significant. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
11. Liquefaction Potential Zone				
a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Land Information System, 2009; City of Moreno Valley, 2009c; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2006b

11. (a) Findings of Fact: *Less Than Significant Impact.* Liquefaction is the loss of soil strength from sudden shock (usually earthquake shaking), causing the soil to become a fluid-like mass. In general, for the effects of liquefaction to be manifested at the surface, groundwater levels must be within 50 feet of the ground surface and the soils within the saturated zone must also be susceptible to liquefaction. As provided by information from the RCLIS, the soils that underlie the project site have a "low" to "moderate" potential of experiencing liquefaction resulting from seismic activity occurring at or near the project site (RCLIS, 2009). However, as stated in the City of Moreno General Plan Safety Element, "Liquefaction is not considered to be a local hazard since groundwater levels in Moreno Valley are far below the surface" (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). As stated above, the proposed project would be required to adhere to all geotechnical recommendations and policies as delineated in the latest edition of the CBC, which would reduce the potential for adverse impact resulting from liquefaction at the project site. Therefore, with adherence to the regulations found in the CBC, impacts resulting from the potential for seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, at the project site would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site

for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts from liquefaction hazards for each project would be similar. As discussed above, the project site has a “low” to “moderate” potential for liquefaction. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be required to adhere to all geotechnical recommendations and policies as delineated in the latest edition of the CBC, which would reduce the potential for adverse impact resulting from liquefaction at the project site. Therefore, with adherence to the regulations found in the CBC, the Revised Project would not have the ability to expose substantial numbers of people to hazards associated with seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
12. Ground-shaking Zone				
a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Land Information System, 2009; City of Moreno Valley, 2009c; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2006b.

12. (a) Findings of Fact: *Less Than Significant Impact.* Due to the project site’s location within the seismically-active region of Southern California, it is anticipated that the proposed project will experience at least some moderate ground shaking throughout the life of the proposed structures. As stated above, the most significant probable seismic events likely to affect the project site would be earthquakes associated with the San Jacinto fault zone, which is located approximately four miles northeast of the project site (City of Moreno Valley, 2009c). However, as provided by information from the RCLIS, the project site is not located within an A-P zone for the San Jacinto fault, or for any other active or potentially active faults in the region (RCLIS, 2009). Furthermore, the project site is not located within one-half mile of any active or potentially active faults located in the surrounding vicinity (RCLIS, 2009). Construction of the proposed project would adhere to all geotechnical recommendations and policies as delineated in the most recent CBC guidelines, further ensuring impacts from seismic activity would be

minimized. Therefore, due to the project site's location away from the immediate vicinity of any active or potentially active faults or fault zones, impacts from the proposed project regarding adverse impacts resulting from strong seismic groundshaking would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts from groundshaking hazards for each project would be similar. Due to the project site's location within the seismically-active region of Southern California, it is anticipated that the Revised Project will experience at least some moderate ground shaking throughout the life of the proposed structures. However, both construction and operations of the Revised Project would be required to adhere to all geotechnical recommendations and policies as delineated in the most recent CBC guidelines. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, impacts from the Revised Project would be less than significant. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

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

13. Landslide Risk

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

SOURCE: Riverside County Land Information System, 2009; City of Moreno Valley, 2009c; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2006b.

13. (a) Findings of Fact: Less than Significant Impact. Landslide hazard areas are generally considered to exist when substantial slopes are located on or immediately

adjacent to a subject property. The project site and surrounding land is relatively flat, with an elevation ranging from approximately 1,548 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to approximately 1,560 feet amsl (RCLIS, 2009). Considering the relatively level terrain of the subject property and surrounding area, landslide hazards, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards, are not expected to occur. Furthermore, adherence to all recommendations as delineated in the latest version of the CBC would ensure that impact resulting from on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards would be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts from landslide hazards for each project would be similar. The project site and surrounding land is relatively flat and therefore landslide hazards, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards, are not expected to occur. Furthermore, adherence to all recommendations as delineated in the latest version of the CBC would ensure that potential impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, impacts from the Revised Project would also be less than significant. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
---	---	---	----------------------

14. Ground Subsidence

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

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

SOURCE: Riverside County Land Information System, 2009; City of Moreno Valley, 2009c; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2006b.

14. (a) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** According to information obtained from the RCLIS, similar to much of the City of Moreno Valley the project site is located within an area that is considered susceptible to ground subsidence (RCLIS, 2009). Still, as stated in the City of Moreno Valley General Plan, Safety Element, "An area in the southeastern portion of the planning area has experienced subsidence in the past. However, the area is located within the San Jacinto Wildlife Area and/or within the designated floodplain, where the risk for injury or loss of life due to subsidence is considered low" (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). As stated above, the proposed project would adhere to all recommendations as delineated in the latest version of the CBC; Site preparation as typically conducted in accordance with current geotechnical practices and local building codes would minimize the effects of subsidence. Therefore, with compliance with applicable CBC specifications, any potential hazard associated with unstable soil conditions on-site, including ground subsidence is anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts from ground subsidence would be similar. Like much of the City of Moreno Valley, the project site is located within an area that is considered susceptible to ground subsidence (RCLIS, 2009). However, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would also be required to adhere to all recommendations as delineated in the latest version of the CBC, which would minimize the effects of subsidence. Therefore, with compliance with all applicable CBC specifications, any potential hazard associated with unstable soil conditions on-site, including ground subsidence, is anticipated to be less than significant. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impac t</u>
---	---	---	---------------------------

15. Other Geologic Hazards

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

SOURCE: *Riverside County Land Information System, 2009; City of Moreno Valley, 2009c; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2006b.*

15. (a) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** A seiche is defined as a standing wave in an enclosed or partially enclosed body of water such as a lake, reservoir or sea. The closest large body of water to the proposed project is Perris Lake, which is located approximately three miles south of the project site. Due to the project site's distance from Perris Lake, significant adverse impacts resulting from inundation by seiche is not anticipated for the proposed project. In addition, the project site is relatively flat, and the hydrologic and topographic conditions of the site and surrounding area do not lend themselves to being susceptible to mudflow. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of any active volcano. Therefore, with compliance with applicable CBC specifications, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to other geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts from seiche, tsunami, and mudflow would be similar. Due to the project site's distance from Perris Lake (i.e., the nearest body of water), and the relatively flat nature of the project site, the Revised Project would not be susceptible to seiche or mudflow. Similarly, the project site is not located within the vicinity of any active volcano. Therefore, with compliance with all applicable requirements as found in the latest edition of the CBC, the Revised Project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to other geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16. Slopes				
a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Land Information System, 2009; City of Moreno Valley, 2009c; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2006b.

16. (a-c) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The site topography is flat with an elevation ranging between 1,548 feet amsl and 1,560 feet amsl. The project site is currently developed with the existing RCRMC facility and the majority of the remaining project site has been rough graded. Grading activities associated with the proposed project would not substantially change the existing site topography, or result in grading that would affect or negate subsurface sewage disposal systems. Furthermore, no subterranean building structures (e.g., underground parking lots) are proposed, and the project would not create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts regarding the creation of slopes or the alteration of on-site topography and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Although the Revised Project would require more grading of the project site (for expanded parking areas) as compared to the Original Project, grading activities associated with the Revised Project would not substantially change the existing site topography. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not include the development of subterranean building structures (e.g., underground parking lots), nor would it create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than ten feet. Therefore, the Revised Project would have less than significant impacts regarding the creation of slopes or the alteration of on-site topography. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
17. Soils				
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Land Information System, 2009; City of Moreno Valley, 2009c; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2006b.

17. (a) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. The project site's soils are susceptible to wind and water erosion, especially during construction activities that include the exposure of bare soils to the air or the stockpiling of soils on-site. However, short-term erosion effects during the construction phase of the project would be prevented through implementation of dust control and suppression measures and preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which is required in accordance with the State General Construction Permit. The SWPPP includes standard construction methods and best management practices (BMPs) such as sandbags, silt fencing, and temporary detention basins with the main goal of controlling on-site and off-site erosion. In accordance with the General Construction Permit permitting requirements, a SWPPP will be developed for the proposed project and all recommended BMPs will be implemented throughout the construction phase of development. Therefore, with implementation of the SWPPP, impacts resulting from erosion during construction operations would be less than significant. In addition, upon full build-out of the proposed project, a network of storm drains and gutters will be provided throughout the parking areas and surrounding the proposed Operations/Maintenance Warehouse, along with landscaped areas and retention features, in order to further prevent undirected runoff from eroding soils at the project site. Specification for the design of all drainage improvements would be provided in the project specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). Therefore, with adherence to the specifications of the SWPPP, and development of an adequate storm drain system, the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil is considered less than significant for the proposed project.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts from soil erosion would be similar. Although the Revised Project would require more grading as compared to the Original Project, short-term erosion effects during the construction phase of the Revised Project would be prevented through implementation of BMP's, as discussed in the project-specific SWPPP. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, construction-phase impacts resulting from the Revised Project would be less than significant. Construction of the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

As discussed in the project-specific WQMP for the Revised Project (refer to Appendix B of this Addendum), a network of storm drains, gutters, landscaped areas, catch basins and other retention features would be provided throughout the project site in order to prevent undirected runoff from eroding soils at the project site. Implementation of the measures discussed in the project-specific WQMP would ensure that operation of the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

In summary, with adherence to the specifications of the project-specific SWPPP and WQMP, the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil resulting from the Revised Project would be less than significant. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*17. (b) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** Based on the geographic location of the site and the soils present at the site, development of the proposed project is expected to have a less than significant impact with regard to expansive soil conditions. However, site preparation as typically conducted in accordance with current geotechnical practices and local building codes, including the CBC, would minimize the effects of subsidence. As stated above, the proposed project would adhere to all recommendations as delineated in the latest version of the CBC. Therefore, with compliance with applicable CBC specifications, any potential hazard associated with unstable soil conditions on-site, including expansive soils, would be less than significant.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, site preparation for the Revised Project would be conducted in accordance with all current geotechnical practices, including the CBC, which would minimize the effects of subsidence at the project site. With compliance with applicable CBC specifications, any potential hazard associated with unstable soil conditions on-site, including expansive soils would be less than significant. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
18. Erosion				
a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Land Information System, 2009; City of Moreno Valley, 2009c; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2006b.

18. (a-b) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. There is no existing river or stream located on the project site, or within close proximity to the project site. The Perris Valley Storm Drain is located approximately 3.5 mile south and west of the property, which runs south to Canyon Lake located south of the City of Moreno Valley. During any grading activities associated with the proposed project, there would be a potential for short-term erosion and discharge of pollutants, especially during times of inclement weather. Indirect impacts to downstream water quality could occur as a result of the potential erosion and sediment transport. This short-term indirect impact is considered to be potentially significant and mitigation, in the form of site-specific BMPs, would need to be implemented. As stated above, potential water quality impacts from erosion and sedimentation would be controlled through implementation of standard erosion control measures, as specified in the SWPPP. Adherence to the requirements found in the site-specific SWPPP would reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level and would ensure that proposed project has no impact on the existing stormwater

channel. With adherence to the site-specific BMPs, the proposed project would not result in an increase in on- or off-site water erosion, nor would it alter deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake. Impacts would be less than significant for the proposed project and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts from soil erosion, siltation and deposition would be similar. There is no existing river or stream located on, or within close proximity to, the project site although the Perris Valley Storm Drain is located southwest of the project site. Grading activities associated with the Revised Project would have the potential for short-term erosion and discharge of pollutants, especially during times of inclement weather. Although the Revised Project would require more grading as compared to the Original Project, short-term erosion effects during the construction phase of the Revised Project would be prevented through implementation of BMP's, as discussed in the project-specific SWPPP. Therefore, with adherence to the SWPPP, construction of the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

As discussed in the project-specific WQMP for the Revised Project (refer to Appendix B), a network of storm drains, gutters, landscaped areas, catch basins and other retention features would be provided throughout the project site in order to prevent undirected runoff from eroding soils at the project site. Implementation of the measures discussed in the project-specific WQMP would ensure that operation of the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

In summary, with adherence to the specifications of the project-specific SWPPP and WQMP, the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil resulting from the Revised Project is considered less than significant. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
---	---	---	----------------------

19. Wind Erosion and Blows from project either on or off site

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blows, either on or off site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

SOURCE: Riverside County Land Information System, 2009; City of Moreno Valley, 2009c; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2006b

19. (a) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The area proposed for development is currently vacant and contains no structures or dwellings units; therefore, the soils currently located on-site are susceptible to wind and water erosion. As mentioned above, short-term erosion effects during the construction phase of the project would be prevented through implementation of dust control measures and a SWPPP, which would include site-specific BMPs addressing erosion and dust suppression methods. The SWPPP includes standard construction methods such as sandbags, silt fencing, and temporary detention basins to control on-site and off-site erosion. Upon build-out of the project, a network of storm drains and gutters will be provided throughout the developed site, in addition to landscaped areas, which would reduce the potential for soil erosion and loss of topsoil to a less than significant level. In addition, during construction, SCAQMD Rule 403 requirements would be implemented in order to further minimize fugitive dust emissions (see Air Quality discussion item 5 (b, d)). Therefore, neither construction nor operation of the proposed project would result in an increase in wind erosion either on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above, the Revised Project would require more grading of the project site as compared to the Original Project. The area proposed for development is currently vacant and therefore susceptible to wind and water erosion. Similar to the Original Project, short-term erosion effects during the construction phase of the Revised Project would be prevented through implementation of dust control measures and a SWPPP, which would include site-specific BMPs addressing erosion and dust suppression methods. In addition, the Revised Project would also be required to adhere to SCAQMD Rule 403 requirements in order to further minimize fugitive dust emissions. With adherence to these requirements, the Revised Project would not result in an increase in wind erosion either on- or off-site and impacts would be less than significant. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those

identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Regional Medical Center, *Plant Operations Shops: Storage, Staging and Work Requirements Worksheets*, Riverside County Regional Medical Center, 2002.

