

**SUBMITTAL TO THE FLOOD CONTROL AND
WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

904B



FROM: General Manager-Chief Engineer

SUBMITTAL DATE:
January 14, 2014

SUBJECT: Resolution F2014-01 - Public Hearing for Temescal Creek – Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1 and Adoption of the Associated Mitigated Negative Declaration; Project No. 2-0-00493; District 1 & 2/District 1; [\$0]

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Adopt Resolution No. F2014-01 which finds that the project will not have a significant adverse effect upon the environment and is in compliance with the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan;
2. Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program for the project based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment;
3. Approve and authorize the District to proceed with the Project; and;
4. Direct the Clerk of the Board to deliver the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Notice of Determination to the office of the County Clerk and the State Office of Planning and Research for filing within five (5) working days of this Board hearing.

BACKGROUND:

Summary

See Page 2.

WARREN D. WILLIAMS
General Manager-Chief Engineer

JS:mcv
P8\156723

FINANCIAL DATA	Current Fiscal Year:	Next Fiscal Year:	Total Cost:	Ongoing Cost:	POLICY/CONSENT (per Exec. Office)
COST	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	Consent <input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input type="checkbox"/>
NET DISTRICT COST	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	
SOURCE OF FUNDS: N/A				Budget Adjustment:	N/A
				For Fiscal Year:	N/A

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

BY:
Steven C. Horn, MPA

County Executive Office Signature

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Ashley, seconded by Supervisor Jeffries and duly carried, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as recommended.

Ayes: Jeffries, Tavaglione, Benoit and Ashley
Nays: None
Absent: Stone
Date: January 14, 2014
xc: Flood, Recorder

Kecia Harper-Ihem
Clerk of the Board
By:
Deputy

Prev. Agn. Ref.:

District: 1&2/1

Agenda Number:

11-4

FORM APPROVES COUNTY COUNSEL
DATE 11/5/13
MICHELLE CLACK

Departmental Concurrence

- A-30
- 4/5 Vote
- Positions Added
- Change Order

**SUBMITTAL TO THE FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

FORM 11: Resolution F2014-01 - Public Hearing for Temescal Creek – Foster Road Storm Drain,
Stage 1 and Adoption of the Associated Mitigated Negative Declaration;
Project No. 2-0-00493; District 1 & 2/District 1; [\$0]

DATE: January 14, 2014

PAGE: Page 2 of 2

BACKGROUND:

Summary (continued)

The public hearing is in accordance with the requirements for Section 18 of the District Act.

All provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and the District Rules to Implement the California Environmental Quality Act have been met and the General Manager-Chief Engineer of the District has found that the Project will not have a significant adverse effect upon the environment and has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Impact on Citizens and Businesses

Not Applicable.

P8\156723

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL
AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. F2014-01
APPROVING TEMESCAL CREEK - FOSTER ROAD STORM DRAIN, STAGE 1 PROJECT

WHEREAS, on November 26, 2013, the Board adopted Resolution No. F2013-25 pursuant to Section 18 of the District Act giving notice of its intention to construct a project in Zone 2, within unincorporated Riverside County, designated as Temescal Creek - Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1 Project ("Project") and giving further notice that the Project would be considered at a public hearing on January 14, 2014; and

WHEREAS, notice of the public hearing was properly made by publication and posting as required by law, and all persons desiring to be heard on the matter were given the opportunity to appear and present testimony, both oral and written; and

WHEREAS, all provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and the District Rules to Implement the California Environmental Quality Act have been met and the General Manager-Chief Engineer of the District has found that the Project will not have a significant adverse effect upon the environment and has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the Board of Supervisors of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District in regular session assembled on January 14, 2014 based upon the evidence and testimony presented on the matter, both written and oral, that:

1. The Project is partially within the Criteria Area set forth in and established by the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and is specifically within Subunit SU3 (Temescal Wash West) of the Temescal Canyon Area Plan and Cell No. 2723.

2. The Project has been submitted to and reviewed by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) pursuant to the Joint Project Review (JPR) process. Pursuant to a Criteria Consistency Review letter (JPR #12-02-21-01) received from the RCA

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: *Michelle Clack* 11/5/13
MICHELLE CLACK DATE

1

2 dated February 2, 2013, it was determined that the Project is consistent with both the Criteria and
3 other MSHCP requirements. Although no formal responses were received by U.S. Fish and
4 Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Resource Agencies) during the
5 10-day review period, the District did respond to a request for clarification from the U.S. Fish
6 and Wildlife Service to their satisfaction.

7 3. The Project is consistent with the Riparian/Riverine Area and Vernal Pool
8 requirements of the MSHCP. Pursuant to Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP, Riparian/Riverine areas
9 are lands which contain habitat dominated by trees, shrubs, persistent emergents, or emergent
10 mosses and lichens, which occur close to or which depend upon soil moisture from a nearby
11 freshwater source, or areas with freshwater flow during all or a portion of the year. Vernal Pools
12 are seasonal wetlands that occur in depression areas that have wetlands indicators of all three
13 parameters (soils, vegetation, and hydrology) during the wetter portion of the growing season. It
14 has been determined that although the Project area does not contain any vernal pools, the Project
15 area does include Riparian/Riverine Area as defined by the MSHCP. Construction of the Project
16 would result in approximately 0.12 acre of permanent impacts to riparian habitat and 0.39 acre of
17 temporary impacts to riparian habitat within Temescal Creek consisting of Southern Cottonwood
18 Willow Riparian Forest. In addition, the proposed Project area was determined to contain habitat
19 suitable to support the least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher and western yellow-
20 billed cuckoo. To mitigate for potential impacts to Riparian/Riverine Areas and riparian birds,
21 all temporary impacts to riparian and riverine resources would be restored to pre-project
22 condition and 0.46 acre of Southern Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest will be created to offset
23 permanent impacts. Pursuant to Section 6.1.2, a Determination of Biologically Equivalent or
24 Superior Preservation (DBESP) analysis of unavoidable impacts to Riparian/Riverine Areas has
25 been completed and submitted to the Resource Agencies on November 2, 2011. The Resource
26 Agencies did not respond to the DBESP during the 60-day review period.

27 4. The Project is consistent with the Narrow Endemic Plant Species requirements of
28 the MSHCP. Pursuant to Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP, habitat assessments and/or focused

1

2 surveys for certain narrow endemic plant species are required for properties within mapped
3 survey areas. The survey area maps included within the MSHCP have been reviewed and the
4 Project is partially located within the survey areas for Munz's onion, San Diego ambrosia,
5 Slender-Horned Spineflower, Many-stemmed dudleya, Spreading Navarretia, California Orcutt
6 grass, San Miguel savory, Hammitt's clay-cress, and Wright's trichocoronis. A habitat
7 assessment was conducted and it was determined that suitable habitat for the above plant species
8 does not occur on the Project site. Therefore, no further surveys or conservation measures are
9 required.

10 5. The Project is consistent with the Urban-Wildlands Interface requirements of the
11 MSHCP. Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP presents guidelines to minimize indirect effects of a
12 project in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area. This section provides mitigation
13 measures for impacts associated with: Drainage, Toxics, Lighting, Noise, Invasives, Barriers
14 and Grading/Land Development. The Project has been reviewed and it has been determined the
15 Project occurs within or adjacent to the Criteria Area. The project will comply with all waste
16 discharge requirements in the applicable National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
17 permits and the Municipal Separate Stormwater Sewer Systems permit to ensure there will be no
18 adverse impacts to Temescal Creek with respect to drainage and toxics. Construction will occur
19 during daytime hours and will be temporary. Therefore, the project will not have any adverse
20 effects on wildlife movement and drainage features due to lighting and increased traffic noise. If
21 construction is to occur adjacent to the riparian habitat areas during the nesting season, MM BIO
22 2 will be implemented to ensure that potential impacts are reduced to less than significant levels.
23 The Project's Plant Palette will not include any invasive plant species in areas adjacent to
24 preserved habitat. Appropriate barriers and signs will be used to minimize unauthorized access
25 to the preserved habitat areas.

