

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

GEO-1 (page V.B-20, paragraph 2 of Final SEIR No. 401) **Required Soils Report and Geotechnical Study.** Prior to any grading activities on-site, a soils report and geotechnical study shall be prepared to further analyze soil conditions on the project site and slope stability. The study shall be submitted in compliance with the requirements of the Riverside County Ordinances, and shall include analysis of: 1) soils engineering qualities of underlying soils and rock conditions (e.g., soil bearing, consolidation, expansion, etc.); 2) seismic refraction traverses to determine rippability characteristics of crystalline rock units; 3) percolation testing of site earth materials for feasibility of on-site sewage disposal systems; 4) liquefaction potentials; 5) fault verification; and 6) site seismic parameters for and building construction requirements.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures **GEO-1** through **GEO-3** shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

12. Liquefaction Potential Zone

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Figure S-3, *Generalized Liquefaction*; Riverside County Land Information System, site accessed September 14, 2011; Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.B.2, "Soils and Agriculture".

Findings of Fact:

a) The previous Project Final SEIR determined that the Rancho Bella Specific Plan was not shown as being located in a "Liquefaction Hazard Area." The previous Project Final SEIR also included a mitigation measure (Section V.B.2, page V.B-20) to prepare and submit detailed geologist's reports (including an evaluation of liquefaction potential) in compliance with the County's requirements prior to tract map approval. Liquefaction is a phenomenon that occurs when strong earthquake shaking causes soils to collapse from a sudden loss of cohesion and undergo a transformation from a solid to a liquefied state. Factors influencing a site's potential for liquefaction include area seismicity, the type and characteristics of on-site soils, and the level of groundwater. Liquefaction typically occurs in areas where groundwater is shallower than approximately 30 feet, and where there is the presence of loose, sandy soils. The Riverside County Land Information System identifies the proposed Project site as an area with low and moderate liquefaction potential. The proposed Project would have the same boundary as Phase III of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan as identified in the previous Project and would therefore be subject to similar liquefaction potential. No new liquefaction impacts would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Final SEIR No. 401 are required; however, GEO-1 has been revised as indicated below. Also refer to mitigation measures **GEO-2** and **GEO-3** in the attached MMRP.

The following measure was stricken due to redundancy with mitigation measure GEO-1. GEO-1 has been revised to incorporate this measure.

~~Detailed geologist's reports shall be submitted in compliance with the requirements of Riverside County Ordinances, and will be conducted prior to tract map approval. The report(s) will evaluate: (a)~~

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

~~underlying soil conditions; (b) liquefaction potentials; (c) fault verification; and (d) site specific seismic parameters and building requirements.~~

GEO-1 (page V.B-20, paragraph 2 of Final SEIR No. 401) **Required Soils Report and Geotechnical Study.** Prior to any grading activities on-site, a soils report and geotechnical study shall be prepared to further analyze soil conditions on the project site and slope stability. The study shall be submitted in compliance with the requirements of the Riverside County Ordinances, and shall include analysis of: 1) soils engineering qualities of underlying soils and rock conditions (e.g., soil bearing, consolidation, expansion, etc.); 2) seismic refraction traverses to determine rippability characteristics of crystalline rock units; 3) percolation testing of site earth materials for feasibility of on-site sewage disposal systems; 4) liquefaction potentials; 5) fault verification; and 6) site seismic parameters for and building construction requirements.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures **GEO-1** through **GEO-3** shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

13. Ground-shaking Zone

a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Figure S-4, *Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map*, and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk); Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.B.5, "Geology and Seismicity".

Findings of Fact:

a) The previous Project Final SEIR identifies the Project site (like most of southern California) as an area prone to potential ground shaking. Because ground shaking is a geologic hazard that is common in the southern California region, construction in accordance with minimum standards of the California Building Code, which requires sufficient calculated factors of safety to resist seismically induced failure, would minimize potential damage from seismic activity. The proposed Project is subject to ground shaking hazards. Structures associated with the proposed Project would be constructed to current building standards to reduce ground shaking impacts to a less than significant level. No new impact associated with ground shaking would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

14. Landslide Risk

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

Source: Southwest Area Plan, Figures 13, *Steep Slope*, and 14, *Slope Instability*; Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.B.1, "Landform and Topography/Slopes and Erosion".

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The previous Project Final SEIR indicates that the potential for landslides or rockslides on the Project site is remote due to the crystalline nature of the bedrock complex present on the Project site. The Project site is not identified as an area of existing landslides or an area of high susceptibility for landslides. The Project site boundaries would not change as a result of the proposed Project; thus, potential for landslide would be the same for the proposed Project as was identified in the previous Project Final SEIR. No new impact associated with landslides would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

15. Ground Subsidence

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

Source: Riverside County Land Information System, site accessed September 14, 2011; Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.B.5, "Geology and Seismicity".

Findings of Fact:

a) The previous Project Final SEIR does not specifically address subsidence impacts, but indicates that secondary hazards associated with earthquakes (including ground rupture, liquefaction, seismically induced settlement, seismically induced landslides, seiches, tsunamis and inundation due to failure of large water storage facilities) is low. Subsidence is the sudden sinking or gradual downward settling of the earth's surface with little or no horizontal motion. The causes (mostly due to human activities) include dewatering of peat or organic soils, the dissolution in limestone aquifers, first-time wetting of moisture-deficient low-density soils (hydrocompaction), natural compaction, and the withdrawal of fluids (e.g., groundwater and petroleum). The Project site is located in an area identified by the Riverside County Land Information System as being susceptible to subsidence. Although the previous Project Final SEIR does not specifically identify a potential impact related to subsidence, it does include the requirement for preparation and submittal of a detailed geologist's reports in compliance with the County's requirements prior to tract map approval to address potential geotechnical hazards (previous Project Final SEIR Section V.B.2, page V.B-20). Conformance to these mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. A detailed geotechnical study would provide appropriate, site-specific seismic parameters that would ensure impacts associated with subsidence would be less than significant. The potential for ground subsidence was not previously identified in the Final SEIR for the Project site. However, with implementation of the mitigation contained in the Final SEIR, the new impact associated with subsidence would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Final SEIR No. 401 are required; however, GEO-1 has been revised as indicated below. Also refer to mitigation measures **GEO-2** and **GEO-3** in the attached MMRP.

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

The following measure was stricken due to redundancy with mitigation measure GEO-1. GEO-1 has been revised to incorporate this measure.

~~Detailed geologist's reports shall be submitted in compliance with the requirements of Riverside County Ordinances, and will be conducted prior to tract map approval. The report(s) will evaluate: (a) underlying soil conditions; (b) liquefaction potentials; (c) fault verification; and (d) site specific seismic parameters and building requirements.~~

GEO-1 (page V.B-20, paragraph 2 of Final SEIR No. 401) **Required Soils Report and Geotechnical Study.** Prior to any grading activities on-site, a soils report and geotechnical study shall be prepared to further analyze soil conditions on the project site and slope stability. The study shall be submitted in compliance with the requirements of the Riverside County Ordinances, and shall include analysis of: 1) soils engineering qualities of underlying soils and rock conditions (e.g., soil bearing, consolidation, expansion, etc.); 2) seismic refraction traverses to determine rippability characteristics of crystalline rock units; 3) percolation testing of site earth materials for feasibility of on-site sewage disposal systems; 4) liquefaction potentials; 5) fault verification; and 6) site seismic parameters for and building construction requirements.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures **GEO-1** through **GEO-3** shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

16. Other Geologic Hazards

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

Source: Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.B.5, "Geology and Seismicity".

Findings of Fact:

a) As discussed in response 15(a) above, the previous Project Final SEIR indicates that the potential for secondary hazards associated with earthquakes (including ground rupture, liquefaction, seismically induced settlement, seismically induced landslides, seiches, tsunamis and inundation due to failure of large water storage facilities) to occur at the Project site is low. The previous Project Final SEIR identifies a potential seiche hazard to the Project site associated with the Lake Skinner Dam, which is located approximately two miles from northeast of the Project site. A seiche is a free or standing-wave oscillation of the surface of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed basin (as a lake, bay or harbor). It is generally caused by local changes in atmospheric pressure, aided by winds, tidal currents, and small earthquakes. As identified in the previous Project Final SEIR, any seiche flood water from the Lake Skinner Reservoir would likely fall within the limits of inundation for dam failure and would be less than significant. While the Skinner Reservoir may be subject to a seiche, the project site is located approximately two miles from this reservoir. Given the distance of the project site from this reservoir and the low likelihood of a seiche occurring, impacts would be considered less than significant. No volcanic hazards are present in the area and the site is not located in an area that would be subject to mudflows. No change to the conclusions for other geological hazards identified in the previous Project Final SEIR would occur as a result of the proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

17. Slopes

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

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

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

Source: Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.B.1, "Landform and Topography/Slopes and Erosion".