20. (a) Findings of Fact: *Less Than Significant Impact.* Because the area proposed for development is currently vacant, the proposed project would increase the amount of hazardous waste generated on-site (during both construction and operation) as compared to existing conditions. Fine grading and construction activities for the proposed project may involve the limited transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials from the fueling or servicing of construction equipment on-site. Construction activities could also include general commercial cleaners, solvents, lubricants, paints, industrial coatings and

other substances utilized for resurfacing. These types of chemicals are not acutely hazardous, and would be used in limited quantities and in adherence to the manufacturers' guidelines. Further, these activities would be minimal, short-term, or one-time in nature. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regards to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during construction.

Operation of the proposed project would involve the use of hazardous materials within the Plant Operations portion of the proposed project. Specifically, hazardous materials would be generated at the following Plant Operations shops: AC Mechanics (industrial chemicals/oils/flammables), Bio-Medical (compressed air), Carpenter (glue/paint), Electrical (industrial chemicals), Key (industrial chemicals), Maintenance (industrial chemicals), Paint (flammables/paints) and Plumber (industrial chemicals). In order to safely accommodate the use of hazardous materials at each of these shops, the proposed project would incorporate special storage requirements and other safety measures into project design in order to minimize potential impacts. For example, all shops that utilize flammable materials and other industrial chemicals would store these materials in the recommended flame-retardant metal cabinets to minimize the potential for ignition and/or explosion of these materials. All shops would be equipped with the appropriate fire suppression equipment, including at least one 10-pound ABC fire extinguisher. Furthermore, all hazardous materials utilized by the Plant Operations shops would be properly locked and made inaccessible to the public and/or untrained personnel in order to prevent unauthorized usage of these materials. Lastly, all hazardous materials would be used, transported, and stored in accordance to the manufacturer's labels and with all accepted best management practices, and the use of hazardous materials and substances would be subject to federal, state, and local health and safety requirements. Therefore, with adherence to all federal, state and local regulatory and safety requirements, operation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to the public or environment from the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, fine grading and construction activities associated with the Revised Project may involve the limited transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials from the fueling or servicing of construction equipment on-site. Construction activities could also include general commercial cleaners, solvents, lubricants, paints, industrial coatings and other substances utilized for resurfacing. However, these types of chemicals are not considered to be acutely hazardous, and would be used in limited quantities. With adherence to the manufacturers' guidelines, construction of the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, construction of the Revised

Project would have a less than significant impact with regards to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during construction.

Similar to the Original Project, operation of the Revised Project would involve the use of hazardous materials within the Plant Operations/Warehouse facility including, but not limited to, industrial chemicals, oils, flammables, compressed air, glues and paints. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would incorporate special storage requirements and other safety measures into the project design in order to minimize potential impacts from these materials. With adherence to all applicable local, state and federal regulations related to the transport, use and storage of hazardous materials, impacts from the Plant Operations/Warehouse facility would be less than significant. Operation of the Plant Operations/Warehouse facility would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

As discussed above, the Revised Project would include one new project component: a cardboard baler. The cardboard baler would run on electricity and would not require the use of any flammable materials or hazardous chemicals, such as diesel fuel. The cardboard baler would be operated in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications and with all applicable regulations. Therefore, operation of the cardboard baler would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would involve installation of a diesel generator and associated fuel storage tank. As previously mentioned, further analysis of the generator and fuel storage tank is necessary because new information has become available since adoption of the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. The backup diesel generator and attached fuel storage tank would be located north of the Plant Operations/Warehouse facility, and would require the use of diesel fuel in order to operate. Accordingly, operation of the generator would require the routine transport, storage and use of diesel fuel which is considered to be a flammable hazardous material. The primary diesel fuel tank associated with the generator would be located aboveground and would have the capacity to hold a maximum of 7,000 gallons of diesel fuel. The generator would include two separate diesel fuel tanks: the day tank, or the primary tank, and the overflow tank, or the secondary tank. The day tank would be contained within an integral rupture basin that would have approximately 150 percent of the nominal capacity of the day tank. The day tank would also be equipped with a leak detector located within the rupture basin, which would provide audible and visual alarms in the event of a day tank leak. The secondary tank, the overflow tank, would have the same features, alarms and components as the day tank. All components of the diesel fuel tank would be required to adhere to NFPA 30 requirements, as well as comply with Underwriters Laboratories Standard for Safety for the Aboveground Storage of Flammable and Combustible Liquids (UL-142). If any leak, spill, overfill, or other release from the aboveground diesel storage tank were to occur, it is likely that the secondary tank would capture all diesel fuel. However, in the event that diesel fuel is released into the environment, corrective actions

would be undertaken immediately to stop the release and prevent further impact to the environment, in accordance with the a Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure Plan created for the RCMRC. If a spill occurs outside of required secondary containment, the County Department of Environmental Health would be notified and corrective actions taken.

Once finalized, the site plans for the diesel generator would be submitted for review to the Riverside County Economic Development Agency and the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health in order to ensure that all applicable requirements have been incorporated into the design. Furthermore, as stated above, a Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure Plan will be prepared and reviewed by the Department of Environmental Health. Lastly, the generator's engine and all components would be required to comply with NFPA 30 and 110, Type 10 system requirements, which would minimize risk associated with diesel's flammable properties. With adherence to all applicable county, state and federal requirements, and review by pertinent County departments, operation of the diesel generator would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

In summary, similar to the Original Project, both operation and construction of the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

***20. (b) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is not anticipated to create a hazard through upset or accidental conditions involving hazardous materials. Currently, the area proposed for development of the Plant Operations/Warehouse and supplemental parking is vacant and therefore manufactured asbestos containing materials (ACM) and lead based paint (LBP) would not be released during construction. Furthermore, because the project site has not been utilized for agricultural activities in recent years, soil contamination from pesticide use would also not be expected to be encountered at the project site. As stated above, the proposed maintenance operations would require the use of numerous hazardous materials including, but not limited to, industrial chemicals, oils, flammables, glue, and paint. However, the proposed project would incorporate all appropriate safety measures to minimize potential impacts, including the use of fire suppression equipment and fire-retardant metal cabinets for storage. Furthermore, all hazardous materials utilized by the Plant Operations shops would be properly locked and made inaccessible to the public and/or untrained personnel in order to prevent unauthorized usage of these materials. Lastly, as stated above, all hazardous materials would be used, transported, and stored in accordance to the manufacturer's labels and with all accepted best management practices, and the use of hazardous materials and substances would be subject to federal,*

state, and local health and safety requirements. The project proposes to utilize an emergency generator equipped with 7,000 gallon fuel tank for continuous operations of the data center for 48 hours. A Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure Plan (ASPCC) will be prepared and reviewed by the Department of Environmental Health. Therefore, with adherence to all federal, state and local regulatory and safety requirements, operation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project is not anticipated to result in the accidental release of any hazardous materials. As discussed above, if a leak, spill, overfill, or other release from the aboveground diesel storage tank were to occur, it is likely that the secondary tank would capture all diesel fuel. However, in the event that diesel fuel is released into the environment, corrective actions would be undertaken immediately to stop the release and prevent further impact to the environment. If a spill occurs outside of required secondary containment, the County Department of Environmental Health would be notified and corrective actions taken.

Once finalized, the site plans for the diesel generator would be submitted for review to the Riverside County Economic Development Agency and the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health, to ensure that all applicable requirements have been incorporated into the design. Furthermore, a Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure Plan will be prepared and reviewed by the Department of Environmental Health. With adherence to all applicable county, state and federal requirements, and review by pertinent County departments, operation of the diesel generator would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, with adherence to all applicable requirements, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

20. (c) Findings of Fact: No Impact. The proposed project does not include any uses or design features that would result in interference with adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. The proposed project would be designed to maintain consistency with the County's emergency response and evacuation plans, and project

design would provide adequate emergency access consistent with County requirements regarding the required number and design of access points and safety features. Construction and operational activities associated with the proposed project would be performed in a manner that would ensure implementation of all adopted emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans. In addition, the proposed project would adhere to the emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans currently established at the existing RCRMC, and the County's design review process would also ensure project conformance with these plans. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. The proposed project would have no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not include any uses or design features that would result in interference with adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. The Revised Project would be designed to maintain consistency with the County's emergency response and evacuation plans, and would provide adequate emergency access consistent with County requirements regarding the required number and design of access points and safety features. Similar to the Original Project, construction and operational activities associated with the Revised Project would be performed in a manner that would ensure implementation of all adopted emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans, including those currently established at the existing RCRMC. Therefore, the Revised Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, with adherence to all applicable regulations, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

20. (d) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. *There are existing preschools, elementary schools, middle schools and high schools located within a one-mile radius of the project site, including: Valley Christian Academy, located at 26755 Alessandro Boulevard; Moreno Elementary School, located at 26700 Cottonwood Avenue; La Jolla Elementary School, located at 14745 Willow Grove Place; and Landmark Middle School, located at 15261 Legendary Drive. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile of the project site. As mentioned above, hazardous materials used during construction (i.e., fuels, petroleum and solvents) would be transported and handled in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws regulating the use and disposal of hazardous*

materials. Also, maintenance activities would require the use of numerous hazardous materials including, but not limited to, industrial chemicals, oils, flammables, glue, and paint. However, the proposed project would incorporate all appropriate safety measures into project design in order to minimize potential impacts including the use of fire suppression equipment and fire-retardant metal cabinets for storage. Furthermore, all hazardous materials would be used, transported, and stored in accordance to the manufacturer's labels and with all accepted best management practices, and the use of hazardous materials and substances would be subject to federal, state, and local health and safety requirements. Lastly, the proposed project would implement established County protocols and design guidelines to ensure hazardous waste is managed and disposed of properly. Therefore, with adherence to all federal, state and local regulatory and safety requirements, operation of the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile of the project site. As mentioned above, hazardous materials used during construction of the Revised Project would be transported and handled in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws pertaining to hazardous materials. Operation of the Revised Project, including operation of the generator, would also be required to adhere to all applicable requirements, including those related to accidental release of hazardous materials. As stated above, a Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure Plan would be created for the diesel fuel tanks associated with the generator and reviewed by the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health. Therefore, with adherence to all federal, state and local regulatory and safety requirements, neither operation nor construction of the Revised Project would release hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, with adherence to all applicable regulations, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

20. (e) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** Government code 65962.5 requires that the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) annually maintain a list of hazardous materials release sites, commonly referred to as the Cortese List. Based on information gathered from the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database, the project site is not located on the Cortese List, nor is the site located on a Federal Superfund Site (NPL), State Response Site, Voluntary Cleanup Site, School Cleanup Site, or Corrective Action Site (Department of Toxic Substance Control,

2009). The proposed project is located approximately 2.5 miles northeast of a School Cleanup Site, located at Indian Middle School at the intersection of Indian Avenue and Iris Avenue, in the City of Moreno Valley. This site is located on a 29-acre parcel of land which was previously utilized for past agricultural activities and a private airport landing strip. However, in March 2006, this site was cleaned of all contaminants in accordance with DTSC criteria. As such, the proposed project is not located on, or within close proximity to, a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts from previously recorded hazardous materials sites on or in the vicinity of the project site would be similar. As stated above, the project site is not located on the Cortese List, a Federal Superfund Site, a State Response Site, a Voluntary Cleanup Site, a School Cleanup Site, or a Corrective Action Site. As such, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not be located on, or within close proximity to, a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

21. Airports

a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
---	---	---	----------------------

21. Airports

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

SOURCE: Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan - Fig. S-19 "Airport Locations," GIS database, 2003a.

21. (a-d) Findings of Fact: **No Impact.** The project site is not located in close proximity to a public airport or private airstrip and is not affected by an airport land use plan. The project site is located approximately 4.5 miles northeast of the March Air Reserve Base military landing strip, approximately 12 miles south of Redlands Municipal Airport, and approximately 14 miles east of Riverside Municipal and Flabob Airports. However, the project site is not located within any airport land use plan boundaries, nor is it within the primary flight-path of arriving and departing aircrafts for any surrounding airports. Consequently, development of the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within two miles of a public airport. The proposed project would have no impact on airports and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRM. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential conflicts with nearby airports and airport land use plans would be similar. The project site is not located in close proximity to a public airport or private airstrip and is not affected by an airport land use plan. The project site is located approximately 4.5 miles northeast of the March Air Reserve Base military landing strip, approximately 12 miles south of Redlands Municipal Airport, and approximately 14 miles east of Riverside Municipal and Flabob Airports. The project site is not within the primary flight-path of arriving and departing aircrafts for any surrounding airports. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, development of the Revised Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within two miles of a public airport. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

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

SOURCE: Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan - Fig. S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility," GIS database, 2003a.