26 6. The Project is consistent with the Database Updates/Additional Surveys
27 requirements of the MSHCP. Pursuant to Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP, habitat assessments
28 and/or focused surveys for certain additional plant and animal species are required for properties

1

2 within mapped survey areas. The survey area maps have been reviewed and the Project is within
3 a mapped survey area for the Burrowing Owl and Criteria Area Species Survey Area for Thread-
4 leaved brodiaea, Davidson's saltscale, Parish's brittlescale, Smooth Tarplant, Round-leaved
5 filaree, Coulter's goldfields, and Little Mousetail. A habitat assessment was conducted for the
6 Burrowing Owl and CASSA species during April 2010. It was determined that suitable habitat
7 for these species was not present within the mapped survey areas. Therefore, no further surveys
8 or conservation measures are required.

9 7. The Project is consistent with the Criteria Area and Public/Quasi-Public Land
10 provisions contained in Section 3.2.1 of the MSHCP. Section 3.2.1 describes lands within the
11 MSHCP conservation area including those designated as Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) Lands.
12 Section 3.2.1 states that if a Permittee elects to use property currently depicted as PQP Lands in a
13 way that alters the land use such that it would not contribute to Reserve Assembly, the Permittee
14 shall locate and acquire or otherwise encumber replacement acreage at a minimum ratio of 1:1.
15 The Permittee must make findings that the replacement acreage is biologically equivalent or
16 superior to the existing property. The Project has been reviewed and it has been determined the
17 Project does not occur within MSHCP designated PQP Lands; therefore, replacement acreage for
18 impacts to PQP Lands is not required. A portion of the Project is located in lands currently
19 designated as Additional Reserve Lands (ARL) located within Temescal Creek. The Project will
20 impact 1.13 acres of ARL; however the ARL area will increase to 1.26 acres when the Project is
21 finished because the District will put into a conservation easement an additional 0.13 acre of
22 Southern Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest within an area currently described as
23 upland/disturbed/developed. Therefore, since the Project will result in a net increase of ARL
24 when completed, and ARL that has better habitat than currently exists, there will be no net
25 impact to the Reserve design as a result of the Project.

26 8. The Project will not have a significant adverse effect upon the environment and a
27 Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program are adopted based on the
28 findings incorporated in the initial study.

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


9. The Project is approved and the District is hereby authorized to proceed with the Project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, within five (5) working days of this Board hearing, the Clerk of the Board is directed to deliver the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Notice of Determination to the Office of the County Clerk and Recorder and to the State Office of Planning and Research, who are thereby directed to file same, all as required by law.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Jeffries, Tavaglione, Benoit and Ashley
Nays: None
Absent: Stone

The foregoing is certified to be a true copy of a resolution duly adopted by said Board of Supervisors on the date therein set forth.

KECIA HARPER-IHEM, Clerk of said Board
By 
Deputy

Notice of Determination

To: Office of Planning and Research

From: Riverside County Flood Control
1995 Market Street
Riverside, CA 92501
Contact: Mike Wong
Phone: 951.955.1233

For U.S. Mail:
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Street Address:
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

County Clerk
County of Riverside
2724 Gateway Drive
Riverside, CA 92507

Lead Agency (if different from above):

SUBJECT:

Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to State Clearinghouse): 201310100

Original Negative Declaration/Notice of Determination was routed to County Clerks for posting on.

Project Title: Temescal Creek – Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1

1/15/14 Date KB Initial

Project Location (include county)

The proposed project area is generally bounded to the north by Dos Lagos Drive, to the east by Temescal Wash, to the south by Leroy Road and to the west by Interstate 15 in the unincorporated El Cerrito area of Riverside County. The proposed project area may be found within Township 4 South, Range 6 West, Sections 21 and 22 of the Lake Matthews and Corona South 7.5 Series Topographic Quadrangle maps.

Project Description

The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District proposes to construct, operate and maintain an underground storm drain system comprised of approximately 2,000 lineal feet of reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) ranging in size from 30 inches to 72 inches in diameter. The proposed project begins at the outlet within Temescal Creek. The concrete outlet structure is an impact type energy dissipater and will be located in an area of Temescal Creek that will be widened to create a "cove" area as part of this project. The corners of the "cove" area will be armored with buried rock riprap. From the outlet, the proposed project will transition into an underground RCP and traverse southwesterly to Foster Road via an unpaved road and an open field currently used for the cultivation of mint and watercress. The RCP will then head west within the existing Foster Road right-of-way to a connection with an existing culvert located west of Temescal Canyon Road. In addition, a lateral RCP will connect to the main RCP at the intersection of Foster Road and Temescal Canyon Road and will extend approximately 300 feet south in Temescal Canyon Road. The proposed storm drain system, once completed, will provide substantial flood protection to existing development at the intersection of Foster Road and Temescal Canyon Road.

This is to advise that the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Lead Agency) has approved the above described project on January 14, 2014 and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures were made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A Mitigation Monitoring Program was adopted for this project.

This is to certify that the Mitigated Negative Declaration is available to the General Public at: The Office of the Clerk of the Board, County Administrative Center, 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, CA 92501.

[Signature]
Signature (Public Agency)

Board Assistant
Title

1/14/14
Date

Date received for filing at OPR:

Revised 2004

Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code.
Reference: Sections 21000-21174, Public Resources Code.

JAN 14 2014 114

RIVERSIDE COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER

AUTHORIZATION TO BILL

TO BE FILLED OUT BY SUBMITTING AGENCY

DATE: 11/14/2013 BUSINESS UNIT/AGENCY: FLOOD CONTROL - FCARC

ACCOUNTING STRING:

ACCOUNT: 526410 FUND: 25120
DEPT ID: 947420 PROGRAM: _____

AMOUNT: \$2,231.25

REF: FINAL CEQA POSTING FOR 222-2-8-00493-01-30-0000-000 TEMESCAL CRK-FOSTER RD SD STG1

THIS AUTHORIZES THE COUNTY CLERK & RECORDER TO ISSUE AN INVOICE FOR PAYMENT OF ALL FEES FOR THE ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS.

NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS INCLUDED: 6

AUTHORIZED BY: DARRYLENN PRUDHOLME-BROCKINGTON 

PRESENTED BY: JASON SWENSON 58082

CONTACT: DARRYLENN PRUDHOLME-BROCKINGTON 58357

TO BE FILLED OUT BY COUNTY CLERK

ACCEPTED BY: _____

DATE: _____


DOCUMENT NO(S)/INVOICE NO(S): _____

Temescal Creek - Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1
Project No. 2-0-00493-01
Engineer's Statement





The proposed Temescal Creek - Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1 project is located south of the city of Corona within unincorporated Riverside County, California. The project is an ultimate storm drain system designed to collect runoff from a 142-acre tributary area. When complete, this system will provide 100-year flood protection.

This project will consist of the construction of approximately 2,000 lineal feet of reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) ranging from 30 inches to 72 inches. Three catch basins, one along Temescal Canyon Road and two along Foster Road, will collect local drainage. Beginning at the upstream end of the project, the mainline will connect to an existing 54-inch culvert with a 60-inch diameter RCP. The mainline will cross underneath Temescal Canyon Road and parallel Foster Road. A 30-inch RCP lateral will connect to the mainline near the intersection of Temescal Canyon Road and Foster Road. The lateral will extend south along Temescal Canyon Road for approximately 300 lineal feet. The mainline will head east within the public right of way limits of Foster Road for approximately 800 feet. At this point, the diameter of the pipe transitions from 60 inches to 72 inches and then travels in a northeasterly direction for approximately 700 feet. The alignment then turns to the southeast for approximately 200 feet where it will connect to the system outlet. The outlet structure is an impact type energy dissipator. At the outlet location, Temescal Creek will be widened by approximately 160 feet. The new streambank will be armored with riprap. The estimated cost of construction is \$1,500,000. The estimated cost of right of way is \$180,000, bringing the total estimated cost to \$1,680,000.