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) The previous Project Final SEIR characterizes the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan Area as level terrain incised by Tocalota Creek and its natural drainages and tributaries. The previous Project Final SEIR identifies two prominent knolls in the western portion of the site. The site's highest elevations occur in these areas, with a maximum elevation of 1,625 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). The lowest elevation in the Specific Plan Area is 1,305 feet AMSL and is associated with the eroded drainages of Tocalota Creek. As discussed in the previous Project Final SEIR, the Rancho Bella Specific Plan would result in the creation of manufactured slopes of up to 35 feet throughout the development area. The previous Project Final SEIR identifies potentially significant impacts associated with landform and topography as a result of recontouring and landscaping of manufactured slopes. These impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance through incorporation of mitigation measures identified in the Final SEIR (Section V.B.1, pages V.B-5 and V.B-6), including the following measures: (1) Prior to development of any planning area of the Specific Plan, an overall Conceptual Grading Plan for the planning area in process shall be submitted for Planning Department approval; (2) All grading procedures shall be in compliance with the Riverside County Grading Standards including requirements for erosion control during rainy months; (3) Prior to any grading activities, a soils report and geotechnical study will be performed to further analyze on-site soil conditions and slope stability and will include the appropriate measures to control erosion and dust as mentioned in mitigation measure number 1; (4) Where cut and fill slopes are created higher than three feet, detailed Landscaping and Irrigation Plans shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to Grading Plan approval. The plans shall be reviewed for type and density of ground cover, shrubs, and trees; (5) All streets shall have a gradient not to exceed 15 percent; (6) Slopes steeper than 2:1 or higher than ten feet are allowed provided they are recommended to be safe in the slope stability report prepared by the soils engineer or engineering geologist. All slopes shall be landscaped per County Ordinance 457. The slope stability report shall also contain recommendations for landscaping and erosion control. The California Building Code, County Ordinance No. 457, and all other relevant laws, rules, and regulations governing grading in Riverside County shall be observed; (7) Potential brow ditches, terrace drains or other minor swales, determined necessary by the County of Riverside at future stages of project review, shall be lined with natural erosion control materials or concrete; (8) Grading work on the entire project site shall be balanced on-site whenever possible; (9) Graded, but undeveloped land shall be maintained weed-free and planted with interim landscaping within

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

90 days of completion of grading, unless building permits are obtained; (10) On-site water wells shall be further investigated as a source of deep aquifer groundwater; (11) Planting of developed land shall comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Best Management Practices Construction Handbook Section 6.2; and (12) All grading shall be done in conformance with recommendations contained within the Geotechnical Report included as Appendix B in the previous Project Final SEIR.

The proposed Project is located entirely within the previously identified Specific Plan boundary. The grading associated with the proposed Project is expected to be similar to that previously identified for the Specific Plan. There are no new components that would result in changes to the previously identified impacts associated with grading and topography. No change to the conclusions for impacts associated with slopes identified in the previous Project Final SEIR would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

c) There are no subsurface sewage disposal systems on the Project site, thus, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Final SEIR No. 401 are required. Refer to mitigation measures **GEO-4** through **GEO-15** in the attached MMRP.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures **GEO-4** through **GEO-15** shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

18. Soils

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

Source: Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.B.1, "Landform and Topography/Slopes and Erosion".

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) The previous Project Final SEIR concluded that the major constraint on site is erosion potential. Because the Project would result in the creation of manufactured slopes up to 35 feet in height throughout the development area, impacts associated with soil erosion would be considered significant unless mitigated. Phase III would not include any slopes in excess of 30 feet in height. Implementation of the mitigation measures in the previous Project Final SEIR (Section V.B.1, pages V.B-5 and V.B-6 and summarized in response 17[a-b] above) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. The proposed Project does not include any components that would change impacts or result in any new impacts associated with soil erosion. Impacts would be less than

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

significant with mitigation incorporated. No change to the conclusions of the previous Project Final SEIR for erosion impacts would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

c) No septic tanks are proposed as part of the Project, thus, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Final SEIR No. 401 are required. Refer to mitigation measures **GEO-4** through **GEO-15** in the attached MMRP.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures **GEO-4** through **GEO-15** shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

19. Erosion

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

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

Source: Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.B.1, "Landform and Topography/Slopes and Erosion".

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) As discussed in responses 17 and 18 above, the previous Project Final SEIR concluded that the major constraint on site is erosion potential. Because the Project would result in the creation of manufactured slopes up to 35 feet in height throughout the development area, impacts associated with soil erosion would be considered significant unless mitigated. As noted above, Phase III would not include any slopes in excess of 30 feet in height. Implementation of the mitigation measures in the previous Project Final SEIR (Section V.B.1, pages V.B-5 and V.B-6 and summarized in response 17[a-b] above) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. With implementation of mitigation, the proposed Project would not increase water erosion on or off site. Consequently, it would not result in erosion that would modify the channel or a river, stream, or bed of a lake. The proposed Project does not include components that would change impacts or result in any new impacts associated with soil erosion. No change to the conclusions of the previous Project Final SEIR for erosion impacts would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Final SEIR No. 401 are required. Refer to mitigation measures **GEO-4** through **GEO-15** in the attached MMRP.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures **GEO-4** through **GEO-15** shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

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

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

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Figure S-8, *Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map*; Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.G, "Effects Found Not to be Significant".

Findings of Fact:

a) The previous Project Final SEIR indicates that the Project site is not located in an area subject to high levels of wind erosion or blowsand and impacts associated with these issues would not be significant.

The Project site is located within an area identified as a "Moderate" wind erodibility rating by the County's General Plan. The proposed Project does not include components that would change impacts or result in new impacts associated with wind erosion or blowsand. No change to the conclusions of the previous Project Final SEIR for erosion impacts would occur as a result of the proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project

21. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

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

Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Technical Report, Rancho Bella Vista (Phase III) Addendum to Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Specific Plan 184, Amendment No. 2, Substantial Conformance No. 4, prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc., dated April 2012.

Findings of Fact:

a) A greenhouse gas (GHG) analysis was not performed in association with the Project Final SEIR as none was required at that time. Unlike localized air emissions, which are a temporal issue, global climate change is an ongoing global issue. As global climate change impacts are by nature cumulative, direct impacts cannot be evaluated. The analysis herein, therefore, addresses cumulative impacts. The information from the Final SEIR regarding proposed uses was used in the HELIX GHG report (HELIX 2012) to generate a 'Business As Usual' (BAU) GHG emission level.

To date, there is little guidance and no local, regional, state, or federal regulations to establish a threshold of significance to determine project-specific impacts of GHG emissions on global climate change. The SCAQMD has provided a recommended interim GHG significance threshold proposal, which uses a five-tiered approach. The guidance includes a 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) per year significance threshold for the residential/commercial sector. Accordingly, 3,000 metric tons of CO₂e per year is established as the significance threshold for the project's GHG

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

emissions. For construction emissions, the interim guidance recommends that the emissions be amortized over 30 years and added to operational emissions.

The Riverside County Planning Department is developing a draft Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for GHGs and CEQA compliance. According to the draft SOP, for non-industrial projects, a demonstration by the project applicant that the project has reduced GHG emissions by 30 percent or more below a BAU standard shall suffice for demonstrating the project has a less than significant impact. The draft SOP defines BAU as those emissions that would occur in 2020 if the average baseline emissions during the 2002–2004 period were grown to 2020 levels without control.

Based on emission factors from the SCAQMD, total GHGs associated with Project construction are summarized in Table 6. The total construction emissions amortized over a period of 30 years are estimated at 161.49 metric tons of CO₂e per year. As this would not exceed the 3,000 metric tons threshold, short-term construction-related GHG impacts would be less than significant.

**Table 6
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – CONSTRUCTION**

Emission Sources	CO ₂ metric tons per year	CH ₄ metric tons per year	N ₂ O metric tons per year	CO ₂ e metric tons per year
Existing Road Demolition	63.61	0.01	0.00	63.74
House Construction Phase IIIa (up to 151 units)	1,164.46	0.13	0.00	1,167.16
House Construction Phase IIIb (up to 151 units)	1,164.46	0.13	0.00	1,167.16
Sewer Pipeline	29.76	0.001	0.00	29.79
Park Construction	370.15	0.05	0.00	371.13
Road Construction – Butterfield Stage Road	116.08	N/A	N/A	116.08
Water Basins	460.14	0.05	0.00	461.14
Road Construction – Pourroy	110.97	N/A	N/A	110.97
Bridge Construction – Butterfield Stage	190.24	N/A	N/A	190.24
Total Construction Scenario				4,844.57
Amortized TOTAL				161.49
Significance Threshold				3,000.00
Exceedance?				No

Note: The Road Construction Model provided CO₂ emission rates, therefore, the emission rates for CH₄ and N₂O are not applicable (N/A).
Source: HELIX 2012

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

Operation of the proposed Project would result in GHG emissions from amortized construction, vehicular traffic generated by residents, area sources (natural gas appliances, hearth combustion, and landscape maintenance), electrical generation, solid waste generation, and water supply. The estimated GHG emissions associated with vehicular traffic, area sources, electrical generation, water supply, and solid waste generation are shown below in Table 7. The estimated emissions of CO₂e would be 8,363 metric tons per year without the GHG reduction measures, which would exceed significance thresholds, resulting in a potentially significant impact, requiring mitigation.

Implementation of mitigation measure **GHG-1**, in combination with GHG reduction measures discussed below, would reduce GHG emissions to a less than significant level. Emissions associated with amortized construction, vehicular traffic, electrical generation, and water supply would be reduced by implementing GHG reduction measures and mitigation measure **GHG-1** as a matter of Project design. As indicated in Table 8, the GHG reduction measures and mitigation measure **GHG-1** would reduce GHG emissions by approximately 30 percent to 5,840 metric tons per year.