22. (a) Findings of Fact: No Impact. The project site consists of vacant land, which is surrounded by the existing RCRMC facility and other residential structures. There are no wildland areas within the project vicinity that would create a potential fire hazard at the subject property. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. The proposed project would have no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land adjacent surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts from wildfires would be similar. Currently, the project site is located within an urbanized area and there are no wildland areas located within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, similar to the Original Project the Revised Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
23. Water Quality Impacts				
a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors and odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, *Moreno Master Drainage Plan* FFMA EMWD

23. (a) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. *The proposed project is located in the Santa Ana River watershed. The Santa Ana River watershed is composed of three sub-watersheds: the San Jacinto Watershed Basin, the Inland Santa Ana Basin, and the Coastal Santa Ana Basin. The watershed is approximately 2,800 square miles in area.*

The watershed primarily slopes from northeast to southwest and water is pumped into water storage reservoirs such as Lake Perris and Lake Mathews (Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority, 2009). The project site is underlain by the San Jacinto Groundwater Basin. There are numerous hydrologic features within five miles of the project site including Lake Perris, which is approximately three miles south. Additionally, the Perris Valley Storm Drain is located approximately 3.5 miles south and west of the property and eventually flows into the San Jacinto Watershed.

The project site is located 250 feet east of an unnamed drainage that flows north to south along Morrison Street and is part of the Perris Valley Storm Drain system. The project site is not otherwise adjacent to any tributaries, streams or rivers. The project proposes to construct a two-story 50,000 square foot building and an additional 820 parking spaces over a total area of approximately 20 acres, which is assumed to create approximately 18 acres of impervious surfaces (considering landscaped and drainage areas). The anticipated increase in impervious surfaces as a result of the proposed project could impact the project site's existing drainage pattern by increasing the amount of stormwater flows that enter the local stormwater system and reducing stormwater percolation into the underlying aquifer. Increased stormwater flows may increase erosion of soils downstream of the project site. Increases in erosion and siltation could negatively impact the quality of water in receiving water bodies.

The proposed project would be required to adhere to a number of federal, state and local water quality provisions including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) as implemented by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Riverside County Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), and the Santa Ana Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) NPDES Permit. In order to comply with the requirements of the NPDES and the State's General Construction Permit, the project contractor will be required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP will contain Best Management Practices (BMPs) that include erosion control measures designed to reduce potential impacts from on- and off-site erosion. In accordance with the Riverside County WQMP the proposed project would also be required to complete a project-specific WQMP. The project-specific WQMP would provide guidelines for project-specific post-construction BMPs in order to address the management of urban runoff quantity and quality and to protect any receiving waters. In accordance with the County's MS4 NPDES requirements, the proposed project would be required to design and construct on-site drainage improvements that have sufficient capacity to handle the increase runoff. Preparation and implementation of a WQMP and a SWPPP as well as compliance with the MS4 NPDES requirements would ensure that no substantial soil erosion occurs during construction and throughout operation of the proposed project. Impacts related to existing drainage pattern alteration and subsequent erosion or siltation would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Revised Project would require more grading of the project site, and would develop more impervious surfaces at the project site, as compared to the Original Project. However, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would also be required to adhere to the Riverside County WQMP and to all Santa Ana MS4 permit requirements. In addition, the Revised Project would be required to adhere to all recommendations found within the project-specific SWPPP and WQMP. In accordance with the County's MS4 NPDES requirements, the Revised Project would be required to design and construct on-site drainage improvements that have sufficient capacity to handle the increase runoff. As discussed above, the project-specific WQMP proposes the development of stormdrain lines in order to convey all on-site stormwater drainage to RCFCWCD Master Drainage Plan Line-J, which resides in Cactus Avenue directly south of the project site. A connection to Line-J via a catch basin is also proposed near the new driveway entry located on Cactus Avenue in order to help mitigate potential flows off-site. The Revised Project is also proposing the development of two main treatment control BMPs, nutrient separating baffle boxes and curb inlet baskets, in order to further mitigate the potential for erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The curb inlet baskets would be installed for all existing and proposed catch basins throughout the project site, while one baffle box would be installed at each down stream tributary area.

In summary, with adherence to the project-specific WQMP and a SWPPP, as well as compliance with the MS4 NPDES requirements, the Revised Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or siltation. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*23. (b) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is located in the Santa Ana River Watershed. In general, the quality of surface and groundwater in the Santa Ana Basin becomes progressively poorer as water moves along hydraulic flow-paths. The highest quality water is typically associated with tributaries flowing from surrounding mountains and ground water recharged by these streams. Water quality is altered by a number of factors including consumptive use, importation of water high in dissolved solids, run-off from urban and agricultural areas, and the recycling of water within the basin (United States Geologic Survey, 2009). There are no existing rivers or streams located on the project site. The Perris Valley Storm Drain is located approximately 3.5 miles south and west of the property, which flows into the San Jacinto River Watershed.*

During construction, grading and excavation activities associated with the proposed project would generate potential for short-term erosion and discharge of pollutants, especially during times of inclement weather. Impacts to downstream water quality could

occur as a result of the potential erosion and sediment transport. The proposed project would be required to prepare a SWPPP pursuant to NPDES and the State General Construction Permit. This SWPPP will contain BMPs that include erosion control measures that are designed to reduce impacts from on- and off-site erosion to less than significant levels during construction activities. Adherence with SWPPP requirements would ensure that water discharged from the site would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. With adherence to the site-specific BMPs, the proposed project would not result in an increase in on- or off-site water erosion, nor would it result in adverse impact to water quality at the site or in the surrounding area.

Operation of the proposed project could result in negative impacts to water quality associated with increased stormwater pollutants to receiving waters. The facility expansion includes the conversion of pervious surfaces to impervious surfaces which are generally associated with various pollutants such as petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, and sedimentation. The proposed project will continue to discharge into the local drainage which discharges into the Perris Valley Storm Drain and eventually on to Canyon Lake and occasionally Lake Elsinore. Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore are both on the State Water Resources Control Board List of impaired water bodies. However, Canyon Lake is impaired for pathogens and Lake Elsinore is impaired for PCBs (Polychlorinated biphenyls). Neither of these pollutants would be present at the project site nor expected in stormwater runoff, therefore the project will not increase the presence of either of these substances. In addition, the proposed project, as discussed above, would be required to adhere to the Riverside County WQMP and the Santa Ana MS4 NPDES Permit. Both the WQMP and NPDES permit include requirements for new construction to include in their storm drainage plans to address stormwater quality. Typical requirements include use of Low Impact Development measures such as use of bioswales and retention basins for stormwater treatment. Thus, with adherence to regulatory requirements stated above, impacts on water quality to surface water resources would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Mitigation: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Item 23(a) above. With adherence to the project-specific WQMP and a SWPPP, as well as compliance with the MS4 NPDES requirements, the Revised Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

23. (c) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. The San Jacinto Groundwater Basin underlies the Moreno Valley as well as the San Jacinto, Perris, and Menifee Valleys in western Riverside County. The estimated groundwater storage capacity of the San Jacinto Basin is 3,070,000 acre feet (af). In 1975, the calculated groundwater in storage was 2,700,000 af (California Department of Water Resources, 2006). High extraction rates have produced groundwater depressions and locally reversed the historical flow pattern. Natural recharge to the basin is primarily from percolation of flow in the San Jacinto River and its tributary streams.

The project site lies within the service area of the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), which uses groundwater from the San Jacinto Groundwater Basin to supply potable water to its service area, including the project site. Pursuant to Water Code Section 10620 (a) of the Urban Water Management Act, the EMWD prepared and adopted an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) in 2005. The 2005 UWMP incorporates a plan to ensure safe-yield from local groundwater sources. Thus, the groundwater demand of a project would be considered significant if water use associated with the project results in EMWD exceeding its water demand projections as evaluated in UWMP. The water demand for the EMWD's service area is based on customer types (land use) and regional population projections.

Based on the City of Moreno General Plan, the project site is zoned for commercial land use. The project's water demand has been incorporated in the total General Plan water demand projection as analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not exceed the anticipated water demand for the project area, as anticipated by the EMWD's 2005 UWMP. The proposed project's water usage from operations would primarily result from the restroom and sinks located in Plant Operations shops, fire sprinkler systems, and landscape irrigation.

Water consumption factors provided by the EMWD, estimate that operation of industrial land uses such as the proposed project would demand approximately 2,000 gallons per day per gross acre³ of water (Eastern Municipal Water District, 2007). This would equate to a water demand of approximately 276 gallons per day (gpd)⁴ or approximately 0.31 acre-feet/year (afy)⁵. According to the EMWD's 2005 UWMP, it is anticipated that approximately 7,200 afy of groundwater will be pumped by EMWD from the San Jacinto Groundwater Basin in 2010. The EMWD also anticipates that in 2010 approximately 710 afy of this groundwater will be supplied to industrial land uses. Based on these factors, the proposed project's water demand would represent approximately 0.043 percent of water anticipated for industrial land uses in 2010, and approximately 0.0043 percent of EMWD's overall groundwater supply for 2010. The proposed project's

³ For industrial land uses, 1 acre = 0.0069 gross acre.

⁴ Calculations: 20 acres x (0.0069 gross acre/acre) x (2000 gallons per day/gross acre) = 276 gallons per day.

⁵ 1 acre-feet per year = 892.151645 gallons per day.

water demand would represent a small percentage of the water anticipated for use by industrial land uses, and an even smaller percentage of EMWD's anticipated overall groundwater supply. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

Water agencies typically require new projects to apply water conservation practices to the maximum extent practical such as water efficient plumbing fixtures that comply with Title 24, California Administrative Code, Section 1604(f) and County Policy H-29 (Sustainable Building Policy); the installation of drought tolerant and native plants in landscaped areas; and the use of reclaimed water for irrigation when available. All water mains and fire hydrants providing required fire flows to the project will be constructed in accordance with the appropriate ordinances and regulations. Furthermore, the project would implement applicable conservation measures in order to help reduce impacts to the San Jacinto watershed. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Impacts from the proposed project on groundwater would be less than significant.

Mitigation: *None required.*

Monitoring: *None required.*

Less than Significant Impact. The Revised Project would not add any components to the project site that would demand substantially more water as compared to the Original Project. Although the Revised Project would develop more of the project site as compared to the Original Project, the additional parking areas, cardboard baler and generator would require minimal water during operational activities. The Revised Project proposes more landscaping throughout the parking areas as compared to the Original Project; however, the proposed landscape plan has been designed to be consistent with the requirements of Riverside County Policy H-25 and with Riverside County Ordinance 859 regarding water efficient landscaping. Therefore, the increase in water demand associated with the Revised Project, as compared to the Original Project, is considered nominal.

Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project's water demand would represent a small percentage of the water anticipated for use by industrial land uses, and an even smaller percentage of EMWD's anticipated overall groundwater supply (i.e., 7,200 acre-feet per year). The Revised Project would be required to apply water conservation practices to the maximum extent practical such as water efficient plumbing fixtures that comply with Title 24, California Administrative Code, Section 1604(f) and County Policy H-29 (Sustainable Building Policy); the installation of drought tolerant and native plants in landscaped areas; and the use of reclaimed water for irrigation when available. Therefore, with adherence to all applicable water conservation requirements, the Revised Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a

lowering of the local groundwater table level. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*23. (d) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The addition of impervious surfaces to the project site would increase the volume of stormwater runoff and could potentially impact the capacity of local stormwater systems or introduce additional polluted runoff into those systems. According to the Moreno Master Drainage Plan as well as recent aerial photography, the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District has constructed a storm drain directly west of the project site adjacent to the area designated for the future extension of Morrison Road, as shown in the 1991 Moreno Drainage Master Plan. The proposed project would be required to design and construct additional on-site drainage improvements that have sufficient capacity to handle the increased runoff and meet Santa Ana MS4 permit requirements, and the requirements of the project-specific WQMP.*

During any grading activities associated with the proposed project there would be a potential for short-term erosion and discharge of pollutants, especially during times of inclement weather. Indirect impacts to downstream water quality could occur as a result of the potential erosion and sediment transport. However, potential water quality impacts from erosion and sedimentation would be controlled through implementation of standard erosion control measures, as specified in the project's SWPPP. Adherence with SWPPP requirements would ensure that stormwater discharged from the site would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. With adherence to the site-specific BMPs, the proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Items 23(a) and 23(b) above. With adherence to the project-specific WQMP and a SWPPP, as well as compliance with the MS4 NPDES requirements, the Revised Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial, additional sources of polluted runoff. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than

those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*23. (e) Findings of Fact: **No Impact.** The Federal Emergency Management Act (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) classifies the project site within "Zone X". Areas classified in Zone X are outside the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain (FEMA, 2008) and thus have extremely low flood risk. The proposed project consists of a two-story Plant Operations/Warehouse facility and supplemental parking, and does not involve the construction of any housing units. Therefore, the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area and would have no impact. No mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts from flooding at the project site would be similar. As stated above, the project site is located within "Zone X" according to the latest FEMA floodplain maps. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project does not propose the construction of housing. Therefore, the Revised Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*23. (f) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is designated by FEMA as located in "Zone X". Flooding in this zone is extremely unlikely as a result, significant impacts to any on-site structures would be similar to existing conditions. The proposed project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, impeding or redirecting flood flows. Impacts would be less than significant for the proposed project and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts from flooding at the project site would be similar. As stated above, the project site is located within "Zone X" which is located outside the 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that could impede or redirect flood flows. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*23. (g) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** Automobiles and construction machinery that use the site during construction and operation of the proposed project have the potential to discharge contaminants such as oil, gas and rubber. Additionally project operations would include the transport and transfer of hazardous materials on the project site. Should any of these substances enter the stormwater system or the groundwater through accidental upset conditions, it could significantly degrade water quality. However, the transport, handling, and storage of hazardous materials is stringently regulated by California Highway Patrol, the California Department of Transportation, and federal, state, and local regulatory requirements regarding storage of hazardous materials. Potential water quality impacts from erosion and sedimentation during construction would be controlled through implementation of standard erosion control measures, as specified in the project-specific SWPPP. Adherence with the General Construction Permit and SWPPP requirements would ensure that water discharged from the site would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. With adherence to the site-specific BMPs the proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality at the project site or within the surrounding vicinity (see also the discussion for (b), above). Impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Items 23(a), 23(b) and 23(d) above. With adherence to the project-specific WQMP and a SWPPP, as well as compliance with the MS4 NPDES requirements, the Revised Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Adherence to all applicable requirements would ensure that the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those

identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*23. (h) Findings of Fact: **Less than Significant Impact.** Construction of the project site would likely involve the construction of new or retrofitted stormwater treatment control BMPs such as water quality treatment features or biofiltration swales. Incorporation of Low Impact Development measures such as biofiltration swales do not have any secondary impacts as they passively treat stormwater runoff. Retention basins, stormwater filters, hydrodynamic separators, and other treatment control BMPs, if maintained appropriately, can effectively treat stormwater without secondary impacts. No constructed wetlands would be anticipated for the proposed project based on the facilities proposed. With implementation of the WQMP, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.*