SECTION 18
PUBLIC HEARING
MAP



TEMESCAL CREEK
FOSTER ROAD
STORM DRAIN
STAGE 1
PROJECT NO.
2-0-0493
NOV 2013



CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

(Original copy, duly executed, must be attached to original at the time of filing)

I, Elizabeth DeHayes, Secretary II, do hereby certify that I am
not
(NAME AND TITLE)
a party to the within action or proceeding; that on Dec. 10, 2013, I posted a
(DATE)
copy of the following document:


**RESOLUTION NO. F2013-25 SETTING A PUBLIC HEARING DATE FOR TEMESCAL CREEK –
FOSTER ROAD STORM DRAIN, STAGE 1 PROJECT AND GIVING NOTICE OF INTENT TO
ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION THEREFOR IN ACCORDANCE WITH
SECTION 18 OF THE DISTRICT ACT AND THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
(CEQA)**

by posting at:

El Cerrito Branch Library
7581 Rudell Road
Corona, CA 92881

Date: 12/10/13

El Cerrito Public Library


(Signature)

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

(Original copy, duly executed, must be attached to original at the time of filing)

I, Mary Meyer, do hereby certify that I am not

(NAME AND TITLE)

a party to the within action or proceeding; that on 12.10.13, I posted a

(DATE)

copy of the following document:

RESOLUTION NO. F2013-25 SETTING A PUBLIC HEARING DATE FOR TEMESCAL CREEK – FOSTER ROAD STORM DRAIN, STAGE 1 PROJECT AND GIVING NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION THEREFOR IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 18 OF THE DISTRICT ACT AND THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

by posting at:

Riverside County Clerk and Recorder's Office
2724 Gateway drive
Riverside, CA 92507

Date: 12.10.13

Mary Meyer
(Signature)

**Riverside County Flood Control
and Water Conservation District**

Riverside, California

FINAL

**CEQA INITIAL STUDY
&
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
(SCH #2013101086)**

for

**TEMESCAL CREEK -
FOSTER ROAD STORM DRAIN, STAGE 1**

ZONE 2

January 2014

**WARREN D. WILLIAMS
General Manager-Chief Engineer**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
Regulatory Framework.....	1
Organization of the Initial Study.....	1
Public Review and Comments Received.....	1
PROJECT INFORMATION.....	2
1. Project Title:.....	2
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:.....	2
3. Contact Person Email Address and Phone Number:.....	2
4. Project Location:.....	2
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:.....	2
6. General Plan Designation:.....	2
7. Description of Project:.....	2
8. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:.....	2
9. Earlier Analyses Used:.....	3
10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:.....	3
LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION.....	9
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected.....	9
Determination.....	9
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION.....	10
MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM TABLE.....	11
EVALUATING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	14
CEQA CHECKLIST.....	15
I. AESTHETICS.....	15
II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES.....	16
III. AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.....	17
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	20
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	26
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....	27
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	29
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.....	31
IX. LAND USE PLANNING.....	33
X. MINERAL RESOURCES.....	34
XI. NOISE.....	34
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	37
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.....	37
XIV. RECREATION.....	38
XV. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC.....	39
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	40
XVII.MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	42
REFERENCES.....	43

FIGURES

Figure 1 Section 18 Public Hearing Map 4
Figure 2 USGS Vicinity Map..... 5
Figure 3 Vicinity Map and Photo Locations 6
Figure 4 Photos..... 7

TABLES

Table 1: Estimated Construction Air Quality Emissions 18
Table 2: Estimated Unmitigated Onsite Maximum Daily Construction Excavation Emissions..... 19
Table 3: Estimated Onsite Maximum Daily Construction Emissions from Paving..... 19
Table 4: Guidance Vibration Annoyance Potential Criteria..... 35
Table 5: Guidance Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria 35
Table 6: Project Construction Induced Impacts (in/sec) 35

APPENDICES

Appendix A Air Quality CalEEMod
Appendix B Air Quality Localized Significance Thresholds
Appendix C Joint Project Review 12-01-21-01
Appendix D Response to Comments

INTRODUCTION

Regulatory Framework

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Sections 21000-21177), this Initial Study has been prepared to determine potentially significant impacts upon the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the ***Temescal Creek - Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1*** project (collectively hereinafter referred to as the "project"). In accordance with Section 15063 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, this Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) as Lead Agency to inform the Lead Agency decision makers, other affected agencies, and the public of potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed Project.

Organization of the Initial Study

The Initial Study is organized as follows:

Introduction: Provides the regulatory context for the review along a brief summary of the CEQA process.

Project Information: Provides fundamental project information, such as the project description, project location and figures.

Lead Agency Determination: Identifies environmental factors potentially affected by the project and identifies the Lead Agency's determination based on the initial evaluation.

Mitigated Negative Declaration: Prepared when a determination can be made that no significant environmental effects will occur because revisions to the project have been made or mitigation measures will be implemented which will reduce all potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Monitoring Program Table: Identifies objectives, criteria, and specific procedures to administer the District's responsibilities under CEQA.

Evaluating Environmental Impacts: Provides the parameters the District uses when determining level of impact.

CEQA Checklist: Provides an environmental checklist and accompanying analysis for responding to checklist questions.

References: Includes a list of references and various resources utilized in preparing the analysis.

Public Review and Comments Received

The Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration were circulated for a 30-day public review and comment period. During this review period, the District received comments from:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife;

The District also received comments outside the comment period from:

- Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians; and
- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Comments on the environmental analysis that were received during the public review period are included in the project's administrative record. If the environmental analysis is challenged in court, the challenge may be limited to only those issues raised during the public review period described above. Comments, and related responses, are included with the Initial Study document as Appendix D for consideration by the Board of Supervisors of the District. If the Board concurs with the findings presented herein the enclosed Mitigated Negative Declaration will be adopted and the project will be approved.

PROJECT INFORMATION

1. ***Project Title:***
Temescal Creek – Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1
2. ***Lead Agency Name and Address:***
Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
1995 Market Street
Riverside, California 92501
3. ***Contact Person Email Address and Phone Number:***
Mike Wong: mwong@rcflood.org: 951.955.1233
4. ***Project Location:***
The proposed project area is generally bounded on the north by Dos Lagos Drive, on the east by Temescal Wash, on the south by Leroy Road and on the west by the Interstate 15 Freeway in the unincorporated El Cerrito area of Riverside County. The proposed project area can be found within Township 4 South, Range 6 West, Sections 21 and 22 of the Lake Matthews and Corona South 7.5 Series Topographic Quadrangle maps.
5. ***Project Sponsor's Name and Address:***
None.
6. ***General Plan Designation:***
The proposed project site is located within the Temescal Canyon Area Plan of the Riverside County General Plan. Land uses within the proposed project area include:
 - "Light Industrial" within Temescal Wash and along the proposed project alignment east of Foster Road.
 - "Rural Residential" and "High Density Residential" north of Foster Road.
 - "Business Park" south of Foster Road.
 - "Commercial Retail" west of Temescal Canyon Road.
7. ***Description of Project:***
The District proposes to construct, operate and maintain an underground storm drain system comprised of approximately 2,000 lineal feet of reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) ranging in size from 30 inches to 72 inches in diameter. The proposed project alignment, described in greater detail below, is shown schematically on the attached figures. The proposed project begins at the outlet within Temescal Creek. The concrete outlet structure is an impact type energy dissipater and will be located in an area of Temescal Creek that will be widened to create a "cove" area as part of this project. The corners of the "cove" area will be armored with buried rock riprap. From the outlet, the proposed project will transition into an underground RCP and traverse southwesterly to Foster Road via an unpaved road and an open field currently used for the cultivation of mint and watercress. The RCP will then head west within the existing Foster Road right-of-way to a connection with an existing culvert located west of Temescal Canyon Road. In addition, a lateral RCP will connect to the main RCP at the intersection of Foster Road and Temescal Canyon Road and will extend approximately 300 feet south in Temescal Canyon Road. The proposed storm drain system, once completed, will provide substantial flood protection to existing development at the intersection of Foster Road and Temescal Canyon Road.
8. ***Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:***
The storm drain alignment along Temescal Canyon Road and Foster Road is located within paved streets and along the disturbed unpaved road shoulder. The connection to the existing outlet, located

west of the intersection of Foster Road and Temescal Canyon Road, is located within a gravel parking area. Surrounding land uses within this area include commercial, industrial and residential uses. There are six residences north and one residence south of the paved portion of Foster Road. One large industrial yard and building is located to the south of the paved portion of Foster Road.

The RCP alignment east of Foster Road is located adjacent to an unpaved road. The majority of the land adjacent to the unpaved road is used for the cultivation of mint and watercress; however, there is one residence north and one residence south of the unpaved road. Much of this area is mapped as a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) as shown on Panels 06065C1370G and 06065C1390G of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM).

The outlet area is located within a disturbed vacant field and Temescal Creek. The portion of the outlet area within Temescal Creek is considered an active restoration area and is maintained by the Riverside – Corona Resource Conservation District via a conservation easement. Both the vacant field and Temescal Creek are mapped as an SFHA on the currently effective FIRMs listed above.

9. *Earlier Analyses Used:*

None.

Impacts Adequately Addressed in Earlier Analyses:

None.