Emission Sources	CO ₂ metric tons per year	CH ₄ metric tons per year	N ₂ O metric tons per year	CO ₂ e metric tons per year
Amortized Construction				161.49
Area Sources	304.98	0.03	0.00	306.99
Energy Sources	1,928.31	0.06	0.03	1,940.22
Mobile Sources	5,508.87	0.24	0.00	5,513.64
Waste Sources	107.85	6.36	0.00	241.71
Water Sources	172.26	0.90	0.03	199.17
TOTAL	8,022.27	7.59	0.06	8,363.22
Significance Thresholds				3,000
Exceedance?				Yes

Source: HELIX 2012

The assumptions for the Project's GHG-reducing design features were obtained from California Air Pollution Controls Officer Association's *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures*. The proposed project would be consistent with the latest County building requirements by employing energy-efficient measures beyond those required by the Title 24 Energy Code, resulting in a 15 percent reduction in emissions generated by in-home energy use. Both the State of California and the federal government have adopted GHG emission reduction measures that are designed to reduce the amount of GHGs emitted from vehicles. The U.S. Congress has recently adopted legislation to require Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency (CAFE) standards to reach 35 miles per gallon (mpg) by the year 2020. The new CAFE standards would lead to approximately 23 percent greater fuel efficiency, which would lower GHG emissions. Additionally, mitigation measure **GHG-1** would require the overall use of potable water for the project to be reduced by 30 percent, consistent with the Riverside County Code.

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

Table 8 ESTIMATED OPERATIONAL GHG REDUCTIONS (Metric tons per year)			
Emission Sources	Estimated CO ₂ e Emissions	CO ₂ e Emissions w/ GHG Reduction Measures	Percent Reduction
Amortized Construction	161.49	161.49	0%
Area Sources	306.99	260.94	15%
Energy Sources	1,940.22	1,299.95	33%
Mobile Sources	5,513.64	3,749.28	32%
Waste Sources	241.71	229.62	5%
Water Sources	199.17	139.42	30%
TOTAL	8,363.22	5,840.70	30%

Source: HELIX 2012

As shown in Table 8, with implementation of GHG reduction measures the proposed Project would reduce GHG emissions by 30 percent. The proposed Project would therefore meet the target of 30 percent below BAU that has been established for the purposes of assessing operational GHG emissions of projects in Riverside County, and this reduction would be consistent with the goals of Assembly Bill (AB) 32. With implementation of the energy efficiency programs, and State and federal vehicle emission reduction programs, the proposed Project would be consistent with the goals of AB 32 and would not result in a significant impact on global climate change. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) The County has not adopted an applicable plan, policy or regulation for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Therefore, the significance of the project's consistency with applicable plans is determined by demonstration whether or not the project would reduce GHG emissions by 30 percent or more below a BAU standard, consistent with the BAU definition from the draft SOP (refer to response 21(a) above for more detail on the County's draft SOP and BAU standards). The 30 percent target is based on the estimated reductions California Air Resources Board (CARB) projected for 2020 emissions, extrapolated using 2002 through 2004 data, in order to meet the 1990 level emissions, as required by AB 32.

The core mandate of AB 32 is that statewide GHG emissions in 2020 be equal to 1990 levels. AB 32 is anticipated to secure emission reductions through a variety of mechanisms, such as increasing energy efficiency and introducing more renewable energy sources. CARB has already begun to adopt strategies to reduce GHG emissions under AB 32. Strategies included in the Climate Change Scoping Plan, such as SPM-2 (California Light-Duty Vehicle GHG Standards), SPM-3 (Energy Efficiency), SPM-4 (Renewables Portfolio Standard), SPM-5 (Low Carbon Fuel Standard), SPM-7 (Vehicle Efficiency Measures), and SPM-10 (Heavy/Medium-Duty Vehicles), while applicable to land use projects, are generally not under the control of local agencies. Nonetheless, emission reductions from these strategies are anticipated to occur as CARB adopts and implements regulations under AB 32. Reductions are already expected to take place in 2012, due to the newly adopted vehicle emission standards and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard.

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

With implementation of the energy efficiency programs, and state and federal vehicle emission reduction programs, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the goals of AB 32 and Riverside County's SOP.

Mitigation: For a list of GHG mitigation measures, refer to the attached MMRP. No mitigation measures for GHG were identified in the previous Project Final SEIR, as GHG impacts were not a required topic of analysis at the time the previous Project Final SEIR was prepared. One mitigation measure (mitigation measure **GHG-1**) has been added to the project to reduce GHG emission impacts associated with the project.

GHG-1 Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits, the Project applicant shall demonstrate to the Riverside County Planning Department that measures are in place to ensure a 30 percent reduction in overall use of potable water, consistent with Riverside County requirements.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measure **GHG-1** shall occur as specified in the attached MMRP.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:

22. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.B.12, "Toxic Substances".

Findings of Fact:

a) The previous Project Final SEIR concluded that the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan would not result in any impacts associated with toxic substances. The Specific Plan includes residential and open space uses, two school sites, and three parks, none of which would generate toxic waste. The proposed Project does not include any new uses which would result in the use or transportation of toxic substances or wastes. Thus, there would not be a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. No impact would occur.

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

b) The previous Project Final SEIR concluded that the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan would not result in any impacts associated with toxic substances. The potential release of hazardous materials from the proposed Project would be limited to construction-related materials such as vehicle fuels and lubricants. Given the types of hazardous materials needed during construction, hazardous materials on site would not be present in any significant quantity and any spill is likely to be easily contained. Because the use of these materials would be conducted in accordance with all applicable state and federal laws, which include requirements for secondary containment of hazardous materials and appropriate spill response procedures, and because quantities of these materials present on site would be small and would be limited to construction activities, impacts would be less than significant.

c) The previous Project Final SEIR did not evaluate impacts associated with an adopted emergency response plan. Roadways associated with the proposed Project have been designed to current County standards. The Project has no potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur and no new impact would result from the proposed Project.

d) There are no uses proposed that would emit any hazardous wastes within one quarter mile of a school. No new impact would occur.

e) The previous Project Final SEIR did not evaluate impacts associated with a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

23. Airports

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

b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?

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

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

Sources: *Riverside County General Plan*, June 2003, Figure S-19, *Airport Locations*; *Southwest Area Plan*, Figure 5, *French Valley Airport Influence Policy Area*; *Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policy Document*, adopted October 2007; *Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.G., "Effects Found Not to be Significant"*; Letter from Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, dated October 5, 2011.

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The French Valley Airport, which is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan area, is a general aviation airport owned and operated by Riverside County. The previous Project Final SEIR indicates that the western portion of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan is located within the Airport Influence Area. However, uses proposed within the portion of the Project site that was within the Airport Influence Area did not include any non-residential uses sensitive to noise and flight hazards, such as schools or active parks. At the time of writing of the previous Project Final SEIR, the Airport Land Use Plan for French Valley Airport was still in draft form and had not been adopted. The previous Project Final SEIR determined that no impacts to French Valley Airport would occur as a result of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan.

The most recently adopted version of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policy Document was adopted in October 2007. Based on this document, the proposed Project site is located within Compatibility Zones D and E for the French Valley Airport. Hazards to flight are prohibited in Zones D and E. Zone D also prohibits highly noise-sensitive outdoor non-residential uses (e.g., amphitheatres and drive-in theaters). Uses proposed in Zone D include residential and open space, which are not considered highly noise-sensitive outdoor non-residential uses for the purposes of this policy. Uses proposed on the portion of the Project site located within Zone E are residential uses and an active park. There are no uses proposed in either area that are considered hazards to flight. The proposed Project site is not located within the noise compatibility contours for the French Valley Airport. In a letter dated October 5, 2011, the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission determined the proposed project would be consistent with the 2007 French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, subject to conditions identified in the letter. These conditions, identified as mitigation measures (mitigation measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-5 below) would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

b) The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission has previously reviewed the Specific Plan and found the Rancho Bella Vista project to be consistent with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the French Valley Airport, subject to the conditions specified in their letter dated August 15, 2002. As discussed above, the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission reviewed the project and in a letter dated October 5, 2011, determined that the proposed Project would be consistent with the 2007 French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Refer to response 23(a) above and to mitigation measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-5 below. The proposed Project would not result in any significant changes to the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan and would not result in the need for additional review by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

c) As discussed in response 23(a) and (b) above, the Project site is located within Compatibility Zones D and E for French Valley Airport, and has been reviewed and approved by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, subject to mitigation measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-5. Like the remainder of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan, the proposed Project would be subject to the conditions identified by the Riverside County Land Use Commission. Adherence to these conditions would ensure that impacts associated with airport safety would remain less than significant.

d) The Project site is not located within two miles of a private airstrip; thus, no impact would occur.

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

Mitigation: For a list of all applicable hazard mitigation measures, refer to the attached MMRP. As compared to the mitigation measures identified in the previous Project Final SEIR, five new mitigation measures (HAZ-1 through HAZ-5) have been added to reduce impacts associated with airport compatibility. The previous Project Final SEIR did not identify significant impacts associated with this issue, and thus, there are no mitigation measures related to airport compatibility in the previous Project Final SEIR.

HAZ-1 Any new outdoor lighting that is installed shall be hooded or shielded so as to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.

HAZ-2 The following uses shall be prohibited:

- (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
- (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
- (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
- (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

HAZ-3 Prior to issuance of building permits for any structure within the subdivision with an elevation at top of roof exceeding 1,392 feet above mean sea level, the project applicant shall submit evidence to the County of Riverside Planning Department that the FAA has issued a determination of "Not a Hazard to Air Navigation" for such structure. Based on the projected pad elevations, this would only be potentially applicable to structures exceeding 28 feet in height.