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above, the project-specific WQMP proposes the development of stormdrain lines in order to convey all on-site stormwater drainage to RCFCWCD Master Drainage Plan Line-J, which resides in Cactus Avenue directly south of the project site. A connection to Line-J via a catch basin is also proposed near the new driveway entry located on Cactus Avenue in order to help mitigate potential flows off-site. The Revised Project is also proposing the development of two main treatment control BMPs, nutrient separating baffle boxes and curb inlet baskets, in order to further mitigate the potential for erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The curb inlet baskets would be installed for all existing and proposed catch basins throughout the project site, while one baffle box would be installed at each down stream tributary area. The on-site drainage plans for the Revised Project would be reviewed by the RCFCWCD and the Riverside County Economic Development Agency to ensure that construction of these improvements would not result in significant environmental effects such as increased vectors and odors. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

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

24. Floodplains

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

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan, Fig. S-9 "100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones," Fig. S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone", 2003a; Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, 2003. Riverside County Area Drainage Plans, 2003a. GIS database, 2009, FEMA

24. (a-b) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is 250 feet east of a drainage that flows along ~~Moreno Road~~ Morrison Street. The project site does not contain any tributaries, streams or rivers. Neither construction nor operation of the proposed project would involve alterations to an existing stream or river. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in impermeable surfaces on-site as compared to existing conditions, which has the potential to result in an increase in surface water runoff and reduce the absorption rate of the project site. The proposed project would be required to design and construct drainage improvements that have sufficient capacity to handle the increase runoff and meet CBC standards, and comply with the MS4 permit and the project-specific WQMP. Additionally, the project would be required to implement a SWPPP pursuant to NBPDES permitting compliance. This SWPPP would contain BMPs that would reduce impacts from on- and off-site flooding to less than significant levels during both construction and operation. The proposed project would also be required to implement a project-specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). The WQMP would address potential impacts to water quality during operation of the proposed project. Preparation and implementation of both a SWPPP and WQMP would ensure that the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or

river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site during either construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Items 23(a), 23(b) and 23(d) above. With adherence to the project-specific WQMP and a SWPPP, as well as compliance with the MS4 NPDES requirements, the Revised Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Adherence to all applicable requirements would ensure that the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*24. (c) Findings of Fact: **No Impact.** Project implementation is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. According to the appropriate FEMA FIRM, the project site is located within "Zone X", which are areas classified as being outside the annual 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain (FEMA, 2008). Furthermore, the Safety Element of the Riverside County General Plan does not identify the proposed project as being located within the dam inundation area for Perris Lake (Riverside County Planning Department, 2003a). Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Item 23(f) above. The project site is located within "Zone X" which is located outside of the 100-year flood hazard area. In addition, the project site is not located within the inundation zone for any upstream dams. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not expose substantial numbers of people to risks associated with flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

24. (d) Findings of Fact: **No Impact.** Neither construction nor operation of the proposed project would result in an increase in water flows at the project site or in the surrounding vicinity, and no changes in the amount of surface water in any water body would occur from project implementation (see discussion 24.(a-b) above). Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, neither construction nor operation of the Revised Project would result in changes in the amount of surface water in any water body. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
LAND USE - Would the project:				
25. Land Use				
a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan, 2003a; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, 2006b.

25. (a) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The general plan land use designation for the site is Commercial (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). The project site is zoned Community Commercial (CC) (City of Moreno Valley, 2009d). The site is presently developed with the existing RCRMC facility and has other areas of vacant land. The project site is located in a developed area within the City of Moreno Valley with

residential uses located adjacent to the site to the north and east. The development of the proposed project would not change the use of the site, as the project site would remain dedicated to the operation of the RCRMC; however, the proposed project would increase the overall footprint on the vacant portions of the site by approximately 50,000 sf of building area and supplemental parking. Construction of the site as proposed under the current land use and zoning designation would not result in a significant conflict with City of Moreno Valley or Riverside County applicable land use policies, and no land use or zoning variance would be required for the proposed project. Furthermore, the proposed project would adhere to all Riverside County General Plan land use policies including Policy 6.2 which aims to, "Direct public, educational, religious, and utility uses established to serve the surrounding community toward those areas designated for Community Development and Rural Community uses on the applicable Area Plan land use maps" (Riverside County Planning Department, 2003a). The proposed project is compatible in scale and design with surrounding land uses, and would not generate excessive noise, traffic, light, fumes, or odors that might have a negative impact on adjacent neighborhoods. The proposed Plant Operations/Warehouse facility would be an ancillary use, intended to directly support the daily operations of the existing RCRMC. The RCRMC began operation at the currently location in 1998 and therefore has become an established part of the surrounding community. Accordingly, the proposed project would not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. As previously stated, the general plan land use and zoning designations for the project site are C and CC, respectively. The project site is presently developed with the existing RCRMC facility, and has other areas of vacant land. The project site is located in a developed area within the City of Moreno Valley with residential uses located north and east. When compared to the Original Project, the Revised Project would include the construction of more parking areas and landscaping, as well as include the installation of a cardboard baler and minor roadway improvements along Cactus Avenue. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project proposes installation of a generator and associated fuel storage tank and construction of the Plant Operations/warehouse facility. A cardboard baler and generator are both considered to be permitted land uses under the CC zoning designation. Construction of the Revised Project, as proposed under the current land use and zoning designations at the project site, would not result in a significant conflict with applicable land use policies. Similar to the Original Project, neither a general plan amendment nor a zoning variance would be required for the Revised Project. Also similar to the Original Project, the Plant Operations/Warehouse facility associated with the Revised Project is compatible in scale and design with surrounding land uses, and would not generate excessive noise, traffic, light, fumes, or odors that might have a negative impact on adjacent neighborhoods. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area. With adherence to

all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*25. (b) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is located adjacent to the existing RCRMC and is intended to support the increased healthcare demands of the region as growth within the surrounding area continues to increase at a rapid rate, and is intended to directly support the daily operations of the existing RCRMC. The RCRMC began operation in 1998 and therefore has been an established part of the surrounding community for over 10 years. The proposed project is compatible with the surrounding land uses, and would not require an amendment to the Riverside County General Plan. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would have less than significant impact.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above, the existing RCRMC began operation in 1998 and has been an established part of the surrounding community for over ten years. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be compatible with surrounding land uses, and would not require an amendment to the Riverside County General Plan or adversely affect land uses within the City of Moreno Valley. The Revised Project would not adversely affect any nearby land uses and impacts would be less than significant. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	---	---	----------------------

26. Planning

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
26. Planning				
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan, 2003a.

26. (a) Findings of Fact: No Impact. The parcel is currently developed with the existing RCRMC, parking lots, and other areas of vacant land. The existing land use designation for the subject site is Commercial (C) as shown on Figure 1.5, and the existing zoning for the site is Community Commercial (CC) as shown on Figure 1.6. The proposed project is consistent with the established land use and zoning designations and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Item 25(a) above. The Revised Project would not add any components to the project site that would conflict with the project site's existing land use and zoning designations. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not require a general plan amendment or zoning variance in order to accommodate the proposed land uses or structures. The Revised Project would therefore be consistent with the project site's existing land use and zoning designations. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

26. (b-d) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed in item 26(a) above, the proposed project is consistent with existing land use and zoning designations for the site. The existing surrounding zoning and land uses include the following:

<u>Zoning Designation</u>	<u>Land Use Designation</u>
North: Office Commercial (OC) and Multi-Family Residential (R15)	North: Residential/Office (RO)
South: Residential (R5 or R15) (maximum 5 or 15 du/ac)	South: Residential (R5 or R15) and Commercial (C)
East: Residential/Agriculture (RA2), Suburban Residential (R5)	East: Community (C)
West: Suburban Residential (SP 218 LM)	West: Residential (R5 or R15)

Though the proposed project would develop vacant portions of the project site, the RCRMC expansion would be compatible with the established zoning. Accordingly, because land uses at the project site would not differ significantly as compared to existing conditions, the project would maintain the compatibility with the Residential/Office (RO) and Commercial (C) land uses within the surrounding area. As a result, the proposed project would be compatible with surrounding land uses.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less than Significant Impact. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Items 25(a) and 26(a) above. The Revised Project is consistent with the project site's existing land use and zoning designations. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project is the expansion of the existing RCRMC facility, which has been established in the community for over ten years. Therefore, the Revised Project would be compatible with all surrounding land use and zoning designations in the project area. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

26. (e) Findings of Fact: **No Impact.** As previously mentioned, the project site is currently developed with the existing RCRMC facility, which has been an established part of the surrounding community for over 10 years. The new Operations/Maintenance Warehouse and supplemental parking is intended to support the increased healthcare demands resulting from rapid population growth within the region. Furthermore, the proposed project is intended to directly support the daily operations of the existing

RCRMC. Accordingly, land uses at the project site would remain the same as compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project is intended to directly support the daily operations of the existing RCRMC, which has been established at the project site for over ten years. Accordingly, land uses at the project site would remain the same under the Revised Project, as compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the Revised Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

27. Mineral Resources

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: *City of Moreno Valley General Plan, 2006b, RCLIS, 2009.*

*27. (a-d) Findings of Fact: **No Impact.** According to the City of Moreno Valley General Plan, the mineral resources known to be located within the City are common materials including sand, gravel and rock (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). However, there are currently no active surface mines located within the City, as the last surface mine, Jackrabbit Canyon, was closed in 2001 (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). The area proposed for development of the project has remained adjacent to the existing RCRMC facility for over 10 years, and the project site has not been utilized as a mineral resource recovery site in this time. Further, according to information provided by the RCLIS, the project site is not located atop a surface mine or a mineral resources recovery site (RCLIS, 2009). Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource or mineral resources recovery site. The proposed project would have no impact and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts to nearby mineral resources would be similar. As discussed above, the project site is not located atop a surface mine or a mineral resources recovery site. Therefore, implementation of the Revised Project would not have the ability to result in the loss of any locally or regionally important surface mines or resource recovery sites. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

NOISE - Would the project result in

Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings

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

NA - Not Applicable A - Generally Acceptable B - Conditionally Acceptable

C - Generally Unacceptable D - Land Use Discouraged

28. Airport Noise

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| b) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |

SOURCE: Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan Fig. S-19 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map

28. (a-b) Findings of Fact: No Impact. The nearest airport/airstrip is located at the March Air Reserve Base, which is 4.5 miles southwest of the project site. The project site is not located within the influence area of this airport. Thus, the project site is not located in close proximity to a public airport or private airstrip, and is not affected by an airport land use plan nor would the project be capable of exposing a private airstrip or people working in the project area to excessive noise levels. No impact would result from acquisition, construction, or operation of the proposed project and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. The project site is not located within the influence area of any nearby airports. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not expose people working in the project area to excessive noise levels. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the

Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact					
29. Railroad Noise	NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A <input type="checkbox"/>	B <input type="checkbox"/>	C <input type="checkbox"/>	D <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan, Fig C-1 "Circulation Plan", 2003a; GIS database, 2009; ESA, 2009.

29. Findings of Fact: No Impact. The project site is not located in close proximity to a railroad. The proposed project would not expose people working in the project area to excessive noise levels from railroad noise or other noise prominent sources. No Impacts would occur from acquisition, construction, or operation of the proposed project and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. The project site is not located in close proximity to a railroad. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not expose people working in the project area to excessive noise levels from railroad noise or other similar noise sources. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

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

31. Other Noise

NA A B C D

SOURCE: GIS database: Riverside County Ordinance 457.90, Section 1G of the Riverside County Building and Safety Department

31. Findings of Fact: No Impact. There are no other prominent noise sources in the project area in addition to those previously analyzed in discussion items 28, 29 and 30 above. As provided in discussion items 32 below, project implementation would result in short term (e.g., seven months) noise impacts from construction. Construction and operation of the proposed project will not result in additional background noise in addition to those sources provided below (discussion item 32). The proposed project would have no impact from additional noise sources.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would result in short term (e.g., ten to 14 months) noise impacts from construction activities, as well as noise impacts from operation of the Plant Operations/Warehouse facility and diesel generator. In addition, the Revised Project would also generate additional noise associated with the proposed cardboard baler and expanded parking areas. As previously mentioned, further analysis of the generator is necessary because new information has become available since adoption of the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

The diesel generator would be housed in a double-walled aluminum enclosure with three-inch fiberglass insulation. With an attenuation of 86 dBA at three feet, noise levels associated with the diesel generator would be less than 50 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptor, even if not completely masked by traffic on Brodiaea Avenue. The cardboard baler would be located west of the Plant Operation/Warehouse facility, and would be electrically powered (i.e., not diesel or gasoline powered) with a ten hp motor. Noise generated by both sources would likely be masked by road traffic in between these project components (Brodiaea Avenue and Morrison Street) and the sensitive receptors to the north and west. Although the Revised Project would extend the length of construction activities as compared to the Original Project, impacts would nonetheless continue to be short-term and intermittent. Therefore, even with the additional project

components (i.e., the cardboard baler and expanded parking areas), the Revised Project would not result in significant impacts resulting from on-site noise sources. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
32. Noise Effects on or by the Project				
a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCES: GIS database, 2009; State of California exterior noise guidelines; Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan, Noise Element, 2003a, National Roads Authority, 2004.