Mitigation Measures from Earlier Analysis:

None.

10. *Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:*

(e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Federal Agencies (not "public agencies" as defined by CEQA or required to take a CEQA action)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps): Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit.

State Agencies

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW): Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement.
Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB): Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Standards Certification.

California Department of Transportation: Approval of detours within Caltrans jurisdiction.

City/County Agencies

Riverside – Corona Resource Conservation District (RCRCD): Approval of construction activity within RCRCD conservation easement.

Riverside County Transportation Department: Approval of construction activities within County maintained road right-of-way.


Financing Approval or Participation Agreements

None.

P8\156560

Figure 1 Section 18 Public Hearing Map

**SECTION 18
PUBLIC HEARING
MAP**



**TEMESCAL CREEK
FOSTER ROAD
STORM DRAIN
STAGE 1**

**PROJECT NO.
2-0-0493
NOV 2013**







Figure 2 USGS Vicinity Map



RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Temescal Creek - Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1
Project No. 2-0-0493

Figure 2
USGS Vicinity Map



Figure 3 Vicinity Map and Photo Locations



RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Temescal Creek - Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1
Project No. 2-0-0493

Figure 3
Vicinity Map and Photo Locations



Eagle Aerial Imagery: 2012

Figure 4 Photos



Photo location 1: View facing east along Foster Road



Photo location 2: View facing northeast along Foster Road



Photo location 3: View of the proposed outlet area facing southeast



Photo location 4: View of Temescal Creek facing southeast

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors, as checked below, would potentially be affected by this project.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise
<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance
<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning	

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature: 

WARREN D. WILLIAMS
General Manager-Chief Engineer

Dated: 12/23/13

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project:
Temescal Creek – Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1

State Clearinghouse Number:
2013101086

Lead Agency and Project Sponsor:
Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
1995 Market Street, Riverside, CA, 92501

Project Contact:
Mike Wong

Phone:
951.955.1233

Email:
mwong@rcflood.org

Project Description: The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District proposes to construct, operate and maintain an underground storm drain system comprised of approximately 2,000 lineal feet of reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) ranging in size from 30 inches to 72 inches in diameter. The proposed project alignment, described in greater detail below, is shown schematically on the attached figures. The proposed project begins at the outlet within Temescal Creek. The concrete outlet structure is an impact type energy dissipater and will be located in an area of Temescal Creek that will be widened to create a "cove" area as part of this project. The corners of the "cove" area will be armored with buried rock riprap. From the outlet, the proposed project will transition into an underground RCP and traverse southwesterly to Foster Road via an unpaved road and an open field currently used for the cultivation of mint and watercress. The RCP will then head west within the existing Foster Road right-of-way to a connection with an existing culvert located west of Temescal Canyon Road. In addition, a lateral RCP will connect to the main RCP at the intersection of Foster Road and Temescal Canyon Road and will extend approximately 300 feet south in Temescal Canyon Road. The proposed storm drain system, once completed, will provide substantial flood protection to existing development at the intersection of Foster Road and Temescal Canyon Road.

Project Location: The proposed project area is generally bounded on the north by Dos Lagos Drive, on the east by Temescal Wash, on the south by Leroy Road and on the west by the Interstate 15 Freeway in the unincorporated El Cerrito area of Riverside County. The proposed project area can be found within Township 4 South, Range 6 West, Sections 21 and 22 of the Lake Matthews and Corona South 7.5 Series Topographic Quadrangle maps.


Lead Agency Finding: The General Manager-Chief Engineer of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District has made a finding that the proposed *Temescal Creek – Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1* project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment. An Initial Study supporting this finding is attached. This finding will become final upon adoption of this Mitigated Negative Declaration by the Board of Supervisors of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. The Mitigation Monitoring Program Table is attached herein.

Signature: 
WARREN D. WILLIAMS
General Manager-Chief Engineer

Dated: 12/23/13

Board of Supervisors Action:

The Board of Supervisors of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District assembled in regular session on January 14, 2014 has determined that the *Temescal Creek – Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1* project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and has adopted a *Mitigated Negative Declaration*.

Signature: 
KECIA HARPER-JHEM
Clerk of the Board

Dated: 1/14/14

Attachments

Copies to: 1) County Clerk;
2) Flood Control

P8\157676

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM TABLE

Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1

Issue	Potential Impact	Mitigation Measures	Action	Implementation Responsibility	Governing Agency	Implementation Timing
IV. Biological Resources	During construction, there is potential to disturb burrowing owl.	MM BIO 1: A pre-construction survey for burrowing owls shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to grading or ground disturbing activity. The pre-construction survey and any relocation of burrowing owls, if present, shall be conducted in accordance with current MSHCP survey guidelines and protocols.	Conduct a 30-day pre-construction presence/absence burrowing owl survey.	RCFC&WCD (Regulatory Division)	CDFW	No more than 30 days prior to grading or ground disturbing activity.
IV. Biological Resources	During construction, there is potential to disturb nesting birds.	MM BIO 2: The removal of potential nesting vegetation will be conducted outside of the nesting season (February 1 st to August 31 st) to the extent that is feasible. If vegetation must be removed during the nesting season, a qualified biologist will conduct a nesting bird survey of potentially suitable nesting vegetation prior to removal. Surveys will be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to scheduled removals. If active nests are identified, the biologist will establish buffers around the vegetation containing the active nest (300 feet for raptors and 100 feet for non-raptors). The vegetation containing the active nest will not be removed, and no grading will occur within the established buffer, until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active. If clearing is not conducted within three days of a negative survey, the nesting survey must be repeated to confirm the absence of nesting birds.	Conduct a pre-activity field survey for nesting birds if tree removal takes place during the nesting season.	RCFC&WCD (Regulatory Division)	CDFW; USFWS	Prior to tree removal.
IV. Biological Resources		MM BIO 3: Impacts to riparian vegetation will be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio for temporary impacts through onsite re-vegetation and a minimum 3:1 ratio through onsite creation for permanent impacts.	Ensure the appropriate mitigation ratios for riparian impacts to riparian vegetation are implemented.	RCFC&WCD (Regulatory Division)	CDFW; ACOE; RWQCB	After completion of construction.

Issue	Potential Impact	Mitigation Measures	Action	Implementation Responsibility	Governing Agency	Implementation Timing
V. Cultural Resources	During construction, there is potential to impact unknown buried cultural resources.	<p>MM CULT 1: An approved Archeological Monitor shall be present during all project related ground disturbance activities within the project areas adjacent to Temescal Creek. Tribal monitors from the Pechanga Tribe and/or Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians shall also be allowed to access areas that require monitoring during initial grading and excavation activities. If cultural resources are discovered during project construction, all work in the area of the find shall cease, and a qualified archaeologist and representatives of the Pechanga Tribe shall investigate the find, and make recommendations for <i>treatment in accordance with the Master Cultural Resources Treatment and Tribal Monitoring Agreement.</i></p>	Ensure an approved Archeological monitor and tribal monitors are present during all project related ground disturbance activities within the project areas adjacent to Temescal Creek as described.	RCFC&WCD (Design and Construction Division)	State Historic Preservation Office	During excavation activities
V. Cultural Resources	During construction, there is potential to impact unknown buried cultural resources.	<p>MM CULT 2: An approved paleontological monitor shall spot-check the excavated areas during construction. If paleontological resources are discovered during construction, all work in the area of the find shall cease, and a qualified paleontological resources specialist will evaluate the find. Any discovered paleontological resources that merit long-term consideration, shall be collected and reported in accordance with standard paleontological management practices.</p>	Ensure an approved paleontological monitor spot-checks the excavated areas during construction as described.	RCFC&WCD (Design and Construction Division)	None	During excavation activities