HAZ-4 The notice provided by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission shall be provided to all potential purchasers of the property, and shall be recorded as a deed notice.

HAZ-5 Any ground-level or aboveground water retention or detention basin or facilities shall be designed so as to provide for a detention period for the design storm that does not exceed 48 hours and to remain totally dry between rainfalls. Vegetation in and around such facilities that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be incompatible with airport operations shall not be utilized in project landscaping. Landscaping shall utilize plant species that do not produce seeds, fruits, or berries. Trees shall be spaced so as to prevent large expanses of contiguous canopy, when mature.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-5 shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

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

24. Hazardous Fire Area

a) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

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

Source: Riverside County Land Information System, accessed September 7, 2011; Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.C.3, "Fire Services"; Fire Protection Plan: Rancho Bella Vista Development Phase III.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is not identified as a County Hazardous Fire Area in the previous Project Final SEIR; however, the previous Project Final SEIR does indicate that the open space areas proposed as part of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan may increase fire potential for residents in the area. The Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan established a fuel modification zone that is a minimum of 100 feet wide measured from the neighborhood property line to the natural open space area (Section V.C.3, page V.C-34). Landscaping for the Specific Plan consists of four landscaping zones. Zone 1, closest to the homeowner property line, would be planted with drought-tolerant, low fuel-generating subshrubs and ground cover. Zones 2, 3, and 4 would consist of native vegetation that has been selectively removed and thinned, with 70, 60, and 50 percent native vegetation removed, respectively. The current Fire Protection Plan for Phase III updates the previous requirements by establishing criteria for a defensible space installation and maintenance program. Specifically, this includes establishment of an irrigated Zone "A," consisting of the furthest level 20-foot wide portion of the homeowner's lot extending to a block wall, and a No/Low Fuel Zone "B," extending 10 feet further away from the structures. The inclusion of the defensible space program as well as incorporation of mitigation measures (Section V.C.3, pages V.C-33 and V.C-34) reduce the impact associated with wildland fires to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures include: the participation in an existing Fire Protection Impact Mitigation Program, construction of all structures on site with fire retardant roofing material as described in Section 3203 of the Uniform Building Code, requirements for fuel modification, and the requirements for all water mains and fire hydrants to be constructed in accordance with the appropriate sections of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460 and/or No. 546, subject to the approval of Riverside County Fire Department.

The Project site is not located within a High Fire Area, as identified by the Riverside County Land Information System. The proposed Project does not propose changes to the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan that would result in any changes to the Specific Plan's exposure to wildland fires. The proposed defensible space and mitigation measures that were applied to Phases I and II of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan would also be implemented for Phase III of the Specific Plan. No new impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Final SEIR No. 401 are required. Refer to mitigation measures HAZ-6 through HAZ-10 in the attached MMRP.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures HAZ-6 through HAZ-10 shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project				
25. Water Quality Impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 or odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County Land Information System, accessed September 7, 2011; Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Sections V.B.6, "Hydrology, Flooding, and Drainage" and V.B.8, "Water Quality".

Findings of Fact:

a), b), d), g), & h) The previous Project Final SEIR concluded that grading, excavation and construction activities associated with the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan had the potential to impact water quality due to erosion and sedimentation, as well as the generation of construction related pollutants in drainage areas. Impacts were considered less than significant with incorporation of the specified standard measures identified in the previous Project Final SEIR (Section V.B.8, page V.B-67). Specifically, Section III.A.4, Drainage Plan, in the Final SEIR requires that all projects proposing construction activities that include clearing, grading, or excavation, resulting in the disturbance of at least five acres (this requirement has since been revised to any activity involving the disturbance of more than one acre) of total land area, or activity which is part of a larger common plan of development, shall apply for coverage under the latest version of the State National Pollutant Discharge Elimination (NPDES) Construction General Permit (CGP), currently Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ. The current CGP requires the preparation, submittal, and approval online of a

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

Notice of Intent utilizing the State's Storm Water Multiple Application and Report Tracking System (SMARTS), preparation and uploading of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, an associated Construction Site Monitoring Program (CSMP), employee training, minimum BMPs, and the preparation of a Sediment Risk Analysis prior to the issuance of a grading permit (with additional requirements, such as a Rain Event Action Plan [REAP], also potentially required depending on the identified risk category). Preparation of the SWPPP and associated Sediment Risk Analysis would assist in designating appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) that can be utilized to ensure preservation of existing vegetation, where feasible, and protection of receiving waters from potential sediment and/or unauthorized non-storm water discharges.

In addition, the Project would require the preparation of a Standard Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SSMP) in conformance with NPDES requirements and the related San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board Order No. R9-2010-0016, adopted November 10, 2010 for Southwestern Riverside County. Order No. R9-2010-0016 identifies the proposed development as a Priority Development Project and will require the implementation of applicable post-construction BMPs in order to mitigate for potential impacts to increased runoff volumes as a result of additional impervious surface, and increased pollutant loads based on land use type. In addition, the SSMP would detail the Project's Drainage Management Areas (DMAs) and incorporate infiltration, low impact development principles (LID), source control, and potentially treatment control BMPs into its design.

The proposed Project does not change the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan's drainage and water quality impacts (although the proposed Project is required to comply with new requirements associated with the latest version of the GCP and Order No. R9-2010-0016). Phase III would be required to comply with NPDES requirements and implement BMPs to minimize impacts to water quality and drainage. The proposed Project includes the construction of four water quality basins covering an area of approximately 5.7 acres, instead of the previously anticipated 1.5 acres of bioswales. The four water quality basins have been sized to accommodate a 10-year storm and would provide water quality treatment through percolation and settling. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) The proposed Project does not include any components which would substantially deplete groundwater supplies. The Project does not include any extraction of groundwater. The installation of impermeable surfaces is similar to that identified in the previous Project Final SEIR. For these reasons, impacts associated with groundwater supply would be less than significant.

e) & f) The previous Project Final SEIR identifies a small portion of a proposed public park in Planning Area 4 that would be subject to flooding during a 100-year storm. The previous Project Final SEIR concluded that this would be a less than significant impact, as no permanent structures would be constructed within the floodplain portion of the park. The proposed Project includes a reduction in size of the park in Planning Area 4 from a previously approved 7.2 acres to a 6.1-acre park site. Thus reduction results in the removal of the park site from the floodplain. The portion of the site in the 100-year floodplain would be open space. Because the proposed Project would not place any structures within the 100-year floodplain, no impact associated with this issue would occur.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Final SEIR No. 401 are required. Mitigation measures HYD-1 and HYD-2 from the previous Project Final SEIR have been revised and updated, as follows.

HYD-1 Pursuant to requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board, a State-wide general National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction permit will apply to all

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

construction activities associated with the proposed project. Construction activities include clearing, stockpiling, grading, or excavation that results in the disturbance of one acre or more of total land area or on-sites which are part of a larger common plan of development that disturbs less than one acre.

Therefore, the developer or builder for Rancho Bella Vista shall be required to provide proof of WID# prior to commencing grading activities and keep a current copy of the storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) on the construction site and shall be made available to the Department of Building and Safety upon request.

HYD-2 The project shall comply with the requirements of the California State Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region. Year-round, Best Management Practices (BMP's) shall be maintained and be in place for all areas that have been graded or disturbed and for all material, equipment and/or operations that need protection. Stabilized Construction Entrances and project perimeter linear barriers are required year round. Removal BMP's (those BMP's which must be temporarily removed during construction activities) shall be in place at the end of each working day.

Monitoring for erosion and sediment control is required and shall be performed by the QSD or QSP as required by the Construction General Permit. Stormwater samples are required for all discharge locations and projects may not exceed limits set forth by the Construction General Permit Numeric Action Levels and/or Numeric Effluent Levels. A Rain Event Action Plan is required when there is a 50% or greater forecast of rain within the 48 hours, by the National Weather Service or whenever rain is imminent. The QSD or QSP must print and save records of the precipitation forecast for the project location area from (<http://www.srh.noaa.gov/forecast>) and must accompany monitoring reports and sampling test data. A Rain gauge is required on site. The Department of Building and Safety will conduct periodic NPDES inspections of the site throughout the recognized storm season to verify compliance with the Construction General Permit and Stormwater ordinances and regulations.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures HYD-1 and HYD-2 shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

26. Floodplains

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

	NA - Not Applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	U - Generally Unsuitable <input type="checkbox"/>	R - Restricted <input type="checkbox"/>	
a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Source: Riverside County Land Information System, accessed September 7, 2011; Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.B.6, "Hydrology, Flooding, and Drainage".