32. (a) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. Noise level characteristics for an area can be described by the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL).⁶ In addition to CNEL, noise rating scales have been developed to account for the various effects of noise on people, which include the Equivalent Noise Level (L_{eq}) and the Day Night Noise Level (L_{dn}). The decibel (dB) scale is used to quantify sound intensity. Since the human

⁶ The CNEL is the average of all A-weighted dB levels for a 24-hour period, with a 5 dB upward adjustment added to those noise levels occurring between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. and a 10 dB upward adjustment for noise levels occurring between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

ear is not equally sensitive to sound at all frequencies, a special frequency-dependent rating scale has been devised to relate noise to human sensitivity, or the A-weighted decibel scale (dBA). For residential and school land uses, noise environments of up to 60 dBA CNEL are normally acceptable. Noise impacts may also be assessed in terms of a perceived change in existing sound levels. An increase in a noise level of 3 dBA is considered just perceptible, whereas an increase in noise level of 5 dBA or more is considered clearly discernable. The following summarize thresholds or other conditions that would indicate a significant noise impact:

- In order to generate a significant noise impact, the project must generate noise that would exceed commonly-accepted standards or guidelines within the sensitive receptor land use. The State of California exterior noise guideline is Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) 65 dBA for new residential and other sensitive land uses, which include schools, parks, day-care, etc.
- The County of Riverside, in the County General Plan Noise Element, defines CNEL 60 dBA as the acceptable external noise level for residential land uses (CNEL 70 dBA if noise reduction is incorporated) and CNEL 45 dBA as the acceptable interior level.⁷
- The project must generate traffic noise at commercial land uses where noise levels would be in excess of 75 dBA CNEL at outdoor usable areas.
- The project must generate temporary construction noise which exceeds CNEL 75 dBA for 12 hours within a 24-hour period at residences. Additionally, where temporary construction noise substantially interferes with normal business communication, or affects sensitive receptors such as day-care facilities or schools.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities typically involved. The nearest sensitive receptors include the existing RCRMC located adjacent and to the east of the project site, residences north of Brodiaea Avenue approximately 200 feet north of the project site, residences west of Nason Street approximately 200 feet east of the project site, and residences south of Cactus Avenue approximately 500 feet southeast of the project site. Ambient noise from project operation would primarily be associated with an increase in vehicle use in the area from employees of the proposed project. However, as discussed in the Traffic section of this document, the proposed project would contribute to an insignificant increase in local traffic. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially alter existing CNEL noise levels and it is anticipated that noise from the proposed project would be consistent with the 65 Leq dBA daytime preferred exterior noise standard of the Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan Noise Element. Therefore, operations would not increase permanent noise levels more than 5 dBA (or above 65 CNEL) at the nearest sensitive receptor.

⁷ The 60 CNEL standard for external noise and the 45 CNEL standard for interior noise are consistent with state guidelines for noise elements.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would involve installation of a diesel generator and associated fuel storage tank, as well as construction of the Plant Operations/Warehouse facility. As previously mentioned, further analysis of the generator and fuel storage tank is necessary because new information has become available since adoption of the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. The following analysis also discusses potential impacts from all new Revised Project components, including the cardboard baler and additional parking areas.

As discussed in the analysis of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Item 31 above, the diesel generator would be housed in a double-walled aluminum enclosure with three-inch fiberglass insulation. With an attenuation of 86 dBA at three feet, noise levels associated with this project component would be less than 50 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptor, even if not completely masked by traffic on Brodiaea Avenue. The cardboard baler would be located west of the Plant Operation/Warehouse facility, and would be electrically powered (i.e., not diesel or gasoline powered) with a ten hp motor. Noise generated by both sources would likely be masked by road traffic in between these project components (Brodiaea Avenue and Morrison Street) and the sensitive receptors to the north and west. Similarly, noise generated by the increased parking areas would also be attenuated by road traffic and landscaping in between this project component and the nearest sensitive receptor. Accordingly, it is anticipated that noise from the Revised Project would be consistent with the 65 Leq dBA daytime preferred exterior noise standard, as required by the Riverside County General Plan Noise Element. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, operation of the Revised Project would not increase permanent noise levels more than 5 dBA (or above 65 CNEL) at the nearest sensitive receptor. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. The Revised Project would have a less than significant impact. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

32. (b) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

The generation of noise associated with project construction would occur on a temporary basis for site preparation and construction activities. Construction activities for the proposed site would require approximately seven months and would result in less than five acres per day of disturbed soil during grading and excavation. Construction activities would create noise on a short-term basis from heavy equipment and related construction activities. The operation of heavy equipment during construction would result in temporary increases in noise in the immediate vicinity of the construction site. The

proposed expansion of the RCRMC would be required to adhere to all County of Riverside noise regulations, including those related to acceptable construction hours. Specifically, the County's construction noise regulations are outlined in Riverside County Ordinance 847, which states that the appropriate hours for private construction projects located within one-quarter mile from an inhabited dwelling are from 6:00AM to 6:00PM (June through September), and from 7:00AM to 6:00 PM (October through May). Construction activities associated with the proposed project would not likely occur outside of these hours; however, there may be times when exceptions are necessary in order to complete construction of the project in a timely manner. The exceptions could include, but are not limited to, electrical shutdowns, concrete plant hours of operation, and certain staging activities. Average noise levels associated with the use of heavy equipment at construction sites can range from about 78 to 88 dBA at 50 feet from the source depending upon the types of equipment in operation at any given time and the phase of construction. These noise levels would be reduced (through attenuation by distance) to approximately 66 to 76 dBA at a distance of 200 feet (at the nearest sensitive receptor). To reduce construction noise to a less than significant level, **Mitigation Measure NOI-1** shall be implemented during construction.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1:

The construction contractor shall ensure that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, are properly operating (tuned-up) and mufflers are working adequately.

The construction contractor shall ensure that all construction equipment is located such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers.

The construction contractor shall ensure that stockpiling and vehicle staging areas are located as far as practical from noise-sensitive receptors during construction activities.

Monitoring: *The County shall ensure required inspections are performed during construction.*

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, impacts would be less than significant.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As previously stated, the Revised Project would result in a construction period lasting approximately ten to 14 months, while the Original Project's construction period was estimated to last approximately seven months. In addition to the Plant Operation/Warehouse facility and diesel generator proposed as part of the Original Project, the Revised Project would also include the installation of a cardboard baler and an additional 500 parking spaces. However, impacts from construction of the Revised Project would remain short-term or one-time in nature. Similar to the Original Project, the intermittent impacts resulting from construction of the Revised Project would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 from the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. With

implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

Mitigation: The Revised Project shall be required to implement Mitigation Measure NOI-1, as found in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

Monitoring: The County shall ensure required inspections are performed during construction.

32. (c) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** As discussed in item 32. (b) above, an increase in ambient noise levels would result from project construction activities (e.g. construction crew commutes, excavation, grading, etc). Time limits on construction involving the operation of powered equipment are established by Riverside County Ordinance 457.90, Section 1G of the Riverside County Building and Safety Department: Adherence to the County Ordinance and implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 will reduce potential significant impacts. Even so, **Mitigation Measure NOI-1** will be implemented to ensure impacts remain less than significant.

Mitigation: Please refer to **Mitigation Measure NOI-1** above.

Monitoring: Please refer to **Monitoring for Mitigation Measure NOI-1** above.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 above, impacts would be less than significant.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Item 32(b) above. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity throughout the ten to 14-month construction period. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 from the Final IS/MND for the Original Project would ensure that impacts would be less than significant. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

Mitigation: The Revised Project shall be required to implement Mitigation Measure NOI-1, as found in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

Monitoring: The County shall ensure required inspections are performed during construction.

32. (d) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** *Vibration associated with noise, which takes the form of oscillatory motion, can be described in terms of acceleration, velocity, and displacement. Typically, human response to vibration is not*

significant until the vibration exceeds 70 dBA (NRA, 2004). The equipment and techniques to be used during construction would not result in excessive ground-borne vibration or noise as no pile driving or tunneling would occur. The proposed project would not involve blasting, drilling or other subterranean activities that would generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. In addition, no activities that would result in vibration would occur during operation. Therefore, construction and operation would not generate significant levels of ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the equipment and techniques anticipated for use during construction of the Revised Project would not result in excessive ground-borne vibration or noise, as no pile driving or tunneling would occur. The Revised Project would not involve blasting, drilling or other subterranean activities that would generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. In addition, the Revised Project would not include any new components, such as the cardboard baler, that would result in vibration during operation. Similarly, the generator would also not result in substantial vibration during operation. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, neither construction nor operation of the Revised Project would generate significant levels of ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	---	---	----------------------

POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project

33. Housing

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: GIS database, 2009; Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan Housing Element; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, 2006b.

33. (a) Findings of Fact: No Impact. The project site is occupied by the existing RCRMC facility and vacant land, and does not currently contain housing. Therefore, the project would not displace existing housing nor necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The proposed project is designed to accommodate existing demand for healthcare services in the region and would not induce population or employment growth. The proposed project would have no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land surrounding the existing RCRMC. Because the project site is the same for both the Original Project and the Revised Project, potential impacts regarding the displacement of housing would be similar. As stated above, the project site currently contains no housing. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not displace substantial numbers of housing necessitating the construction of housing elsewhere in the County. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*33. (b) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** Additional housing is needed when new services, employment or educational opportunities induce population growth in area that does not have existing housing available to accommodate the growth. The purpose of the proposed project is to support the increased healthcare demands of the region resulting from recent growth within Riverside County. As such, although it is anticipated that the proposed project would generate temporary jobs during the short construction period, operation of the proposed project would not create new permanent employment opportunities. If necessary, any additional staffing required for the project would come from reassignments or from the existing layoff pool, and it is presumed that future patrons and/or potential employees of the proposed project would reside in the project area. Therefore, implementation of the project would not induce employment growth within the region. Since the proposed project would result in a maximum of three new employees at RCRMC, there would not be a significant increase in permanent employment opportunities for individuals. The project would not contribute to significant population growth in the area as compared to existing conditions. Thus, the proposed project would not create a significant demand for additional housing and impacts would be less than significant.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, operation of the Revised Project would require a maximum of three additional employees. Furthermore, it is assumed that additional staffing required for the Revised Project would come from reassignments or from the existing layoff pool, and that future patrons and/or potential employees of the Revised Project would reside in the project area. Although the Revised Project would generate more temporary jobs during the short construction period as compared to the Original Project (due to the increased duration of construction), operation of the Revised Project would not create more than three new permanent employment opportunities. Therefore, neither construction nor operation of the Revised Project would induce substantial permanent employment growth within the region. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*33. (c) Findings of Fact: **No Impact.** The project site is occupied by the existing RCRMC facility and vacant land, and does not currently contain individuals residing within the*

project boundary. Therefore, the project would not displace substantial numbers of people or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The proposed project would have no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be developed on land adjacent to the existing RCRMC. Because the project site for the Original Project and the Revised Project is the same, potential impacts regarding the displacement of residents would be similar. As stated above, the project site currently contains no individuals residing within the project boundary. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not displace substantial numbers of individuals or necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere in the County. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*33. (d) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** Based on information gathered from the RCLIS, the proposed project is not located within a County Redevelopment Area (RCLIS, 2009). As discussed above, the project would not induce population growth related to new services, employment or educational opportunities, nor would the project construct new residences. Therefore, it is unlikely that the project would affect nearby County Redevelopment Projects. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is not located within a County Redevelopment Area. Furthermore, as discussed above, the Revised Project would not induce population growth related to new services or employment opportunities, nor would the Revised Project construct new residences. Therefore, the Revised Project would not adversely affect nearby County Redevelopment Projects. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

33 (e-f) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** Typically, the growth-inducing potential of a project would be considered significant if it fosters growth or a concentration of population above that is assumed in local and regional land use plans, or in projections made by regional planning authorities, such as the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The proposed project is consistent with the City of Moreno Valley General Plan land use designation of Commercial (C) for the project site (see item 25). As such, the current city and countywide population projections incorporate the proposed project's incremental population contribution. In addition, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). As discussed in item 33.(b), because the proposed project would primarily serve and employ individuals that currently reside in the project area, the proposed project would not significantly contribute to population growth. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Items 33(b) above. Similar to the Original Project, operation of the Revised Project would require a maximum of three additional employees. It is assumed that additional staffing required for the Revised Project would come from reassignments or from the existing layoff pool, and that future patrons and/or potential employees of the Revised Project would reside in the project area. The Revised Project does not include a residential component, and therefore the Revised Project would not have the ability to induce substantial population growth that could conflict with local or regional projections. The Revised Project would neither directly or indirectly induce substantial permanent employment growth within the region. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
34. Fire Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCES: *Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan* Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2003a; *City of Moreno Valley General Plan*, 2006b, RCFD, 2009.

34. Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. Since its incorporation in 1984, the City of Moreno Valley has received fire protection, fire prevention, and emergency medical services through a cooperative contractual agreement with the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). The RCFD is administered and operated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection under an agreement with the County of Riverside. According to the City of Moreno Valley General Plan, a five-minute response time is considered to be the maximum time standard for serving urban and suburban uses within the City (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). Accordingly, the City of Moreno Valley is currently served by the following six fire stations in order to maintain acceptable service ratios (RCFD, 2009):

Station No. 2: Station No. 2 is located at 24935 Hemlock Avenue in Moreno Valley, just west of Perris Boulevard. Currently, this station contains one city paramedic assessment engine and one city truck.

Station No. 6: Station No. 6 is located at 22250 Eucalyptus Avenue in Moreno Valley. Currently, this station is equipped with one city paramedic assessment engine.

Station No. 48: Station No. 48 is located at 10511 Village Road, at the intersection of Village Road and Sunnymead Ranch Parkway. Currently, this station is equipped with one city paramedic assessment engine.

Station No. 58: Station No. 58 is located at 28040 Eucalyptus Avenue in Moreno Valley. Currently, this station is equipped with one city paramedic assessment engine.

Station No. 65: Station No. 65 is currently located at 15111 Indian Street. in Moreno Valley, and mainly serves the southwest area of the city. Currently, this station is equipped with one city paramedic assessment engine.

Station No. 91: Station No. 91 is currently located at 16110 Lasselle Street in Moreno Valley, located adjacent to the Riverside Community College - Moreno Valley campus. Currently, this station is equipped with one city paramedic assessment engine and one city truck.

The proposed project would be serviced by the Fire Station 91, which is located approximately 2.2 miles from the project site. The proposed project is the construction of an Operations/Maintenance Warehouse and parking, and therefore an increase daytime population from the construction crews could occur during construction of the proposed project. In addition, as stated in item 20, the proposed project would slightly increase the use of certain hazardous materials at the project site. However, because the proposed project is the construction of a facility that would ultimately house activities that currently occur at the existing RCRMC, it is anticipated that the demand for fire services would not increase substantially as compared existing conditions. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to comply with existing fire codes including, but not limited to, emergency access requirements and fire flow requirements for fire suppression. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire facilities or the need for new or physically altered police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts would be less than significant for the proposed project and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the Revised Project would result in an increase in the use of hazardous materials at the project site, as compared to the Original Project. Although the Revised Project would include development of the same Plant Operations/Warehouse facility and diesel generator as proposed by the Original Project, the Revised Project also proposes the development of additional ancillary facilities at the project site, including expanded parking areas and the cardboard baler. The generator would require fire protection services in case of an accidental release of diesel fuel; however, implementation of the Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure Plan would reduce any impacts to less than significant levels. In general, it is anticipated that the demand for fire services associated with the Revised Project would not differ substantially as compared to the Original Project. The Revised Project would be required to comply with existing fire codes including, but not limited to, emergency access requirements and fire flow requirements for fire suppression. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire facilities. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project

would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
35. Sheriff Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCES: *Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2003a; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, 2006b.*

35. Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. *In accordance with an annual police services contract between the City of Moreno Valley and Riverside County, the Riverside County Sheriff's Department (RCSD) provides police protection and crime prevention services within the City of Moreno Valley (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). Under the name of Moreno Valley Police Department (MVPD), the RCSD provides law enforcement services within the City of Moreno Valley, as well as at the RCRMC and at all schools within Moreno Valley. As of July 2006, the MVPD had 162 sworn officers, and a current officer to population ratio of approximately 0.9 officers per 1,000 population (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). The average total response time for the period of January 1 to December 31, 2004, was over seven minutes for Priority 1 or emergency calls (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b).*

Protection and prevention services provided by the MVPD include general law enforcement, traffic enforcement, investigations, and routine support services such as communications and evidence collection. In addition, the MVPD also contains numerous specialized teams including the Hazardous Devices Team, Hostage Negotiations Team and Special Enforcement Team, K9 units (including narcotic detection), Crime Prevention Programs, Problem Oriented Policing, Career Criminal Apprehension Team, Bicycle Team, School Resource Officers, Gang and Narcotic Investigations Units and aviation (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). As stated in the City of Moreno Valley General Plan, the management and supervision of the RCRMC is the responsibility of the MVPD, which provides law enforcement for the interior and surrounding grounds of the RCRMC 24 hours a day and seven days a week (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b).

The MVPD would service the project site out of the City's of Moreno Valley's Public Safety Building, located at 22850 Calle San Juan de Los Lagos, approximately four

miles west of the project site. As mentioned above, the proposed project is the construction of the proposed project, and therefore a slight increase in daytime population from additional employees could occur upon implementation of the proposed project. Accordingly, the proposed project could slightly increase the demand for police services at the site, as compared to existing conditions. The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police facilities or the need for new or physically altered police facilities. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, implementation of the Revised Project would slightly increase the daytime population at the project site. The Revised Project is estimated to have approximately 20 daytime construction workers at the peak period of construction, similar to the Original Project. Therefore, the demand for police services at the project site would be similar as compared to the Original Project. Accordingly, the Revised Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police facilities. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
36. Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: City of Moreno Valley General Plan, 2006b.

36. Findings of Fact: No Impact. The proposed project does not include a residential component, it would not induce substantial population growth for the area, nor would it increase the amount of students attending schools in the surrounding area. As such, no impact to the surrounding educational services would occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical

impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered educational facilities or the need for new or physically altered educational facilities. The proposed project would have no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project does not include a residential component and therefore would not increase the amount of students attending schools in the surrounding area. As such, no impact to the surrounding educational services would occur as a result of the Revised Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
37. Libraries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: City of Moreno Valley General Plan, 2006b.

37. Findings of Fact: No Impact. As stated above, the proposed project does not contain a residential component and therefore no significant increase in the demand for library services would occur as a result of project implementation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered libraries or the need for new or physically altered libraries facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. The proposed project would have no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project does not include a residential component and therefore would not result in an increased demand for library services. As such, no impact to nearby libraries would occur as a result of the Revised

Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
38. Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SOURCES: *Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan Chapter 6, Safety Element, 2003a; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, 2006b.*

38. Findings of Fact: No Impact. *The proposed project would entail construction and operation of approximately 50,000 sf of additional useable space that would support existing demands due to recent growth. The proposed project does not include a residential component and therefore the proposed project would not increase the residential population in the area necessitating the use of additional health services. Furthermore, the proposed project is, itself, an expansion of an existing RCRMC that would provide public healthcare services to the community resulting in a beneficial impact on existing health services in the region. As such, the proposed project would be considered beneficial to acceptable service ratios for hospitals and other health services in the area, and no significant impact would occur.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would involve construction and operation of a 50,000 square foot Plant Operations/Warehouse facility and a diesel generator that would support existing operations at the RCRMC. In addition, the Revised Project also proposes the construction of a cardboard baler, additional parking spaces, additional landscaping, minor roadway improvements, and stormdrain improvements. The Revised Project does not include a residential component and therefore would not increase the residential population resulting in the need for additional health services. Furthermore, the Revised Project is, in itself, an expansion of an existing RCRMC that would provide public healthcare services to the community, resulting in a beneficial impact on existing health services in the region. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be considered to have a

beneficial impact on health services in the County. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

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

SOURCES: GIS database, 2009; Riverside County Municipal Ordinance Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications).

39. (a-c) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** *The proposed project would not impact existing parks or recreational facilities. The site is currently developed with the RCRMC and vacant land, and contains no structures that would require the use of surrounding recreational facilities. The proposed project does not contain a residential component and therefore, would not induce substantial population growth nor would it increase the amount of patrons utilizing nearby parks or recreational areas. As such, no impact to the surrounding recreational facilities would occur as a result of the proposed project. In addition, the project is neither located within a Community Service Area (CSA) nor is it within a recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan subject to Quimby fees. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered recreational facilities. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project does not include a residential component and therefore would not result in an increased demand for recreational facilities in the project area. As such, impacts to nearby recreational facilities resulting from implementation of the Revised Project would be less than significant. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
40. Recreational Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside Co. 800 Scale Equestrian Trail Maps, Open Space and Conservation Map for Western County trail alignments

40. Findings of Fact: No Impact. The proposed project does not include a residential component and therefore, would not induce substantial population growth nor would it increase the amount of patrons utilizing nearby recreational trails. As such, no impact to the surrounding recreational trails would occur as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project does not include components that would remove recreational space from operation, and the property does not contain recreational trails on-site. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on recreational trails and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Item 39(a-c), above. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project does not include a residential component and therefore would not result in an increased demand for recreational facilities, such as recreational trails, in the project area. The Revised Project would have no impact on nearby recreational trails. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project				
41. Circulation				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: *Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan, 2003a.*

41. (a) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. *The project site is located at the intersection of Morrison Street and Cactus Avenue, within the City of Moreno Valley. The proposed project would supplement the warehouse and receiving functions that currently take place at the existing RCRMC facility. In addition, the proposed project*

would also involve the addition of approximately 820 parking spaces, in order to address the increasing demand for parking at the RCRMC.

The current technical guide to the evaluation of traffic operations is the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) (Transportation Research Board, 2000). The HCM defines level of service (LOS) as a qualitative measure that describes operational conditions within a traffic stream, generally in terms of factors such as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience, and safety. There is a six-level range of levels of service, with values ranging from LOS A to LOS F. LOS A indicates excellent operating conditions with little delay to motorists, whereas LOS F represents congested conditions with excessive vehicle delay. The impact threshold for roadways operating at LOS A is a project-generated six percent increase in roadway traffic volume, LOS B is five percent, LOS C is a project-generated four percent increase in roadway traffic volume, at LOS D is a two percent increase, and at LOS E is a one percent increase. There is no increase allowed for LOS F. The roadways around the project site are generally vacant and operate at an efficient LOS. The proposed Plant Operations/Warehouse facility is not anticipated to generate more than three new employees upon full build-out (LBL Architecture, Planning Interiors, 2008). Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project is not anticipated to generate a substantial amount of new daily trips as compared to existing conditions at the RCRMC. The addition of two to six new trips per day would not cause an increase in traffic that would be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, Revised Project would generate a maximum of three new employees upon full build-out. Operation of the additional Revised Project components, such as the cardboard baler and expanded parking lots, would not require additional employees. Accordingly, implementation of the Revised Project would not generate a substantial amount of new daily trips as compared to existing conditions at the RCRMC. The addition of two to six new trips per day would not cause an increase in traffic that would be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, potential impacts from the Revised Project would be less than significant. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*41. (b) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project proposes the addition of approximately 820 parking spaces to the project site in order to address the increasing demand for parking at the RCRMC. For hospital land uses, the Riverside County Zoning Ordinance requires: one space per staff member of largest shift; one space per two patient's beds; and one space per vehicle owned and operated by the hospital (Riverside County Planning Department, 2009). The design of the proposed project would comply with the parking requirements identified in the Riverside County Zoning Ordinance. The amount of parking proposed by the project would be more than adequate to meet the existing and anticipated future demand for parking at the RCRMC. Therefore, the proposed project would be considered to have a beneficial impact on the parking capacity available to both patrons and employees of the RCRMC. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Revised Project proposes the construction of 1,526 parking spaces. However, as discussed in Table 1.1 above, parking construction would require the removal of 198 existing parking spaces currently located at the RCRMC. Therefore, considering the existing spaces that would be removed, the Revised Project would add a total of 1,328 new parking spaces to the project site. When added to the 1,562 parking spaces currently existing at the RCRMC, total available parking at the RCRMC would be approximately 2,890 parking spaces at full build-out of the Revised Project. Comparatively, the Original Project proposed the addition of 820 parking spaces at the project site for a total of 2,382 spaces at the RCRMC. Therefore, the Revised Project would provide approximately 500 more parking spaces than the Original Project.