Issue	Potential Impact	Mitigation Measures	Action	Implementation Responsibility	Governing Agency	Implementation Timing
VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Construction activity may increase the potential for fires in adjacent vegetated areas.	MM HAZ 1: When work is conducted adjacent to flammable vegetation appropriate fire-fighting equipment (e.g., extinguishers, shovels, water trucks) shall be available onsite during all phases of project construction to help minimize the chance of human-caused wildfires. Shields, protective mats, and/or other fire preventative methods shall be used during grinding, welding, and other spark-inducing activities.	Ensure that the construction contractor implements appropriate measures while working adjacent to flammable vegetation	RCFC&WCD (Design and Construction Division)	N/A	Implement appropriate measures, as needed, into construction activities throughout the construction period.
XI. Noise	The use of heavy equipment during project construction may temporarily increase noise levels within nearby residential areas.	MM NOISE 1: Heavy equipment that may impact adjacent residential structures shall be limited from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, except under special circumstances approved by the District's General Manager-Chief Engineer.	Limit use of heavy equipment to between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m.	RCFC&WCD (Design and Construction Division)	None	During construction
XI. Noise	The use of heavy equipment during project construction may temporarily increase noise levels within nearby residential areas.	MM NOISE 2: Each resident adjacent to the storm drain construction alignment shall be notified in writing three days prior to operation of heavy construction equipment near the residences. The notice shall include the expected work schedule and the District's contact information. The District shall alert the construction contractor of any noise complaints and incorporate any feasible and practical techniques which minimize the noise impacts on adjacent residences.	Ensure that the described notices are provided to each resident adjacent to the storm drain construction site and inform the	RCFC&WCD (Design and Construction Division)	None	During construction
XV. Transportation and Traffic	Construction activity within existing streets may temporarily result in inadequate emergency access.	MM TRANS 1: Emergency vehicles shall have access through the project site at all times during construction.	Ensure emergency vehicles have access through the project site at all times	RCFC&WCD (Design and Construction Division)	None	During construction

EVALUATING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (*e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone*). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (*e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis*).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: No Impact or Less Than Significant" applies when the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, does not require the incorporation of mitigation measures, and does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. The lead agency must briefly describe the reasons that a proposed project will not have significant effect on the environment and does not require the preparation of an environmental impact report.
5. "Mitigated Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced any effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact". The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses", as described in (-6) below, may be cross-referenced).
6. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D).) The use of an earlier analysis as a reference should include a brief discussion that identifies the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated", describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
7. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (*e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances*). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
8. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

CEQA CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS				
<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
<p>a) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. Immediate views within the underground RCP project alignment include commercial, industrial, residential and agricultural land uses. Exposed surfaces, construction debris and construction equipment may temporarily impact the aesthetic quality of the immediate area. However, impacts will be short-term and will cease upon project completion.</p> <p>The project outlet area is located within the Temescal Creek and may have the potential to alter the existing scenic setting. However, implementation of standard slope stabilization and re-vegetation will reduce long-term visual impacts to an insignificant level. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on a scenic vista.</p> <p>Source: Project Design; RCIP.</p>				
<p>b) <i>Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. Interstate 15 from Corona to the San Diego County line has been designated as a State Eligible Scenic Highway. The underground RCP project alignment is primarily located within road rights-of-way and disturbed agricultural areas. As previously described, impacts will be short term and will cease upon project completion.</p> <p>The project outlet area is located approximately 2000 feet from the State Eligible Scenic Highway and is not visible from this distance. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.</p> <p>Source: Project Design; RCIP.</p>				
<p>c) <i>Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less than Significant Impact. Refer to responses I.a) and I.b). The short-term impacts on visual character or quality of the site and surrounding areas will be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Design.</p>				
<p>d) <i>Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not create new or additional sources of light or glare, either during construction or operation. Only under rare emergency conditions would the use of artificial lighting be anticipated; however, any impacts would be temporary and, therefore, less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Design.</p>				

II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
<p>a) <i>Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>No Impact. The Riverside County General Plan Agricultural Resources Map (Figure OS-2) and the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Riverside County Important Farmland 2008, indicate that the project area east of Foster Road is located within the areas designated as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance. Impacts to these areas will be short term and will cease upon project completion. Therefore, the project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide importance to non-agricultural use. Source: RCIP; Conservation.</p>				
<p>b) <i>Conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. A portion of the underground RCP project alignment is located within areas currently used for the cultivation of mint and watercress, which is permitted under the current County zoning designation (Manufacturing – Service Commercial). As previously discussed, impacts to these areas will be short term and will cease upon project completion. Therefore, the project is expected to have a less than significant impact on existing agricultural zoning or agricultural use. In addition, the project is not located on land subject to a Williamson Act Contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve. Source: RCIP; County Ord.</p>				
<p>c) <i>Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. See responses I.a) and I.b). Impacts to the current agricultural use will be short term and will cease upon project completion. The project will not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.</p>				
<p>d) <i>Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>No Impact. The project site is not located within areas zoned forest land, timberland or timberland production. Therefore, the project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland zoned timberland production.</p> <p>Source: RCIP</p>				
e) <i>Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>No Impact. Forest land does not exist within the project site. Therefore, the project will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.</p>				
<p>III. AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</p> <p>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.</p>				
<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) <i>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), a region that currently exceeds and is in violation of state and national ambient air quality standards for ozone (O₃) and particulate matter (PM) less than 10 and 2.5 microns in diameter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) regulates air quality emissions within the SCAB and has prepared a series of Air Quality Management Plans (AQMP), the most recent of which was adopted by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD on June 1, 2007 (2007 AQMP). The 2007 AQMP is designed to meet applicable Federal and State requirements, including attainment of ambient air quality standards. To assess the impacts of project-related construction and operational emissions, the SCAQMD has established regional significance thresholds.</p> <p>As described below in III.b), construction and subsequent maintenance emissions from the proposed project will only result in temporary, less than significant impacts to air quality. The proposed project must also comply with applicable provisions of Rule 403 for the control of fugitive dust. As such, the proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2007 AQMP.</p> <p>Source: AQMP; SCAQMD</p>				
b) <i>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less than Significant Impact. The SCAB currently exceeds and is in violation of state and national ambient air quality standards for O₃, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. The SCAQMD has established regional significance thresholds to help assess the impacts of project-related construction and operational emissions. Construction and operational emissions from the proposed project that are below these thresholds are considered less than significant. Subsequent maintenance of the proposed flood control facility is expected to release infrequent and minor air emissions associated with trucks used on an as-needed basis for inspection or maintenance purposes. Temporary construction emissions would come from heavy equipment exhaust, construction-related trips by workers, and associated fugitive dust generation from excavation and grading activities. Construction emission thresholds as recommended by the SCAQMD and estimated construction emissions for the proposed project are noted below in Table 1. The estimated construction emissions are calculated using</p>				

the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEModversion 2011.1.1 air pollution model). For the purposes of running the model, it was assumed that the construction would occur in a 3-month period. The construction emissions estimates are based on every piece of equipment operating a full eight (8) hours per day (even though not all equipment will be used for the full 8-hour duration). These estimates are also based on unmitigated emissions. See CalEEMod printout in Appendix A for the detailed emissions reports.

Table 1: Estimated Construction Air Quality Emissions

Criteria Pollutant	SCAQMD Significance Criteria for Construction (lbs/day)	Project Estimated Construction Emissions (lbs/day)
Nitrogen Oxides	100	61.38
Reactive Organic Gases	75	7.64
Sulfur Dioxide	150	0.08
Carbon Monoxide	550	41.14
PM10	150	69.90
PM2.5	55	3.56

Based on the estimated values that are shown above in Table 1, the temporary construction emissions from the proposed project will not exceed the SCAQMD's recommended significant thresholds for construction. In addition, compliance with Rule 403 for the control of fugitive dust would ensure that the proposed project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Source: Project Design; CARB; SCAQMD; CalEEMod

c) *Result in cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?*

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

Less than Significant Impact. The SCAB is designated as a non-attainment area for O3, PM2.5, and PM10. Since the proposed Project does not conflict with any land uses, it is in conformance with the AQMP, and the Project's short-term emissions do not exceed the SCAQMD-established thresholds of significance; the Project's net increase in criteria pollutant emissions for which the Project region is non-attainment is not cumulatively considerable and impacts are considered less than significant.

Source: SCAQMD

d) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Temporary construction emissions would result from heavy equipment exhaust, construction-related trips by workers, and associated fugitive dust generation from excavation during storm drain and outlet installation and paving the existing road after storm drain installation. The proposed project alignment primarily follows existing roads with adjacent occupied structures (e.g., residential, industrial and commercial). The SCAQMD has developed suggested Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) to assist lead agencies in assessing potential air quality impacts near emission sources. LSTs are applicable to oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM10), and particulates less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM2.5). According to the SCAQMD, the LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard. LSTs are also based on the ambient concentrations of the specific pollutants within each source receptor area (SRA) and the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor.