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) The previous Project Final SEIR concluded that grading, excavation and construction activities associated with the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan would result in changes to the existing drainage pattern. Impacts were considered less than significant with incorporation of the specified standard measures identified in the previous Project Final SEIR (Section V.B.8, page V.B-67). Specifically, Section III.A.4, Drainage Plan, in the Final SEIR requires that all projects proposing construction activities that include clearing, grading, or excavation, resulting in the disturbance of at least five acres (this requirement has since been revised to any activity involving the disturbance of more than one acre) of total land area, or activity which is part of a larger common plan of development, shall ensure conformance with the appropriate NPDES CGP as previously described. Typical measures to implement the NPDES program include implementing erosion/sedimentation control programs, avoiding or minimizing the generation of other construction related pollutants through efforts such as covering outside storage facilities and using concrete washouts, and implementing monitoring programs. The proposed Project includes the construction of four on-site water quality basins. The water quality basins have been designed to release flows from a 10-year event at the same rate as predevelopment flows. Water discharge from the basins would flow to Tualota Creek (as predevelopment rates). Because the proposed Project would implement appropriate NPDES measures and includes water quality basins designed to ensure that flows leaving the site would occur at predevelopment rates, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

c) Refer to response 25(e) & 25(f) for a discussion regarding flood hazard impacts associated with the 100-year flood plain. The Project site is located downstream of Skinner Reservoir. The dam is located approximately 2 miles from the Project site. Portions of the Project site are located within the dam inundation areas associated with Skinner Reservoir. These areas generally correspond with the open space/drainage area associated with Tualota Creek traversing through the Project site. Because this portion of the site is designated for open space and drainage, the proposed Project would not result in the exposure of people to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death. In addition, large containment structures such as the Skinner Reservoir Dam are subject to extensive design, construction, inspection, and safety criteria through the California Division of Safety of Dams, with the probability for inundation from a catastrophic event (e.g., earthquake-induced failure) considered extremely low. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) On-site flows would be directed to the four on-site water quality basins. Following a storm event, water would be retained in the on-site basins and released consistent with the pre-development flow rate. With construction of the proposed water quality basins, the proposed Project would not significantly change the amount of surface water in any nearby water bodies. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Final SEIR No. 401 are required. Refer to mitigation measures **HYD-1** and **HYD-2** in the attached MMRP.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures **HYD-1** and **HYD-2** shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

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

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

27. Land Use				
a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County Land Information System, accessed September 7, 2011; Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Sections V.A.1, "Actual Existing and Surrounding Land Uses" and V.A.2, "Land Use Planning Area Profile and Policy Analysis".

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed Project would result in minor changes to the approved Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan, as discussed in the Project Description. In general, these changes would involve a reduction in total acreage of Phase III, park acreage, total residential lots, and minimum lot size associated with residential development, as well as changes to water quality improvements and the alignment of Butterfield Stage Road. These changes would not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area. The uses currently proposed for Phase III of the Specific Plan are in line with the currently approved land uses for the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan. No impacts associated with these issues would occur.

b) The Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan is located adjacent to and north of the City of Temecula and is located within the City of Temecula's Sphere of Influence. The proposed Project would not result in any changes to the boundaries of the already approved Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan, nor would it result in any significant changes to the proposed land uses in Phase III of the Specific Plan. Thus, the proposed Project would not result in any changes to land uses within a City's Sphere of Influence.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

28. 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"/>
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

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

Source: Riverside County Land Information System, accessed September 20, 2011; Riverside County Land Information System, accessed September 7, 2011; Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Sections V.A.1, "Actual Existing and Surrounding Land Uses", V.A.2, "Land Use Planning Area Profile and Policy Analysis", V.A.3, "Land Use Planning Area Policy Analysis", and V.A.4, "Community Policy Area Analysis".

Findings of Fact:

a), b), c) & d) The Project site is within the previously approved Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan. Land to the south and southwest of the Project site is also within the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan. Because the Project site and adjacent land to the south and southwest has already been approved for the uses proposed as part of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan, the Project would not result in any inconsistencies or incompatibilities with the zoning for these parcels. Adjacent land use designations include Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD: MDR) (2-5 Dwelling Units per Acre), Rural: Rural Residential (R: RR), Community Development: Medium High Density Residential (CD: MHDR) (5-8 Dwelling Units per Acre), Community Development: Low Density Residential (CD: LDR) (1/2 Acre Minimum), Open Space: Conservation (OS: C), Open Space: Recreation (OS: R), and Open Space: Conservation Habitat (OS: CH). Adjacent zoning includes Specific Plan No. 106 to the north, Specific Plan No. 307 to the southeast, Light Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-1-10) to the west, and Light Agriculture – 5 Acre Minimum (A-1-5) to the east. The proposed Project does not include any changes to the site's existing zoning and it would be consistent with the existing zoning for the site and surrounding sites. The Project is consistent with the land use designations of the General Plan and Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan. No impact would occur.

e) The proposed Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. The proposed Project is part of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan, which has previously been approved by the County. The proposed Project would not change the planned land uses for the Project site and would result in the placement of residential and park uses within the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan Area. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

29. Mineral Resources

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

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?

d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Figure OS-5, *Mineral Resources*; Riverside County Land Information System, accessed September 20, 2011

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

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) The Riverside County General Plan identifies the Project site and surrounding area as Mineral Resource Zone 3, which is an area where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist, but, the significance of the deposit is undetermined. The Project site is located within the approved Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan and has been planned for uses associated with the Specific Plan. The Project site does not contain any known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the State, and the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important resource. No impact would occur.

c) There are no State classified or designated areas associated with mineral resources adjacent to the proposed Project. Additionally, there are no existing surface mines adjacent to the Project site. No impact would occur.

d) No known existing or abandoned mines or quarries are located near the Project site. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

NOISE Would the project result in

Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings

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

NA - Not Applicable A - Generally Acceptable B - Conditionally Acceptable
 C - Generally Unacceptable D - Land Use Discouraged

30. Airport Noise

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

NA A B C D

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

NA A B C D

Source: Riverside County General Plan, June 2003, Figure S-19, *Airport Locations*; Southwest Area Plan, Figure 5, *French Valley Airport Influence Policy Area*; Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policy Document, adopted October 2007, Map FV-3, *Noise Compatibility Contours*.

Findings of Fact:

a) The French Valley Airport, which is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan area, is a general aviation airport owned and operated by Riverside County. The proposed Project site is not located within any noise compatibility contours for the French Valley Airport. The Project site is at least 0.5 mile outside of the 55 CNEL contour line associated with

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

French Valley Airport. For this reason, impacts associated with airport noise would be less than significant.

b) The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

31. Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Southwest Area Plan, Figure 7, *Circulation*

Findings of Fact:

a) There are no railroad tracks in the immediate vicinity of the Project site, and the Project site would not be subject to railroad noise. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

32. Highway Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Riverside County Land Information System, accessed September 20, 2011

Findings of Fact:

a) The nearest highway to the Project site is SR 79, located approximately 1.4 mile west of the Project site. Based on the distance between State Route 79 and the Project site, no impacts associated with highway noise would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

33. Other Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Riverside County Land Information System, accessed September 20, 2011

Findings of Fact:

a) There are no other sources of noise that have the potential to cause a significant impact. No impact would occur.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

34. Noise Effects on or by the Project

a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Source: Rancho Bella Vista TTM 36376 Preliminary Acoustical Study, County of Riverside, California, prepared by RK Engineering Group, Inc., dated August 31, 2011; Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.B.9, "Noise".

Findings of Fact:

a) Permanent increases in noise associated with the proposed Project would be attributable to vehicular traffic noise. The previous Project Final SEIR determined that Project-specific vehicular noise impacts would be less than significant, as none of the peak noise increases at site access roadways exceeded 3 decibel A-weighted (dBA), which is considered a significance threshold for a perceptible change in noise level. However, the previous Project Final SEIR determined that the previous Project would contribute to a potentially significant cumulative increase in vehicular traffic noise.

A preliminary acoustical study was prepared for the proposed Project to determine if it would result in any significant impacts associated with off-site generated noise. The County has established an exterior noise standard of 65 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and a 45 dBA CNEL interior noise level for residential uses.

Roadway traffic along Promontory Parkway and Butterfield Stage Road would be the main source of off-site noise impacting the Project site. Table 9 identifies the first floor exterior noise levels at selected lots along these roadways (no noise levels for the second floor exterior areas were calculated as there are no second floor outdoor uses). As shown in the table, the projected noise levels at the exterior façade of residential lots along these roadways would range from 68.9 to 74.9 CNEL, for the first and second floors. This is a potentially significant impact, requiring mitigation.

Implementation of mitigation measure NOI-1, discussed below, would reduce noise levels associated with off-site roadway noise to below the County 65 dBA CNEL standard, resulting in a less than significant impact.

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

**Table 9
FUTURE FIRST FLOOR EXTERIOR NOISE LEVELS (dBA CNEL)**

Exterior (Ground Level) Study Locations	Unmitigated Exterior Noise Impacts From ²		Total (Combined) Exterior Noise Level	Noise Barrier Height (in feet) ³	Final Project Exterior Noise Levels
	Promontory Parkway	Butterfield Stage Road			
Lot 335	--	74.9	74.9	8	64.2
Lot 376	68.9	--	68.9	6	62.5
Lot 407	--	72.2	72.2	7	62.4
Lot 438	--	73.1	73.1	6	62.7

¹ Exterior noise levels calculated to backyard.

² "--" indicates noise levels from adjacent roadways are below County standard and therefore no mitigation is required.

³ Barrier height (in feet) is to be above pad or roadway elevation, whichever is greater of the two.

Source: RK Engineering 2011 (lot numbers adjusted to reflect updated lot numbering)

The future interior noise levels for the first and second floors are shown in Tables 10 and 11, respectively. As shown, interior noise levels would range from 61.8 to 66.9 dBA CNEL at the first floor and 68.1 to 74.8 dBA CNEL at the second floor, resulting in a potentially significant impact, requiring mitigation.

Implementation of mitigation measures **NOI-2** and **NOI-3**, discussed below, would reduce noise levels associated with off-site roadway noise to below the County of Riverside 45 dBA CNEL standard, resulting in a less than significant impact.