For hospital land uses, the Riverside County Zoning Ordinance requires one space per staff member of largest shift, one space per two patient's beds, and one space per vehicle owned and operated by the hospital. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would comply with the parking requirements identified in the Riverside County Zoning Ordinance. The amount of parking proposed by the Revised Project would be more than adequate to meet the existing and anticipated future demand for parking at the RCRMC. Therefore, the Revised Project would be considered to have a beneficial impact on the parking capacity at the RCRMC. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*41. (c) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** As provided in item 41.(a) above, the access streets to the project site would maintain an acceptable level of*

service. Therefore, the project would generate trips that are not cumulatively significant. Potential impacts from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less than Significant Impact. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Item 41(a) above. Similar to the Original Project, implementation of the Revised Project would not generate a substantial amount of new daily trips as compared to existing conditions at the RCRMC. More specifically, the addition of two to six new trips per day would not cause an increase in traffic that would be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Therefore, the Revised Project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

41. (d) Findings of Fact: **No Impact.** The project does not propose any uses, design features, or other obstacles (i.e., blinking strobe lights, high-rise towers, etc.), which would impact air traffic patterns. Furthermore, the project site is not located within an Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ), and Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) or an Airport Influence Area (AIA). Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on air traffic patterns and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project does not propose any uses, design features, or other obstacles that would impact air traffic patterns. Furthermore, the project site is not located within an AICUZ, an ALUP or an AIA. Therefore, the Revised Project would have no impact on air traffic patterns and no mitigation is required. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*41.(e) Findings of Fact: **No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project would not alter waterborne traffic as no water navigation areas occur in the area. Furthermore, the proposed projects' main mode of transportation of goods and services is on roadways and project implementation would not impact rail traffic. Additionally, as discussed in item 41.(d) above, no impact to air traffic would occur. The proposed project would have no impact on waterborne traffic, air traffic, or railways traffic and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

No Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not alter waterborne traffic as no water navigation areas occur in the area. Furthermore, the Revised Project's main mode of transportation would be on roadways and would not impact rail traffic. Additionally, as discussed in the analysis of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Item 41(d) above, no impact to air traffic would occur. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would have no impact on waterborne traffic, air traffic, or railways traffic. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*41. (f) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not include any dangerous design features such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections. Emergency route signage, if required, would be incorporated on-site. The driveways would be adequately sized to minimize potential conflicts between delivery trucks and vehicles. In addition, the internal circulation system and roadway connections would be considered during the planning process to assure project features do not significantly affect roadway design and safety. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not include the construction of any dangerous design features such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections. Emergency route signage, if required, would be incorporated on-site. All driveways associated with the Revised Project would be adequately sized to minimize potential conflicts between delivery trucks and vehicles. In addition, the internal circulation system and roadway connections associated with the Revised Project would be considered during the planning process to assure that project features do not significantly affect roadway design and safety. Therefore, with adherence

to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*41. (g) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The increase in traffic resulting from construction and operation of a 50,000 sf Operations/Maintenance Warehouse are considered to be negligible and would neither cause an effect upon, nor create a need for, new or altered maintenance of roads. Because the project would ultimately house activities currently underway at the existing RCRMC (i.e., Plant Operations, maintenance, and storage), roadway maintenance, if any, would likely involve on-site roadways and circulation areas and would not extend to off-site roadways. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would result in a negligible increase in traffic on local roadways. More specifically, operation of the Revised Project would generate approximately two to six new trips per day. This amount of additional trips would not increase the need for roadway maintenance on off-site roads. Because the proposed Plant Operations/Warehouse would ultimately house activities currently underway at the existing RCRMC, any increase in roadway maintenance would be confined on-site. Therefore, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*41. (h) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would result in truck traffic at and near the site during the construction period. Project construction could result in short-term and intermittent construction traffic impacts associated with the delivery of materials and equipment, removal of debris, and parking for construction workers. Construction activities would continue for approximately seven months. Construction activities would include the construction of an approximate 50,000 sf warehouse and maintenance facility, 820 parking space, and other related site improvements such as landscaping. It is estimated that up to 20 workers would be*

commuting to the site during peak construction. Though construction traffic may impact LOS during the construction phase of the project, impacts would be short-term or one-time in nature and the proposed project would not permanently impact LOS within the vicinity. Therefore, due to the short duration for construction and demolition, the proposed project would not generate traffic that would significantly impact, either cumulatively or individually, an established LOS. Impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would result in truck traffic at and near the project site during the construction period. Construction of the Revised Project could result in short-term and intermittent construction traffic impacts associated with the delivery of materials and equipment, removal of debris, and parking for construction workers. Construction activities associated with the Revised Project would continue for approximately ten to 14 months, as compared to approximately seven months for the Original Project. Similar to the Original Project, it is estimated that up to 20 workers would be commuting to the project site during peak construction activities associated with the Revised Project. Though construction traffic may impact roadway capacity during the construction phase of the Revised Project, impacts would be short-term or one-time in nature; permanent reduction in LOS within the vicinity of the project site would not occur. Therefore, due to the short duration of construction and demolition activities, the Revised Project would not generate traffic that would significantly impact, either cumulatively or individually, an established LOS. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*41. (i) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** Emergency access would be provided from ~~Brodiaea Avenue~~ the service road located along the north and west side of the proposed Plant Operations Warehouse. Off-site access to the proposed Plant Operations Warehouse would be provided by Cactus Avenue. The proposed project would result in a minimal increase in vehicle use and related road access loads in the area. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, emergency access at the Revised Project would be provided by the service road located along the north and west side of the proposed Plant Operations/Warehouse facility. Off-site access to the proposed Plant Operations/Warehouse facility would be provided by Cactus Avenue. As discussed above, the Revised Project would result in a minimal increase in daily vehicle trips in the project area and would not result in inadequate emergency access. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*41. (j) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is located in an established urban area and development of the project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Furthermore, due to the nature of the project, the project would not be expected to generate a significant increase in transit trips as compared to existing conditions. It is expected that transit providers in the vicinity would be able to accommodate any project-generated increases in the number of passengers. Impacts would be less than significant from the proposed project and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, development of the Revised Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Due to the nature of the Revised Project, the Revised Project would not be expected to generate a significant increase in transit trips as compared to existing conditions at the RCRMC. It is expected that transit providers serving the project site would be able to accommodate any increases in the number of passengers resulting from the Revised Project. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
42. Bike Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan, 2003a.

42. Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. Removal or disturbance of existing bike trails or alternative modes of travel would not occur. In addition, the proposed project would consider inclusion of bike racks and/or alternative modes of transportation as indicated in the Riverside County General Plan. The proposed project would require the addition of up to three employees, which would not result in a burden to existing alternative transportation modes. Potential impacts on bike trails serving the area would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, implementation of the Revised Project would not require removal or disturbance of any existing bike trails or alternative modes of travel. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would consider the inclusion of bike racks and/or alternative modes of transportation as indicated in the Riverside County General Plan. The Revised Project would require a maximum of three additional employees, which would not result in adverse impacts to existing alternative transportation modes. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

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

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project

43. Water

a) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: City of Moreno Valley General Plan, 2006b, EMWD, 2009

43. (a) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. The water and wastewater needs of the existing RCRMC structures are currently serviced by the EMWD. Located in western Riverside County, EMWD provides water supply and sewage treatment services to a population of approximately 630,000 people and covers a service area of over 555 square miles. Currently, EMWD provides its services through approximately 1,350 miles of water mains, 1,000 miles of sewer mains, approximately 100 water pumping plants, 36 sewer lift stations and five regional water reclamation facilities (Eastern Municipal Water District, 2009).

The current generation of water at the project site is mainly resulting from on-site operations associated with the RCRMC, such as bathrooms, kitchens, other hospital related uses and associated landscaping. The proposed project would support the increased healthcare demands of the region as growth in the area continues. Because the proposed project would provide supplemental space for RCRMC operations, (i.e., Plant Operation shops, maintenance, and storage of various hospital materials) it is anticipated that the proposed project would not significantly increase the demand for water as compared to existing conditions. Similar to the existing RCRMC, the water needs of the proposed project would be serviced by the EMWD water infrastructure currently established at the project site.

As discussed in item 23, EMWD's 2005 UWMP incorporates a plan to ensure that it can meet the water demand of its service area now and in the future. The water demand for the EMWD's service area is based on customer types (land use) and regional population projections. The 2005 UWMP uses these land use designations in order to estimate the amount of water a project site might demand assuming full build-out of the site according

to the permitted uses (i.e., the most conservative estimate). These projections are also used to determine the necessary capacity of each water treatment plant, in order to ensure that demand for water within the service area is met. Because the proposed project conforms to the land use and zoning designations assigned to the project site by the City of Moreno General Plan, the proposed project would not exceed the water demand (worst-case scenario) anticipated by EMWD for the project site. Therefore, the water consumption estimated for the project site would not exceed that which is anticipated by EMWD's 2005 UWMP. Consequently, because the water demand of the project site has been taken into account by EMWD's 2005 UWMP, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Impacts from the proposed project on water treatment facilities would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less than Significant Impact. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to checklist Item 23(c) above. The Revised Project would not add any components to the project site that would use substantially more water as compared to the Original Project. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project's water demand would represent a small percentage of the water anticipated for use by industrial land uses, and an even smaller percentage of EMWD's anticipated overall groundwater supply (i.e., 7,200 afy). The Revised Project would be required to apply water conservation practices to the maximum extent practical such as water efficient plumbing fixtures that comply with Title 24, California Administrative Code, Section 1604(f) and County Policy H-29 (Sustainable Building Policy); the installation of drought tolerant and native plants in landscaped areas; and the use of reclaimed water for irrigation when available. Therefore, with adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

43. (b) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** As mentioned above, the proposed project's water needs would be serviced by existing EMWD infrastructure. Water usage resulting from proposed project operations would primarily result from restroom facilities and sinks located in Plant Operations shops, as well as fire sprinkler systems and landscape irrigation. As mentioned above, the land uses proposed by the project would be compatible with the City of Moreno Valley General Plan land use and zoning designations for the site. Therefore, the project's water demand would not exceed the water demand projection as analyzed in the City of Moreno Valley General Plan EIR.

Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not significantly impact future supply for the project area, as anticipated by the EMWD's 2005 UWMP.

The majority of the City of Moreno Valley's water is imported via the California Aqueduct from northern and central California, and managed by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). MWD currently maintains that successful implementation of its Integrated Resources Plan (IRP) will provide sufficient water to supply all projected imported water demands for the next 20 years (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). In addition, the MWD recently constructed the Diamond Valley Lake, which is intended to hold approximately 800,000 acre-feet (af) of water and improve the reliability of the water supply by storing water that is available during wet years for use during periods of drought. A secondary source of imported water is available to the City of Moreno Valley from the Colorado River Aqueduct. However, the long-term viability of this water source is questionable given California's historical overdraft of the Colorado River. Furthermore, in addition to imported water, groundwater is also available to the City due to its location atop portions of the Perris Basin and the San Jacinto Basin (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b).

According to EMWD, water demand in the City of Moreno Valley area has ranged from 22,000 acre feet per year (afy) to 25,000 afy, and development in the planning area is adequately served by existing EMWD infrastructure (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). Implementation of the proposed project would result in the increased consumption of additional amounts of water as compared to the existing water demand at the project site; however, not to a degree that would adversely impact the capacity of the EMWD water treatment facility. Typically, the water agencies require new projects to apply water conservation practices to the maximum extent practical including water efficient plumbing fixtures, the installation of drought tolerant plants in landscaped areas, and the use of reclaimed water for irrigation when available, all of which comply with Title 24 efficiency standards. Impacts from the proposed project are therefore considered less than significant with adherence to all applicable rules and regulations related to the conservation of water, and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: *None required.*

Monitoring: *None required.*

Less than Significant Impact. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to checklist Item 23(c) and 43(a) above. The Revised Project would not add any components to the project site that would use substantially more water as compared to the Original Project. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project's water demand would represent a small percentage of the water anticipated for use by industrial land uses, and an even smaller percentage of EMWD's anticipated overall groundwater supply (i.e., 7,200 afy). Therefore, the Revised Project would have sufficient water supplies from existing entitlements and resources, and no new or expanded entitlements would be required. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially

more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
44. Sewer				
a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: City of Moreno Valley General Plan

44. (a) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. As mentioned above in item 43.(a) above, wastewater service in Moreno Valley is provided by the EMWD, which operates over 356 miles of sewer mains (12" and above) and six sewage lift stations to provide wastewater collection services within the City. All wastewater is collected and conveyed to the Moreno Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility (MVRWRF) located in the southwestern portion of the City, which has a capacity to treat 16 million gallons of wastewater per day (mgd) and a capacity to expand to 41 mgd (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b).

The current generation of wastewater at the project site is mainly resulting from on-site operations associated with the RCRMC. The proposed project would support the increased healthcare demands of the region as growth in the area continues. Because the proposed project would ultimately house activities that currently take place at the existing RCRMC (i.e., Plant Operation shops, maintenance, and storage of hospital materials) it is anticipated that the proposed project would not significantly increase the demand for wastewater services compared to the existing conditions at the project site. Similar to the existing RCRMC, the wastewater needs of the proposed project would be

serviced by the EMWD wastewater infrastructure currently established on the project site.

Similar to water, the wastewater demand for the EMWD's service area is also based on customer types (land use) and regional population projections. These projections are then utilized in order to determine the necessary capacity of each wastewater treatment plant, in order to ensure that demand for wastewater service within the area is met. The proposed project is consistent with the land use and zoning designations assigned to the project site by the City of Moreno Valley General Plan, and therefore the wastewater generation for the proposed project would not exceed that which is anticipated by EMWD. Therefore, because the wastewater generation of the project site has been taken into account by EMWD, the proposed project itself would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Although upgrades, modifications, and/or replacements may be necessary in order to accommodate the proposed project wastewater needs, construction and/or modification of any EMWD facilities will occur in accordance with all applicable requirements and would not result in significant environmental effects. Nonetheless, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Wastewater service at the project site is provided by EMWD. All wastewater is collected and conveyed to the MVRWRF located in the southwestern portion of the City of Moreno Valley, which has a capacity to treat 16 mgd and the ability to expand capacity to 41 mgd. Similar to the existing RCRMC, the wastewater needs of the Revised Project would be serviced by the EMWD wastewater infrastructure currently established on the project site; no new wastewater infrastructure would be required. Therefore, the Revised Project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities that may cause significant environmental effects. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

44. (b) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. As mentioned above, the proposed project's wastewater needs would be serviced by existing EMWD infrastructure. EMWD has prepared a wastewater facilities master plan for its service

area, which assigns connection charges on new development in order to finance the construction of all necessary wastewater facilities. As stated in the Moreno Valley General Plan Final EIR, most of the additional necessary wastewater facilities would consist of pipelines buried under area roadways and therefore the environmental impacts of constructing these sewer pipelines would be minimal (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). Furthermore, a future planned expansion of the MVWRF would increase the capacity of the facility from 16 mgd to 41 mgd (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). This expansion would consist of construction of new and expansion of existing (paralleling) transmission sewers, the construction of new and expansion of existing lift stations, and the general expansion of the MVWRF. Although the proposed project's wastewater generation could be serviced without the aforementioned expansion of the MVWRF, the expansion would ensure that cumulative development in the region would not exceed the existing capacity of the facility (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). Therefore, although unnecessary for the proposed project specifically, the planned expansion of the MVWRF would further ensure that the wastewater facilities serving the proposed project would have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Please refer the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Item 40(a) above. The Revised Project does not include any components that would result in a substantial increase in the generation of wastewater at the project site, as compared to the Original Project. Although unnecessary for the Revised Project, the planned expansion of the MVRWRF would ensure that the wastewater facilities serving the Revised Project would have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Similar to the Original Project, impacts associated with the Revised Project would be less than significant. The Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
45. Solid Waste				
a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan (2003), City of Moreno Valley, 2006b.