Construction and operational emissions from the proposed project are considered less than significant. Construction emission thresholds were determined using SCAQMD's mass-rate look-up table for SRA No. 22 Norco/Corona. To estimate the localized construction emissions from the project, project specific parameters were used to modify the SCAQMD One Acre Site Example spreadsheets for the paving phase and the SCAQMD Two Acre Site Example spreadsheets for the excavation phase. Subsequent operation and maintenance of the proposed flood control facility is expected to require infrequent and small numbers of equipment associated with trucks/tractors used on an as-needed basis for inspection or maintenance proposes. Therefore, only the project related construction emissions are evaluated in this analysis since they represent the maximum amount of pollutants resulting from the project. The construction emissions estimates are based on every piece of equipment operating a full 8 hours per day (even though not all equipment will be used for the full 8-hour duration). See Appendix B for the print out results of the spreadsheets.

The estimated localized construction emissions from excavation and paving activities are shown below in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively.

Table 2: Estimated Unmitigated Onsite Maximum Daily Construction Excavation Emissions

Criteria Pollutants	LST for 2-Acre Construction Area With Receptors at 25 Meters (lbs/day)	Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Onsite Emissions (lbs/day)	Exceed LST?
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	170	36.4	No
Carbon Monoxides (CO)	1003	16.8	No
Particulates (PM ₁₀)	6	3.4	No
Particulates (PM _{2.5})	5	2.2	No

Table 3: Estimated Onsite Maximum Daily Construction Emissions from Paving (pounds per day unmitigated)

Criteria Pollutants	LST for 1-Acre Construction Area With Receptors at 25 Meters (lbs/day)	Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Onsite Emissions (lbs/day)	Exceed LST?
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	118	22.7	No
Carbon Monoxides (CO)	674	11.8	No
Particulates (PM ₁₀)	4	1.6	No
Particulates (PM _{2.5})	3	1.5	No

Based on the estimated values that are shown above in Table 2 and Table 3, emissions from the project are below the thresholds considered significant.

Source: LST Guidance

e) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

Less than Significant Impact. Portions of the proposed project site are located adjacent to occupied structures (e.g., residential, industrial and commercial). Construction activities may produce odors associated with the operation of heavy equipment; however, the generation of any odors would be of short duration and not considered a significant impact.

Source: Project Design

f) <i>Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less than Significant Impact. On June 1, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05 which sets forth a series of target dates by which statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be reduced to, as follows: 1) 2000 levels by the year 2010; 2) 1990 levels by the year 2020; and 3) eighty percent (80%) below the 1990 levels by the year 2050. In 2006, the California State Legislature adopted AB 32 (Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006) and the Governor signed it into law. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB), the State agency charged with regulating statewide air quality, to adopt rules and regulations that would achieve GHG emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by the year 2020. GHG as defined under AB 32 includes carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane, nitrous oxide, sulfur hexafluoride, hydrofluorocarbons, and perfluorocarbons. CO₂ has been identified as the most important anthropogenic GHG because it comprises the majority of total GHG emissions emitted per year and it is very long-lived in the atmosphere.

The main source of GHG emissions associated with the project is the previously described short-term emissions related to the use of heavy equipment. CalEEMod estimated that the temporary project construction emissions will be 220.32 metric tons of CO₂ equivalents per year (MTCO_{2eq/yr}). Subsequent operation and maintenance of the proposed project is expected to release infrequent and minor GHG emissions far less than the estimated construction emissions of 220.32 MTCO_{2eq/yr}.

Currently, there are no established significance thresholds from Federal or State agencies. However, in October 2008, the ARB and SCAQMD issued the draft "Recommended Approaches for Setting Interim Significance Thresholds for Greenhouse Gases under the California Environmental Quality Act" and the "Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold", respectively. Each agency's draft guidance material represents a potential analytical framework for addressing CEQA significance thresholds for GHG. In general, interim GHG thresholds of 7,000 and 10,000 MTCO_{2eq/yr} are recommended by ARB and SCAQMD, respectively. The estimated project construction GHG emissions of 220.32 MTCO_{2eq/yr} is well below the available interim GHG threshold recommended by the ARB and SCAQMD. Therefore, the proposed project will not generate GHG emissions that would cause significant direct or indirect impacts on the environment.

Source: CalEEMod; CARB; SCAQMD

g) <i>Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above, the GHG emissions generated by the proposed project are temporary and fall well below the recommended significance thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with any plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHG.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. The proposed project area is located within Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) survey areas for narrow endemic plant species, criteria area plant species and burrowing owl.

No special status plant species were detected during habitat assessments and biological surveys for the project. In addition, it was determined that the project area does not support suitable habitat for any of the narrow endemic plant species or criteria area plant species within the survey areas. Therefore, no further assessments and/or surveys or conservation measures are required.

An initial habitat assessment for burrowing owl was conducted on April 16, 2010. Potential habitat for burrowing owl did not exist within the MSHCP mapped burrowing owl survey area; however, because portions of the project area outside of the MSHCP mapped burrowing owl survey area indicate potential habitat, the following mitigation measure will be implemented:

MM BIO 1: *A pre-construction survey for burrowing owls shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to grading or ground disturbing activity. The pre-construction survey and any relocation of burrowing owls, if present, shall be conducted in accordance with current MSHCP survey guidelines and protocols.*

The proposed project will also unavoidably impact riparian habitat within Temescal Creek which contains suitable habitat for least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher and western yellow-billed cuckoo. Therefore, in accordance with the MSHCP, focused surveys were conducted for these species. The southwestern willow flycatcher and western yellow-billed cuckoo were not detected during focused surveys. Two least Bell's vireo territorial males were detected during focused surveys; therefore, the project will impact riparian habitat occupied by least Bell's vireo. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will ensure that potential impacts to this species are reduced to less than significant levels:

MM BIO 2: *The removal of potential nesting vegetation will be conducted outside of the nesting season (February 1st to August 31st) to the extent that is feasible. If vegetation must be removed during the nesting season, a qualified biologist will conduct a nesting bird survey of potentially suitable nesting vegetation prior to removal. Surveys will be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to scheduled removals. If active nests are identified, the biologist will establish buffers around the vegetation containing the active nest (300 feet for raptors and 100 feet for non-raptors). The vegetation containing the active nest will not be removed, and no grading will occur within the established buffer, until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active. If clearing is not conducted within three days of a negative survey, the nesting survey must be repeated to confirm the absence of nesting birds.*

MM BIO 3: *Impacts to riparian vegetation will be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio for temporary impacts through onsite re-vegetation and a minimum 3:1 ratio through onsite creation for permanent impacts.*

Trees will be removed to construct the proposed project. The Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3800 prohibit the take, possession or destruction of any birds, their nests or eggs. The District will comply with the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code through the implementation of MM BIO 2.

For these reasons, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact, with mitigation measures implemented, with respect to incurring a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Source: BIO; JD; DBESP

b) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. During construction, the proposed project would unavoidably impact approximately 0.51 acre of riparian habitat within Temescal Creek, of which 0.39 acre would be temporary and 0.12 acre would be permanent. Following construction, the temporarily impacted riparian habitat will be restored to pre-project condition. In order to mitigate for permanent impacts to riparian habitat, mitigation measure MM BIO 3 will be implemented. Therefore, with the mitigation measure implemented, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS.

Source: BIO; JD; DBESP

c) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on biological resources involved within a jurisdictional water feature as defined by federal, state or local regulations (e.g., Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, Section 1602 of California Fish and Game Code, Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, etc.) through direct removal, filing, hydrological interruption, or other means?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. According to a Jurisdictional Delineation prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, the proposed project will impact approximately 0.48 acre of Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) jurisdiction (Section 404 and Section 401 of the Clean Water Act). The project will also impact approximately 0.50 acre of CDFW jurisdiction (Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code). In compliance with Section 404/401 of the Clean Water Act and Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code, necessary authorizations from the ACOE, RWQCB and CDFW will be obtained prior to construction.

For these reasons and with the implementation of mitigation measures MM BIO 2 through MM BIO 5, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on biological resources involved within a jurisdictional water feature as defined by Federal, State or local regulations through direct removal, filing, hydrological interruption, or other means.