**Table 10
FUTURE FIRST FLOOR INTERIOR NOISE LEVEL (dBA CNEL)**

Receiver Location	Noise Impacts at First Floor Building Facade ¹	Interior Noise Reduction Required to Meet Interior Noise Standard of 45 dBA CNEL	First Floor Interior Noise Level with Standard Windows (STC ≥ 25)	
			Windows Open ²	Windows Closed ³
Lot 335	66.9	21.9	54.9	46.9
Lot 376	61.8	16.8	49.8	41.8
Lot 407	65.0	20.0	53.0	45.0
Lot 438	62.7	17.7	50.7	42.7

¹ Indicated noise level includes noise attenuation provided sound wall (refer to mitigation measure NOI-1 below)

² A minimum of 12 dBA noise reduction is assumed with a "windows open" condition.

³ A minimum of 20 dBA noise reduction is assumed with a "windows closed" condition.

Source: RK Engineering 2011 (lot numbers adjusted to reflect updated lot numbering).

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

**Table 11
FUTURE SECOND FLOOR INTERIOR NOISE LEVELS (dBA CNEL)**

Receiver Location	Noise Impacts at Second Floor Building Facade ¹	Interior Noise Reduction Required to Meet Interior Noise Standard of 45 dBA CNEL	Second Floor Interior Noise Level with Standard Windows (STC ≥ 25)	
			Windows Open ²	Windows Closed ³
Lot 335	74.8	29.8	62.8	54.8
Lot 376	68.1	23.1	56.1	48.1
Lot 407	72.2	27.2	60.2	52.2
Lot 438	73.1	28.1	61.1	53.1

¹ Indicated noise level includes noise attenuation provided by either sound wall (refer to mitigation measure NOI-1 below)

² A minimum of 12 dBA noise reduction is assumed with a "windows open" condition.

³ A minimum of 20 dBA noise reduction is assumed with a "windows closed" condition.

Source: RK Engineering 2011 (lot numbers adjusted to reflect updated lot numbering).

All impacts associated with a permanent increase in noise in the Project area would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures.

b) Construction activities associated with the proposed Project would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity; however, this increase in noise was analyzed in the previous Project Final SEIR, and there are no components proposed that would result in a new impact associated with construction noise and temporary increases in ambient noise levels. The previous Final SEIR determined construction noise impacts to be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation (Section V.B.9, page V.B-79). These measures include: restricting construction activities to certain hours (consistent with County code); equipping construction equipment with properly operating mufflers; limiting the use of certain equipment within 500 feet of any occupied residences during certain hours, unless equipment is surrounded by a noise protection barrier; and staging construction equipment as far as possible from occupied dwellings. The proposed Project would be required to comply with the mitigation measures from the previous Project Final SEIR.

c) As discussed in response 34(a) above, implementation of the proposed Project would result in potentially significant impacts associated with off-site roadway noise for residences along Promontory Parkway and Butterfield Stage Road. This would result in the exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of the County of Riverside's standards, resulting in a potentially significant impact. However, with implementation of mitigation measures NOI-1 through NOI-3, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

d) Minor ground-borne vibrations may be associated with the use of earthmoving equipment; however, these vibrations would be localized and would not be significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: For a list of all applicable noise mitigation measures, refer to the attached MMRP. As compared to the mitigation measures identified in the previous Project Final SEIR, three new mitigation measures (NOI-1 through NOI-3) have been added to reduce noise impacts associated with off-site vehicular noise.

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

NOI-1 Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for Lots 325-335, 376, 377, 407, and 437-446, the Project developer shall install noise barriers at the boundary line of the subject lots, at the top of the slope, between the adjacent roadway and exterior living areas. The noise barriers shall have a minimum height as indicated below:

- Lots 325-335 – eight feet
- Lots 376 and 377, 441-446 – six feet
- Lots 407, 437-440 – seven feet

The barriers' minimum height shall be based on height from the pad or roadway elevation at the required noise barrier location, whichever is greater. If the barrier is constructed at a position where the starting elevation is lesser than the pad or adjacent roadway, the barrier's height shall be adjusted to meet this criteria. Barriers shall wrap around the ends of dwelling units to prevent flanking of noise into the property.

NOI-2 Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for Lots 319-337, 376, 407, and 432-446, the Project developer shall install upgraded windows for each unit with a Sound Transmission Class less than 25.

NOI-3 Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for Lots 319-337, 376, 407, and 432-446, the Project developer shall install a mechanical ventilation system for each unit. The mechanical ventilation system shall be capable of providing two air changes per hour in habitable rooms with a minimum of 15 cubic feet per minute of outside air per occupant. The fresh air inlet duct shall be of sound attenuating construction and shall consist of a minimum of ten feet of straight or curved duct or six feet plus one sharp 90 degree bend. Attic vents facing adjacent roadways, if applicable, shall include an acoustical baffle, or the attic floor (including the access panel) shall be fully insulated to prevent vehicle noise intrusion. All exterior windows, doors, and sliding glass doors shall have a positive seal.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures NOI-1 through NOI-3 shall be the responsibility of the Riverside County Building and Safety Department as specified in the attached MMRP. Monitoring for mitigation measures NOI-4 through NOI-8 from the previous Project Final SEIR shall occur as specified in the previous Project Final SEIR and the attached MMRP.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

35. Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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: Riverside County Land Information System, accessed September 20, 2011; Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, Section 10.35

Findings of Fact:

a) & c) There is no existing housing on the Project site and no displacement of residents or construction of replacement housing would occur. There are no other uses located on the Project site which would be displaced as a result of the proposed Project. No impact would occur.

b) The Project site is located within the approved Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan, which consists of residential uses. There are no uses included in the proposed Project which would create a demand for additional housing. No impact would occur.

d) The Project site is not located within a County Redevelopment Area. No impact would occur.

e) The proposed Project would result in a reduction of persons living within the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan, as compared to the Specific Plan analyzed in the previous Project Final SEIR. With an average of 2.59 persons per dwelling unit, a reduction of 30 units would result in a reduction of approximately 78 persons. The previous Final SEIR estimated a population of 5,175 persons for the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan. The proposed Project would reduce the overall population of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan to approximately 5,097 people. The proposed Project would not cumulatively exceed official regional or local populations, as it would result in a reduced population as compared to the previous Project. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

f) The Project site is located within a previously approved Specific Plan. Approved plans for the site would allow for the development of 476 residential dwelling units. The proposed Project would reduce the dwelling units by 30, resulting in a corresponding decrease in population. Infrastructure has already been constructed in the vicinity to serve the already-developed phases of the Specific Plan. Because the Project site has already been approved for development, the proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is 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:

36. Fire Services

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

Source: Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184 Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.C.3, "Fire Services"; Riverside County Fire Department website, <http://www.rvcfire.org/opencms/facilities/FireStations/>, accessed September 14, 2011.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan would be served by the Riverside County Fire Department, with the nearest stations including: Station 83, French Valley Airport Fire Station, located approximately one mile northwest of the Project site; Station 73, Rancho California, located five miles south of the Project site; and Station 12, Temecula, located five miles southwest of the Project site. The previous Project Final SEIR determined that the previous Project, in combination with other projects occurring in the area, may result in a significant impact on the Riverside County Fire Department's ability to serve the area. The previous Project Final SEIR provides mitigation measures (Section V.C.3, pages V.C-33 and V.C-34) to reduce impacts associated with fire services to a less than significant level. These measures include: the participation in an existing Fire Protection Impact Mitigation Program, construction of all structures on site with fire retardant roofing material as described in Section 3203 of the Uniform Building Code, requirements for defensible space, and the requirements for all water mains and fire hydrants to be constructed in accordance with the appropriate sections of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460 and/or No. 546, subject to the approval of Riverside County Fire Department.

The proposed Project would result in construction of Phase III of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan. The boundary for Phase III is the same as that of the previous Project. The proposed Project does not introduce any new uses that were not previously analyzed and would not result in any new impacts associated with the provision of fire services. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Final SEIR No. 401 are required. Refer to mitigation measures **PUB-1** through **PUB-5** in the attached MMRP.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures **PUB-1** through **PUB-5** shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

37. Sheriff Services

Source: Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.C.4, "Sheriff Services".

Findings of Fact:

a) Sheriff services are provided to the Project site by Riverside County Sheriff's Department. The previous Project Final SEIR determined that the previous Project, in combination with other projects occurring in the area, may result in a significant impact on the Riverside County Sheriff Department's ability to serve the area. The previous Project Final SEIR identifies the Sheriff's Department desirable level of service as one deputy per 1,000 residents. The previous Project would have resulted in an increase of 5,175 residents at the Project site, resulting in a need for five additional deputies to provide adequate police protection services. The previous Project Final SEIR included mitigation measures (Section V.C.4, page V.C-36) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. These

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

mitigation measures included: payment of fees in accordance with the provisions of Ordinance No. 659; informing the Crime Prevention Unit of the Sheriff's Department of all new Homeowners Associations; and the incorporation of consideration of Specific Plan Land Use Development Standard No. 21 design concepts and crime prevention techniques.