45. (a) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. Solid waste generated within the City of Moreno Valley is primarily deposited in the Riverside County Waste Management Department's (RCWMD) Badlands Landfill. However, the city's trash hauler can also use other County landfills in the area such as the Lamb Canyon Landfill and El Sobrante Landfill. All Riverside County landfills are Class III disposal sites permitted to receive non-hazardous municipal solid waste (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). Waste Management of Inland Empire currently provides waste pickup in Moreno Valley (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). Below is a brief description of each landfill that could potentially service the proposed project's solid waste needs:

The Badlands landfill encompasses 1,093 acres, of which 150 acres are permitted for landfilling and 70 acres are permitted for excavation and stockpiling cover material and other ancillary activities. As of January 1, 2003, the facility was permitted to receive 4,000 tons per day and had an overall remaining disposal capacity of approximately 9,804,704.62 tons. The Badlands Landfill is expected to reach capacity between 2018 and 2020; however, the landfill site has potential for further expansion (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b).

The El Sobrante Landfill encompasses 1,322 acres, and is permitted to receive 10,000 tons of refuse per day (tpd), of which 4,000 tpd is reserved for refuse generated within Riverside County. The landfill has a total capacity of approximately 109 million tons or 184.93 million cubic yards of waste, of which approximately 68 million tons are reserved for in-County waste. As of June 30, 2003, the landfill's remaining capacity was approximately 98 million tons. The landfill is expected to continue receiving solid waste for approximately 30 years.

The Lamb Canyon Landfill encompasses approximately 1,109 acres, is permitted to receive 1,900 tpd for disposal and, as of January 1, 2003, had a remaining disposal capacity of approximately 5,235,043 tons (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). A proposal to

expand the Lamb Canyon Landfill footprint to encompass an additional 144.6 acres and increase its maximum daily disposal capacity to 3,000 tons is currently under review. The expansion proposal would result in a total landfill capacity of 16.2 million tons, which would extend the use of facility to approximately 2023 (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b).

Solid waste generated by the proposed project would most likely be disposed of in the Badlands Landfill, located approximately 7.4 miles northeast of the project site. As stated above, the Badlands Landfill is currently expected to reach capacity between 2018 and 2020, though the landfill has the potential for further expansion. In addition, the proposed project's solid waste needs could also be serviced by the El Sobrante Landfill or Lamb Canyon Landfill, if deemed necessary by Riverside County. Because the proposed project would ultimately support activities that currently take place within the existing RCRMC, a significant increase in the generation of solid waste is not anticipated at full build-out. Therefore, the proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, solid waste generated by the Revised Project would be disposed of in the Badlands Landfill. The Revised Project does not include any components that would result in a substantial increase in the generation of solid waste at the project site as compared to the Original Project. The Badlands Landfill is currently expected to reach capacity between 2018 and 2020, though the landfill has the potential for further expansion. In addition, the Revised Project's solid waste needs could also be serviced by the El Sobrante Landfill or Lamb Canyon Landfill, if deemed necessary by Riverside County. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

45. (b) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, also known as Assembly Bill 939 (AB939), revised the focus of solid waste management from landfill to diversion strategies such as source reduction, recycling, and composting. The City is currently in compliance with AB 939, having diverted 50 percent of its solid waste from local landfills in 2002 (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). Furthermore, the Moreno Valley City Council also adopted a "Source Reduction

and Recycling Element" in 1992, describing how Moreno Valley plans to meet the goals mandated by AB939. The element includes strategies to address various components of the solid waste challenge, including the character of the waste stream, source reduction, recycling, composting, special waste (e.g. construction debris, auto bodies, medical waste, tires and appliances), education and public information, disposal facility capacity, funding and integration of the various components (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). Moreno Valley works in concert with the local waste hauling company to meet its waste diversion requirements, including the requirement that residential customers place recyclable materials at the curb for collection by the waste hauler. In 2004, fifty-one percent of the solid waste generated in Moreno Valley was diverted from landfills (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). Lastly, the proposed project would be required to maintain consistency with Riverside County Policy A-17, Printed Forms Control/ Purchase and Use of Recycled Materials, and Policy A-64, Purchasing and Use of Recycled Materials (please refer to analysis of Greenhouse Gases under Air Quality, discussion 5(f), for more information on Policy A-17 and A-64). These policies encourage personnel of the county to use paper made with recycled stock and post consumer waste for all county printed products, and aim to increase the use and availability of environmentally-preferable products within the county. As mentioned above, the proposed project's solid waste would be disposed of at an approved site in compliance with federal, state and county regulations. Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the applicable CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan). Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would be required to comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes, including the County Integrated Waste Management Plan. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

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

46. Utilities

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

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

SOURCE: Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan, 2003a; City of Moreno Valley General Plan, 2006b.

46. (a) Findings of Fact: Less Than Significant Impact. The electrical demand of the City of Moreno Valley is serviced by Southern California Edison (SCE) via three substations located throughout the City. These substations include the Maxwell Substation, the Alessandro Substation, and the Bunker Substation. SCE's 115 KV transmission lines bring power to the substations, where the power is subsequently stepped down to 33 KV for distribution to its customers through a local service network (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). In addition, the CBC (Title 24) requires new buildings, including additions and alterations, to be constructed in an energy efficient manner. The proposed project could require modifications and/or updates to its existing electrical connections in order to service the increased electrical demand of the proposed project; however, construction/operation of the proposed project would consider all applicable energy regulations. Lastly, the proposed project would be required to maintain consistency with all Riverside County policies related to energy conservation including Policy H-4, Conservation of Energy and Policy H-29, Sustainable Building Policy. These policies establish the use of sustainable practices using LEED criteria and provide guidance for the use and conservation of energy during the design of all county facilities (please refer to analysis of Greenhouse Gases under Air Quality, discussion 5(f), for more information on Policy H-4 and H-29). As a result, the project would not result in the

construction of new electrical facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Revised Project does not include any components that would result in a substantial increase in the demand for electricity as compared to the Original Project. Although the cardboard baler would run on electricity, the amount of additional electricity required would be negligible when compared to overall operation of the RCRMC. The Revised Project would be required to maintain consistency with all Riverside County policies related to energy conservation including Policy H-4, Conservation of Energy, and Policy H-29, Sustainable Building Policy. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not result in the construction of new electrical facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*46. (b) Findings of fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The demand for natural gas in the City of Moreno Valley is serviced by the Southern California Gas Company. Implementation of the proposed project would increase the demand for natural gas at the site; however, not to such an extent that would require the construction of new or altered natural gas facilities and/or infrastructure. Improvements to the project site could include new distribution feeders, regulator stations, odorizer stations, valve lots, and distribution and transmission lines. Construction and operation of the proposed project would also consider all applicable energy regulations during project implementation, including Title 24 standards. The proposed project would also maintain compliance with Riverside County Policy H-4, Conservation of Energy, which provides specific guidance for the use and conservation of energy in county facilities (please refer to analysis of Greenhouse Gases under Air Quality, discussion 5(f), for more information on Policy H-4 and others). As a result, the project would not result in the construction of new natural gas facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Revised Project does not include any components that would result in a substantial increase in the demand for natural gas, as compared to the Original Project. The Revised Project would be required to maintain consistency with all Riverside County policies related to energy conservation including Policy H-4, Conservation of Energy, which provides specific guidance for the use and conservation of energy in County facilities. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would not result in the construction of new natural gas facilities or the expansion of existing facilities and impacts would be less than significant. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*46. (c) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** As a warehousing and maintenance facility, operational activities associated with the proposed project would require the use of numerous forms of communication systems. These could include telephone, internet and cable services, all of which are currently available at the project site. The proposed project would result in an additional demand for these services; however, not to such an extent that would require the construction of new or altered communication system facilities and/or infrastructure. The availability of such services would be determined through a contract between the RCRMC and the communication service provider at a more appropriate time in project development. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, operation of the Revised Project would require the use of numerous forms of communication systems. These could include telephone, internet and cable services, all of which are currently available at the project site. The Revised Project would result in an additional demand for these services; however, not to such an extent that would require the construction of new or altered communication system facilities and/or infrastructure. The availability of such services would be determined through a contract between the RCRMC and the communication service provider at a more appropriate time in project development. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

46. (d) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** Regional flood control planning and facilities within the City of Moreno Valley are under the jurisdiction of the RCFCWCD; however, the City maintains the responsibility for design, construction, and maintenance of local drainage facilities (City of Moreno Valley, 2006b). The project site is currently serviced by existing stormwater drainage collection infrastructure that adequately meets the demand of the RCRMC. Once collected by existing infrastructure, all stormwater drainage within the City of Moreno Valley is directed to local channels that eventually drain into nearby receiving waters, including Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore. The proposed project would involve the construction of an approximate 50,000 sf Plant Operations/Warehouse facility and additional parking, and a slight increase in stormwater would occur due to the increase in additional impervious soils. However, the increase would not be to the extent that would require new construction or alteration of the city-wide stormwater collection facilities. The project would require site-specific storm drainage improvements (as indicated in the project WQMP) in order to accommodate increased runoff. In addition, if the project is proposing to connect with City or RCFCWCD drainage facilities, an encroachment permit or other similar authorization would be obtained. With adherence to all policies and regulations related to stormwater discharge, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact and no additional mitigation is required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less than Significant. Please refer to the discussion of the Revised Project in response to Checklist Item 23(a) above. The project-specific WQMP proposes the development of stormdrain lines in order to convey all on-site stormwater drainage to RCFCWCD Master Drainage Plan Line-J, which resides in Cactus Avenue directly south of the project site. A connection to Line-J via a catch basin is also proposed near the new driveway entry located on Cactus Avenue in order to help mitigate potential flows off-site. In addition, the Revised Project is also proposing the development of two main treatment control BMPs, nutrient separating baffle boxes and curb inlet baskets, in order to further mitigate the potential for erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The curb inlet baskets would be installed for all existing and proposed catch basins throughout the project site, while one baffle box would be installed at each down stream tributary area. Therefore, with adherence to the project-specific WQMP and a SWPPP, as well as compliance with the MS4 NPDES requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*46. (e) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** Upon full build-out of the proposed project, street lighting around the site would consist of the lighting currently servicing the RCRMC, in addition to any new lights constructed to facilitate in operations, safety and security. Development of the proposed project would occur within the existing footprint of the project site, and would not impact any nearby streetlights or adjacent properties. The proposed project's lighting would comply with all applicable codes and regulations and Riverside County Ordinance 655. The proposed project would therefore not result in the construction of new streetlights that could potentially cause significant environmental effects. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the Revised Project would add more street lighting associated with the expanded parking areas to the project site, as compared to the Original Project. However, similar to the Original Project, development of the Revised Project would not impact any nearby streetlights or adjacent properties. The Revised Project's street lighting would comply with all applicable codes and regulations and Riverside County Ordinance 655. The Revised Project would therefore not result in the construction of new streetlights that could potentially cause significant environmental effects. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*46. (f) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project would not require the construction of any new roadways, as the project site is currently serviced by existing roadway infrastructure that is adequate to service the needs of the site. However, though additional off-site roadways may not be needed, additional on-site circulation roadways may be constructed in order to accommodate the proposed project. Any road maintenance that may be required is expected to be minimal and would not significantly impact adjacent roadways or communities. Therefore, the potential impacts associated with road maintenance for the proposed project are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the Revised Project would require perimeter roadway improvements along the southern border of the project site, along Cactus Avenue. Specifically, improvements to Cactus Avenue would be minor and would consist of redeveloping the roadway to include a curb cut. Furthermore, additional on-site circulation roadways may also be constructed in order to accommodate the new design of the Revised Project. Any road maintenance that may be required is expected to be minimal and would not significantly impact adjacent roadways or communities. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, potential impacts associated with road maintenance for the Revised Project are considered less than significant. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

*46. (g-h) Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** No other known governmental services are expected to be required for the project. The proposed project would meet all requirements of Title 24 and any additional provisional requirements in order to assure that implementation would not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans. As a result, significant impacts would not occur and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. No other known governmental services are expected to be required for the Revised Project. Similar to the Original Project, the Revised Project would meet all requirements of Title 24 and any additional provisional requirements related to adopted energy conservation plans. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
OTHER				
47. Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SOURCE: Staff review

*47. Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not result in a significant impact to other existing utilities systems. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.*

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Revised Project would not result in a significant impact to other existing utilities systems. With adherence to all applicable requirements, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project. Consistent with the finding for the Original Project, neither mitigation nor monitoring would be required for this issue area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

SOURCE: Staff review,

*48. Findings of Fact: **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** As discussed in this Initial Study analysis, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause fish or wildlife populations to be reduced below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Mitigation measures for biological resources will be implemented to assure impacts to biological habitat are less than significant. In addition, mitigation measures for cultural resources will be implemented to assure impacts are less than significant to resources relevant to California history or prehistory. Significant impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed project would not occur.*

*Refer to **Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3.***

*Refer to **Monitoring** required for **Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3.***

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Similar to the Original Project, implementation of the Revised Project would not substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause fish or wildlife populations to be reduced below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. With implementation of the mitigation measures found in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project, the Revised Project would not result in effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the Final IS/MND for the Original Project.

Mitigation: Refer to **Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3.**