Source: JD

d) <i>Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact. According to Figure 3-2 of the MSHCP, the project area is located within the proposed extension of Existing Core 2. The proposed extension is expected to provide habitat and movement for certain planning species in the MSHCP. The project site is located between Temescal Creek and the I-15 and areas immediately upstream consist of developed industrial areas with areas downstream consisting of a mix of residential and industrial areas, which restrict wildlife movement by mammals and reptiles. The proposed project will result in the installation of a limited amount of bank protection on Temescal Creek; however, given the already constrained wildlife movement associated with development between Temescal Creek and the I-15, the project does not have potential for affecting wildlife movement (it is also important to note that the areas to the east of Temescal Creek are largely undeveloped, with the exception of a golf course, providing areas for north-south movement).

In addition, while the project would result in impacts to 0.51 acre of riparian vegetation, it would not affect the function of Temescal Creek as a movement corridor for avian species during migration or for dispersal by

resident species.

For these reasons, the proposed project will have less than significant impacts on local and regional wildlife movement.

Source: MSHCP; BIO

e) <i>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The proposed project is not subject to local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. The proposed project is subject to MSHCP compliance. Refer to response to Section IV.f) below for a discussion of MSHCP compliance.

Source: Project Design; MSHCP

f) <i>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less than Significant Impact. The County of Riverside Board of Supervisors adopted the MSHCP on June 23, 2003. The USFWS and CDFW issued "take" permits in June 2004 for the implementation of the MSHCP. The MSHCP is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional habitat conservation plan focusing on the conservation of species and their associated habitats in Western Riverside County.

The District is an MSHCP permittee, and the proposed project must be consistent with the applicable provisions of the MSHCP. A summary of the obligations specific to implementation by the District is described in Section 13.4 of the Implementing Agreement (IA) and includes:

- Adopt and maintain resolutions as necessary to implement the requirements and to fulfill the purposes of the Permits, the MSHCP, and the IA for covered activities. Such requirements include compliance with: 1) the policies for the protection of species associated with Riparian/Riverine areas and vernal pools as set forth in Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP; 2) the policies for the protection of narrow endemic plant species as set forth in Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP; 3) the requirements of Section 7.3.7 of the MSHCP; 4) the urban/wildlands interface guidelines as set forth in Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP; and 5) the BMPs and the siting and design criteria as set forth in Section 7.0 and Appendix C of the MSHCP. The requirements also include conducting surveys as set forth in Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP.
- Contribute mitigation through payment of 3% of total capital costs for a covered activity. Such payment may be offset through acquisition of replacement habitat or creation of new habitat for the benefit of covered species, as appropriate. Such mitigation shall be implemented prior to impacts to covered species and their habitats.
- Manage land owned or leased within the MSHCP Conservation Area that has been set aside for conservation purposes pursuant to a management agreement to be executed between Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and the CDFW.
- Participate as a member of the Reserve Management Oversight Committee (RMOC).
- Carry out all other requirements of the MSHCP, the MSHCP permits, and the IA.

RCA Approval

The project has been submitted to and reviewed by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) pursuant to the Joint Project Review (JPR) process. Pursuant to a Criteria Consistency Review letter from the RCA dated February 12, 2013 (Appendix C), it was determined that the project is

consistent with both the Criteria and other Plan requirements.

Project Site Location Within MSHCP Area

Regions of the MSHCP have been organized into Area Plans that generally follow political jurisdictional boundaries. The project site is located within Subunit 3 of the Temescal Canyon Area Plan. The eastern portion of the project is located within the western portion of Criteria Cell 2723 (part of Cell Group D).

Regarding Cell conservation objectives, conservation within this Cell will contribute to assembly of the proposed extension of Existing Core 2. The conservation focus will be on coastal sage scrub, grassland and wetland habitat. Areas conserved within this Cell Group will be connected to a variety of uplands proposed for conservation in Cell Groups C and E to the north and south. Conservation within this Cell Group will range from 75%-85% of the Cell Group focusing on the central and eastern portions of the Cell Group. The proposed project is consistent with the goals and objectives of Criteria Cell 2723 as the minimal impacts to native habitats are fully mitigated on site.

During the JPR process, the RCA indicated that a portion of the proposed project is located within existing MSHCP Additional Reserve Lands (ARL). The post-project condition within ARL would not change the current land-use and would be biologically equivalent or superior to the pre-project condition. Therefore, additional conservation measures or replacement acreage of ARL will not be required.

As previously discussed in Section IV.d), the project area is located within a portion of proposed extension of Existing Core 2. While the project would result in impacts to 0.51 acre of riparian vegetation, it would not affect the function of Temescal Creek as a movement corridor for avian species during migration or for dispersal by resident species.

Section 6.1.2

In accordance with MSHCP Section 6.1.2 field assessments of the project area and surrounding lands were performed for Riparian/Riverine and vernal pool habitats. The project area does not contain vernal pools or other seasonal pools with the potential to support listed fairy shrimp.

An analysis of alternative channel alignments to avoid, minimize, and mitigate effects to Riparian/Riverine areas was performed in accordance with MSHCP Section 6.2.1. Two other alternatives were considered and rejected for this project. These alternatives would have resulted in greater impacts to riparian vegetation and to the bed and bank of Temescal Creek. The proposed impacts to Temescal Creek have been minimized to the maximum extent feasible while considering the design requirements for the project.

During construction, the proposed project would unavoidably impact approximately 0.51 acre of riparian habitat within Temescal Creek, of which 0.39 acre would be temporary and 0.12 acre would be permanent. Following construction, the temporarily impacted riparian habitat will be restored to pre-project condition. In order to mitigate for permanent impacts to riparian habitat, mitigation measure MM BIO 2 will be implemented.

In compliance with the MSHCP, the DBESP report describes the measures to ensure replacement of lost functions and values of habitat as it relates to Covered Species. The DBESP was reviewed by the USFWS and the CDFW, and is on file at the District office.

The proposed project area was assessed for habitat that could support riparian birds per MSHCP Section 6.1.2. Focused surveys are required if suitable habitat is present within the project area for the least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, and western yellow-billed cuckoo. In accordance with the MSHCP, focused surveys were conducted for these species. The southwestern willow flycatcher and western yellow-billed cuckoo were not detected during focused surveys. Two least Bell's vireo territorial males were detected during focused surveys; therefore, the project will impact riparian habitat occupied by least Bell's vireo. Implementation of MM BIO 2 through MM BIO 5 will ensure that potential impacts to this species are reduced to less than significant levels.

The project is consistent with Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP.

Section 6.1.3

The proposed project is located within the Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area. Pursuant to Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP, habitat assessments and/or focused surveys for certain narrow endemic plant species were conducted. No special status plant species were detected during habitat assessments and biological surveys for the project. In addition, it was determined that the project area does not support suitable habitat for any of the narrow endemic plant species or criteria area plant species within the survey areas. Therefore, no further assessments and/or surveys or conservation measures are required.

The project is consistent with Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP.

Section 6.1.4

Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP addresses indirect impacts from developments in proximity to MSHCP Conservation Areas. Pursuant to Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP, projects in close proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area are required to incorporate mechanisms to address indirect effects to the MSHCP Conservation Area. The proposed project is located within and adjacent to an existing MSHCP Conservation Area, and the project has been designed to comply with the guidelines set forth in Section 6.1.4. The project will comply with all waste discharge requirements in the applicable NPDES permits and the MS4 permit to ensure there will be no adverse impacts to Temescal Creek with respect to drainage and toxics. Construction will occur during daytime hours and will be temporary. Therefore, the project will not have any adverse effects on wildlife movement and drainage features due to lighting and increased traffic noise. If construction is to occur adjacent to the riparian habitat areas during the nesting season, MM BIO 2 will be implemented to ensure that potential impacts are reduced to less than significant levels. The project's Plant Palette will not include any invasive plant species in areas adjacent to preserved habitat. Appropriate barriers and signs will be used to minimize unauthorized access to the preserved habitat areas.

The project is consistent with Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP.

Section 6.3.2

A portion of the project area is located within the Burrowing Owl survey area per the Additional Survey Needs of Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP. Pursuant to Section 6.3.2, habitat assessments and/or focused surveys for certain additional plant and animal species are required for properties within mapped survey areas. An initial habitat assessment for burrowing owl was conducted on April 16, 2010. Potential habitat for burrowing owl did not exist within the MSHCP mapped burrowing owl survey area; however, because portions of the project area outside of the MSHCP mapped burrowing owl survey area indicate potential habitat, MM BIO 1 will be implemented.

The project is consistent with Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP.

Section 7.3.7

Section 7.3.7 defines flood control facilities that are undertaken by a permittee within the Criteria Area as Covered Activities. Therefore, the proposed project is a Covered Activity as defined in the MSHCP.