The proposed Project would result in construction within Phase III of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan. The boundary for Phase III is the same as that of the previous Project. While the proposed Project would reduce the residential unit count of Phase III by 30 dwelling units, which would correspondingly decrease the population of the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan, this population decrease would not result in a change in the number of deputies needed to maintain a desirable level of service. The proposed Project does not introduce any new uses that were not previously analyzed and would not result in any new impacts associated with the provision of sheriff services.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Final SEIR No. 401 are required. Refer to mitigation measures PUB-6 through PUB-8 in the attached MMRP.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures PUB-6 through PUB-8 shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

38. Schools

Source: Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.C.5, "Schools".

Findings of Fact:

a) The Specific Plan area is within the boundaries of the Temecula Valley Unified School District (TVUSD). The previous Project Final SEIR indicates that the elementary, middle, and high schools serving the Project site were all operating at 100 percent capacity and had no remaining capacity at the time of Final SEIR preparation. The Rancho Bella Specific Plan included an elementary school site in PA 3 and a middle school site in PA 12 (both of which have been constructed and are currently in operation). The previous Project Final SEIR determined that the previous Project would generate students in excess of available capacity at elementary, middle, and high school levels. However, the provision of school on-site mitigated impacts to elementary and middle schools. Mitigation measures (Section V.C.5, page V.C-42) to reduce impacts to TVUSD high schools included: adherence to the provisions of Riverside County Resolution No. 94-131, which require the developer to execute a mitigation agreement with TVUSD prior to project approval; acquisition of school sites in accordance with TVUSD policies; the need for school sites to meet the requirements of TVUSD in terms of size, location, access, and absence from environmental constraints; and the deliverance of school sites to TVUSD at least in rough graded conditions with utilities stubbed to site.

The proposed Project would result in 30 fewer residential units being constructed as part of Phase III. Using the student generation factors from the previous Project Final SEIR, this would result in a reduction of approximately 12 elementary, 7 middle school, and 7 high school students. This small reduction would not result in any changes to the impact conclusion of the previous Project Final SEIR. The elementary and middle schools have already been constructed on site, and a mitigation agreement between the developer and TVUSD has already been implemented. No new impact would occur. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Final SEIR No. 401 are required. Refer to mitigation measures **PUB-9** through **PUB-12** in the attached MMRP.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures **PUB-9** through **PUB-12** shall occur as specified in the Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

39. Libraries

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

Source: Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.C.11, "Libraries".

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed Project would result in the construction of 30 fewer units than previously proposed. This reduction in units would correspond to an approximate decrease of 78 persons living at the Project site, reducing impacts to library services. The previous Final SEIR identified a potentially significant impact to library services, which is reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of mitigation (Section V.C.11, page V.C-63). The mitigation requires the payment of mitigation fees in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 659. As the proposed Project would result in a smaller population at the Project site, impacts to library services associated with the proposed Project would also be reduced. The proposed Project would be required to pay appropriate fees, per the mitigation contained in the previous Project Final SEIR. Similarly, impacts associated with the proposed Project would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: No new mitigation measures beyond those identified in Final SEIR No. 401 are required. Refer to mitigation measure **PUB-13** in the attached MMRP.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measure **PUB-13** shall occur as specified in Final SEIR No. 401 and the attached MMRP.

40. Health Services

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

Source: Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.C.9, "Health Services",

Findings of Fact:

a) As discussed previously, the Project would result in a decrease of population of approximately 78 persons below that analyzed in the previous Project Final SEIR. This would result in a corresponding decrease in demand on health services. The previous Project Final SEIR identified a less than significant impact associated with health services as health care service is a regional issue which is generally responsive to current demand. Therefore, the proposed Project, with a reduced population, would also result in a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

RECREATION

41. Parks and Recreation

a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

c) Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?

Source: Ordinance No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications), Ordinance No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees), Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.C.6, "Parks and Recreation".

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed Project includes the construction of a 6.1-acre active park. This park was included in the previous Project, although its size has been reduced from 7.2 acres in the previously approved Project to a proposed 6.1 acres. The environmental impacts associated with the construction of the park are included in the environmental impact analysis for the entire Project. Because the park's environmental impacts (e.g., impacts to sensitive vegetation communities, air pollutant emissions associated with park construction, potential water quality impacts associated with runoff of pollutants, etc.) are analyzed as part of the Project's overall impact, impacts associated with this issue would be less than significant.

b) & c) As discussed above, the proposed Project includes the construction of a 6.1-acre park. The Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan includes two other park sites – one 6.1-acre active park (PA 13) that has already been constructed and a 3.5-acre passive park (PA 8A). Residents from the proposed Project would likely utilize the park within the proposed Project, as it is closest to their homes, but may use other parks within the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan. The proposed Project may result in increased usage of other local parks, including the nearby Lake Skinner Recreational Area, Diamond Valley Lake, Lake Elsinore, and/or Lake Perris. Based on the previous Project Final SEIR, the Valley-Wide Recreation and Park District and Quimby Act requirements would be met by the proposed parks within the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan. The previous Project Final SEIR determined that impacts associated with parks and recreation would be less than significant. Because the proposed Project slightly reduces the population associated with the Project site, impacts on recreational amenities would be slightly reduced. Thus, impacts associated with the proposed Project would also be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

42. Recreational Trails

Source: Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.C.6, "Parks and Recreation"; Southwest Area Plan, Figure 8, *Trails and Bikeway System*.

Findings of Fact:

a) There are no regional recreational trails identified by the Southwest Area Plan occurring on or adjacent to the Project site. A twelve-foot wide multi-purpose trail is proposed along the west side of Butterfield Stage Road. The proposed Project would add a trail to the area, but would not result in any impacts to existing regional recreational trails. No impact to recreational trails would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

43. Circulation

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

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

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

d) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?

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

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

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Southwest Area Plan; Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.C.1, "Circulation"; Updated Traffic Impact Study, prepared by RK Engineering Group, Inc., dated September 2011.

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) The previous Project Final SEIR concluded that site development had the potential to cause a significant, but mitigable, increase in traffic when compared to the traffic capacity of the street system, and to exceed the established LOS standard. The previous Project Final SEIR concluded that Project intersections would achieve acceptable LOS with the implementation of the improvements discussed in Section V.C.1 (pages V.C-21 through V.C-24) of the previous Project Final SEIR. Specifically, these include measures such as paying a one-time signal mitigation fee upon approval of each building permit for the project, evaluating improvements required to achieve the minimum LOS at each phase of project development, and incorporating such traffic demand management programs as may be appropriate to comply with the goals of the Regional Mobility and Air Quality Management Plan.

An Updated Traffic Impact Study (RK Engineering Group, Inc., September 2011) was prepared for the proposed Project to analyze traffic impacts. The Updated Traffic Impact Study documents the existing traffic conditions in the vicinity of the Project site; evaluates traffic conditions in the Project completion year (2017), with and without the Clinton Keith Road connection; and determines on and off site improvements and system management actions needed to achieve County of Riverside LOS standards.

The County has a LOS standard of D in the Project area. For existing traffic conditions, the study area intersections are operating at a LOS D or better during peak hours, with the exception of the following four intersections:

- SR 79 Winchester Road/Thompson Road (AM peak hour, LOS F)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Margarita Road (PM peak hour, LOS E)
- Pourroy Road/Auld Road (AM peak hour, LOS F)
- Pourroy Road/Murrieta Hot Springs Road (PM peak hour, LOS F)

The proposed Project is expected to generate approximately 4,335 trip-ends per day with 340 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 458 vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour. Although the reduced number of units proposed for this phase would result in a corresponding reduction in the number of trips, thus reducing direct traffic impacts relative to the previously approved project, there is a potential for the Project to contribute to cumulative traffic impacts due to changes in the surrounding condition.

Existing Plus Project

For the Existing Plus Project traffic condition, all intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS, with the exception of the four intersections listed above, which would continue to operate at the current unacceptable LOS levels.

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

The proposed Project would contribute to the existing cumulatively significant impact. Implementation of **TRA-1** would reduce the Project's contribution to a less than significant level.

Project Completion (Year 2017)

For the Project Completion (Year 2017) without the Clinton Keith Road connection, traffic conditions, all intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS, with the exception of the following intersections, which are projected to operate at LOS E or F during peak hours:

- SR 79 Winchester Road/Thompson Road (AM peak hour, LOS F)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Benton Road (PM peak hour, LOS E)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Nicolas Road (PM peak hour, LOS E)
- SR 79 Winchester Road /Margarita Road (PM peak hour, LOS E)
- Pourroy Road/Auld Road (AM peak hour, LOS F)
- Pourroy Road/Murrieta Hot Springs Road (PM peak hour, LOS F)

LOS impacts at these intersections are a potentially significant impact. Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, the project proponent will be required to pay the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time of issuance or provide facilities in-lieu of fee payment, pursuant to Ordinance No. 824. Improvements to Benton Road, Pourroy Road and Winchester Road are currently under construction through TUMF funding; improvements to Butterfield Stage Road are planned. The project also would be required to pay Development Impact Fees (DIF) for traffic signals, in accordance with Ordinance No. 659. In addition to these standard requirements, the project has made fair-share funding contributions to Assessment District 161, based on the full number of units assumed in the Specific Plan (which would be reduced by the proposed project). Facilities funded through Assessment District 161 include, but are not limited to, Winchester Road (to full six-lane width), Nicolas Road, Margarita Road, Pourroy Road, and Murrieta Hot Springs Road. Together with provision of these funds, implementation of mitigation measure **TRA-1** would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

For the Project Completion (Year 2017) with the Clinton Keith Road connection, all intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS, with the exception of the intersections identified above for the Year 2017 without the Clinton Keith connection, and the following intersection:

- SR 79 Winchester Road /Margarita Road (PM peak hour, LOS F)

LOS impacts at these intersections are a potentially significant cumulative impact. Together with payment of TUMF and DIF fees as well as the noted funding contributions to Assessment District 161, implementation of mitigation measure **TRA-1** would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Project Completion (Year 2017) with Cumulative Projects

For the Project Completion (Year 2017) with Cumulative Projects (without the Clinton Keith Road connection), the following study area intersections are projected to operate below LOS D during the peak hours:

- I-215 Freeway southbound ramps/Murrieta Hot Springs Road (PM peak hour, LOS E)
- Alta Murrieta Drive/Murrieta Hot Springs Road (PM peak hour, LOS F)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Thompson Road (AM peak hour, LOS F; PM peak hour, LOS E)

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

- SR 79 Winchester Road/Benton Road (PM peak hour, LOS E)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Auld Road (PM peak hour, LOS F)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/La Alba Drive (PM peak hour, LOS F)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Hunter Road (PM peak hour, LOS F)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Robert Trent Jones Parkway (PM peak hour, LOS E)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Murrieta Hot Springs Road (AM peak hour, LOS F; PM peak hour, LOS F)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Nicolas Road (PM peak hour, LOS E)
- SR 79 Winchester Road /Margarita Road (PM peak hour, LOS F)
- Briggs Road/Auld Road (AM peak hour, LOS E; PM peak hour, LOS F)
- Pourroy Road/Auld Road (AM peak hour, LOS F)
- Pourroy Road/Murrieta Hot Springs Road (AM peak hour, LOS F; PM peak hour, LOS F)

LOS impacts at these intersections are a potentially significant cumulative impact. Together with payment of TUMF and DIF fees and the noted funding contributions to Assessment District 161, implementation of mitigation measures **TRA-1 through TRA-3** would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

For the Project Completion (Year 2017) with Cumulative Projects (with the Clinton Keith Road connection), the following study area intersections are projected to operate below LOS D during the peak hours:

- Alta Murrieta Drive/Murrieta Hot Springs Road (PM peak hour, LOS E)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Thompson Road (AM peak hour, LOS F; PM peak hour, LOS E)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Benton Road (AM peak hour, LOS F; PM peak hour, LOS F)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Auld Road (AM peak hour, LOS E; PM peak hour, LOS F)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/La Alba Drive (PM peak hour, LOS E)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Hunter Road (PM peak hour, LOS F)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Murrieta Hot Springs Road (AM peak hour, LOS E; PM peak hour, LOS F)
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Nicolas Road (PM peak hour, LOS F)
- SR 79 Winchester Road /Margarita Road (PM peak hour, LOS F)
- Briggs Road/Auld Road (AM peak hour, LOS E; PM peak hour, LOS F)
- Pourroy Road/Auld Road (AM peak hour, LOS F)
- Pourroy Road/Murrieta Hot Springs Road (AM peak hour, LOS F; PM peak hour, LOS F)

LOS impacts at these intersections are a potentially significant cumulative impact. Together with payment of TUMF and DIF fees and the noted funding contributions to Assessment District 161, implementation of mitigation measures **TRA-1 through TRA-3** would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

c) & d) The proposed project is located approximately 1.5 miles east of the nearest airport, French Valley Airport. The proposed project does not propose any large structures that would affect the air traffic patterns at French Valley Airport. The project also does not include any components which would alter waterborne or rail traffic. No impacts related to these issues would occur.

e) The previous Project Final SEIR found that the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use Standards relating to road ROW dedication, roadway

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

design, alignment, access, intersections, on-site road improvements, off-site road improvements, arterial highways, collector streets, circulation hazards, congestion relief and levels of service. The proposed Project would ensure proper roadway design through dedication and construction of public roads per County standards. Roadway designs, including curves, would permit safe movement of vehicular traffic at the planned design speeds, and intersections would be designed to ensure the safe passage of through traffic and the negotiation of movements. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) The proposed Project would result in the addition of new roads to the Project site, and would increase usage on other roads in the area. This usage has been previously anticipated and its impacts evaluated as part of the overall Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan. The proposed Project's impact on maintenance of roads would be slightly reduced (although the reduction may not be perceptible), based on a decrease in dwelling units and a corresponding decrease in population. Impacts would be less than significant.

g) & h) During project construction, partial road closures may be required. These closures would be of short duration. Additionally, vehicles traveling along these roadways would be required to yield to emergency vehicles in accordance with the California Vehicle Code. The proposed Project would not result in any permanent road closures, and roads would be navigable by emergency vehicles. The Project would not interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

i) The Project area is served by the Riverside Transit Agency along Murrieta Hot Springs Road, Alta Murrieta Drive, Whitewood Road, and SR 79/Winchester Road. The proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: The previous Project Final SEIR contained mitigation measures for contributions to traffic in areas where congestion was anticipated. Not all of the traffic mitigation measures included in the previous Project Final SEIR are applicable to the proposed Project, and some have already been completed with the construction of other phases on the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan. The following mitigation measures replace and/or update the mitigation measures from the previous Project Final SEIR.

TRA-1 The Project Applicant shall be responsible for the following improvements:

- SR 79 Winchester Road/Thompson Road – modification of traffic signal for eastbound right turn overlap
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Benton Road – modification of traffic signal for westbound right turn overlap
- Pourroy Road/Auld Road – install traffic signal in the ultimate location per Ultimate Geometrics; improve intersection to include one left-turn and one through lane northbound; one shared left/through/right-turn lane southbound; one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane eastbound; and one left-turn lane and two through lanes westbound

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

- Butterfield Stage Road/Pourroy Road – improve intersection to include one left-turn lane and one through lane northbound; one left-turn, one through, and one right-turn lane southbound; one left-turn lane, one shared left-turn/through lane, and one right-turn lane eastbound; and one shared left-turn/through lane/right-turn lane westbound
- Project Access/Flint Ridge Way – improve intersection to provide one shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane northbound, stop-controlled; one shared through-right turn lane eastbound; and one shared left-turn through lane westbound
- Butterfield Stage Road/Project Access/Buena Ventura Road – Provide a signal and improve intersection to provide one left-turn lane and one through-lane northbound; one left-turn lane and one through lane southbound; one shared left-turn/through lane and one right-turn lane eastbound; and one shared left-turn/through lane and one right-turn lane westbound
- Pourroy Road/Project Access (West) – improve intersection to provide one left-turn lane and two through lanes northbound; one left-turn lane and two through lanes southbound; one shared left-turn/right-turn lane eastbound; and one shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane westbound
- Pourroy Road/Project Access (East) – improve intersection to provide two through lanes northbound, two through lanes southbound; and one right-turn lane eastbound

TRA-2 The Project Applicant shall be responsible for the construction of traffic signal(s) at the intersections of:

- SR 79 Winchester Road/Thompson Road - modification of traffic signal for eastbound right turn overlap; improve intersection to provide one left-turn lane and two through lanes northbound; one left-turn lane, two through lanes and one right-turn lane southbound; one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane with overlap signal phasing eastbound; and one left-turn lane and one through lane westbound
- SR 79 Winchester Road/Benton Road – modification of traffic signal for westbound right turn overlap; improve intersection to provide two through lanes and one right-turn lane northbound; one left-turn lane and two through lanes southbound; and two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane with overlap signal phasing westbound

TRA-3 The project shall incorporate such traffic demand management programs as may be appropriate to comply with the goals of the Regional Mobility and Air Quality Management Plan. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the project applicant shall consult with and obtain clearance from the following agencies to assure compliance and coordinate with the Regional Mobility and Air Quality Management Plans:

- Caltrans, District 8;
- The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD);
- The Riverside Transit Agency (RTA); and
- The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC).

Confirmation of such contact and coordination shall be provided to the Riverside County Transportation Department.

Monitoring: Monitoring for mitigation measures **TRA-1** through **TRA-3** shall be the responsibility of the Riverside County Transportation Department and shall occur as specified in the attached MMRP.

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

44. Bike Trails

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

Source: Southwest Area Plan, Figure 8, *Trails and Bikeway System*

Findings of Fact:

a) The Southwest Area Plan does not identify any existing or planned bike trails through or directly adjacent to the Project site. A twelve-foot wide multi-purpose trail is proposed along the west side of Butterfield Stage Road. As such, the proposed Project would provide a trail for local users, but would not result in any impacts to existing or planned bike trails identified in the Southwest Area Plan. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

45. Water

a) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the 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: Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan No. 184, Amendment No. 2/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report No. 401, Section V.C.2, "Water and Sewer".

Findings of Fact:

a) The previous Project Final SEIR concluded that Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), the water provider for the project site, has ability to serve the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan, provided that improvements identified in the Rancho Bella Vista Master Water Plan were implemented. The previous Project Final SEIR also indicates that the existing on-site 6.8-million gallon reservoir would provide the water storage necessary for the Rancho Bella Vista Specific Plan at build out. The previous Project Final SEIR identifies no significant impacts associated with water.

b) The proposed Project would result in 30 fewer residential lots than that of the previous Project (residential lots in Phase III of the Specific Plan are being reduced from a maximum of 476 to a maximum of 446). Thus, water usage associated with residential uses would be reduced. The proposed Project does not include any other components that would affect water usage or water supply. No new impacts would occur and no change to the conclusions of the previous Project Final SEIR for water impacts would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.