The project is consistent with Section 7.3.7 of the MSHCP.

Section 7.5.3

Section 7.5.3 of the MSHCP outlines construction guidelines when constructing facilities within the Criteria Area or within P/QP lands. The proposed project is within a Criteria Area, but is not within P/QP lands. The proposed project will incorporate the applicable Construction Guidelines per MSHCP Section 7.5.3 and the BMPs contained in Appendix C. As such, the proposed project will satisfy the BMP requirements of the MSHCP.

The project is consistent with Section 7.5.3 of the MSHCP.

Based on the above analysis, the proposed project is consistent with the MSHCP.

Source: Project Design; MSHCP; BIO; DBESP; JPR

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) <i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less than Significant Impact. A Phase 1 cultural resources assessment of the project site was conducted by Archaeological Associates. The assessment included a records search conducted at the Eastern Information Center at UC Riverside as well as a field assessment. The results of the records search indicated that no previously recorded prehistoric or historic archaeological sites are present within the project area. However, the records search did indicate that the project area is transected by a section of the historic alignment of Old Temescal Road (California Historic Landmark # 638). During the field assessment, both sides of the road right-of-way were carefully inspected and found to be highly disturbed, developed and/or under landscaping. The project will have no adverse impacts on the historic road alignment as it will not be altered as a result of the project. Based on the above information, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact to historical resources.

Source: CULT; EIC; Project Design

b) <i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. Archaeological resources were not identified within the project area during the field assessment. However, the results of the records search indicated that the region is sensitive for prehistoric resources.

The District also received a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the project area. The SLF failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources within a half mile of the project area; however, the SLF did indicate that Native American cultural resources could be found in close proximity to the project area. In accordance with the NAHC recommendations, all the Native American tribes included in NAHC's contact list were contacted regarding information that they may have concerning Native American cultural resources in the project area.

The District received written comments from the Pechanga Band of Mission Indians (Pechanga Tribe), the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians (Soboba Tribe) and the Pala Band of Mission Indians as well as one verbal comment from the Juaneno Band of Mission Indians. The Pala Band of Mission Indians indicated that the proposed project is located outside of their traditional use area and had no objections to the project. The Juaneno Band of Mission Indians indicated that the project area was culturally sensitive and requested that the area be monitored during construction. Both Pechanga and Soboba Tribes expressed concern regarding the cultural sensitivity of the project area as well and have requested that Tribal monitors be present during construction. The District entered into a Master Cultural Resources Treatment and Tribal Monitoring Agreement in December 2012 to address the treatment of Native American human remains, grave goods, funerary objects, ceremonial and sacred items, and cultural resources. The proposed project is located within the area covered under this agreement. Given the fact that the proposed project is located in an area considered sensitive by the Native American tribes and the fact that the record searches indicate that the area is culturally sensitive, the following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the project to ensure that impacts to archaeological resources are less than significant:

MM CULT 1: *An approved Archeological Monitor shall be present during all project related ground disturbance activities within the project areas adjacent to Temescal Creek. Tribal monitors from the Pechanga Tribe and/or Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians shall also be allowed to access areas that*

require monitoring during initial grading and excavation activities. If cultural resources are discovered during project construction, all work in the area of the find shall cease, and a qualified archaeologist and representatives of the Pechanga Tribe shall investigate the find, and make recommendations for treatment in accordance with the Master Cultural Resources Treatment and Tribal Monitoring Agreement.

Source: CULT; EIC; NAHC; Project Design

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. A paleontological assessment of the project area was conducted by John A. Minch, Ph.D. and Archaeological Associates. The assessment included a literature search, a review of an existing records search conducted by the San Bernardino County Museum and a field reconnaissance.

No paleontological resources were encountered during the field reconnaissance. However, the assessment concluded that the entire project area is underlain by Older Alluvial deposits which are known to contain highly significant fossil localities in other parts of southern California. Therefore, in order to avoid potential impacts to paleontological resources the following mitigation measure will be implemented:

MM CULT 2: *An approved paleontological monitor shall spot-check the excavated areas during construction. If paleontological resources are discovered during construction, all work in the area of the find shall cease, and a qualified paleontological resources specialist will evaluate the find. Any discovered paleontological resources that merit long-term consideration, shall be collected and reported in accordance with standard paleontological management practices.*

Source: PALEO; Project Design

d) <i>Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less than Significant Impact. The Project alignment is not located on or adjacent to a known formal or informal cemetery. No impacts to human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries are anticipated. In the unlikely event that human remains are encountered on the project site, no further disturbance will occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made a determination of their origin pursuant to Health and Safety Code 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The Riverside County Coroner must be notified within 24 hours of the discovery. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are of Native American descent, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted within 24 hours to determine the most likely descendent for this area. Once the most likely descendent is determined, treatment of the Native American human remains will proceed pursuant to Public Resources 5097.98. Based on the above information, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact.

Source: Project Design

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) <i>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:</i>				
i) <i>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p><i>State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a Known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</i></p>				
<p>No Impact: According to the Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Inland Foundation Engineering, a currently delineated State of California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone is not located within or near the project area. In addition, the proposed underground storm drain project does not involve the development of dwelling units and will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of known fault.</p> <p>Source: RCIP; GIS; GeoTech</p>				
<p>ii) <i>Strong seismic ground shaking?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less than Significant Impact. According to Figure S-12 of the County of Riverside General Plan, the project area is located within an area of "very high" risk for ground shaking. The proposed storm drain system may potentially be damaged during a seismic event; however, installation of the storm drain system will not expose people or existing habitable structures to these hazards beyond the current condition. The District's routine inspection and maintenance activities will ensure that the storm drain system is repaired if damage does occur during a seismic event.</p> <p>Source: RCIP</p>				
<p>iii) <i>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less than Significant Impact. According to Figure S-3 of the County of Riverside General Plan, the proposed project area is located within areas of "moderate" susceptibility for liquefaction. The proposed storm drain system may potentially be damaged by seismic related ground failure including liquefaction; however, installation of the storm drain system will not expose people or existing habitable structures to these hazards beyond the current condition. The District's routine inspection and maintenance activities will ensure that the storm drain system is repaired if damage does occur during a seismic-related ground failure.</p> <p>Source: RCIP; GIS</p>				
<p>iv) <i>Landslides or mudflows?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>No Impact. The Temescal Canyon Area Plan Slope Instability Map (Figure 14) of the Riverside County General Plan indicates that the proposed project area is not located within an area susceptible to seismically induced landslides and rock falls. The proposed project is an underground storm drain system located in an area with relatively flat terrain. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving landslides or mudflows.</p> <p>Source: Project Design; RCIP; GIS</p>				
<p>b) <i>Result in substantial changes in topography, unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill, or soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less than Significant Impact. The excavation operation will be conducted in accordance with the Division of Occupational Safety and Health (CAL/OSHA) standards to ensure that unstable soil conditions do not occur. The backfill operation will be conducted in accordance with the applicable recommendations of the Geotechnical Report. During construction and any subsequent maintenance activities, appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented to minimize erosion. Therefore, potential impacts will be reduced to less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Design</p>				

c) <i>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, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less than Significant Impact. According to Figure S-7 (Documented Subsidence) of the Riverside County General Plan, the proposed project is located in an area that may be susceptible to subsidence. The proposed project will be designed and constructed in accordance with the applicable recommendations in the geotechnical analysis prepared for the project, therefore, impacts relating to onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse will be less than significant. See responses above in Sections VI.a)iii) and VI.a)iv).

Source: RCIP; GeoTech

d) <i>Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994 or most current edition), creating substantial risks to life or property?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Geotechnical Investigation, expansive soils are located throughout the project area. However, the proposed project will be designed and constructed in accordance with the applicable recommendations in the geotechnical analysis prepared for the project; therefore, impacts relating to expansive soils will be less than significant.

Source: GeoTech

e) <i>Have soils incapable of adequately supporting any structures, fill or other improvements associated with the project?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less than Significant Impact. The Geotechnical Investigation did not identify any support issues with existing soils. The proposed project will follow the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation Report to ensure that the soils are capable of adequately supporting the storm drain system.

Source: GeoTech; Project Design

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) <i>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less than Significant Impact. Construction and subsequent maintenance of the proposed project does not involve the routine use or transport of hazardous materials beyond the short-term use of petroleum-based fuels, lubricants, pesticides and other similar materials during construction and maintenance activities. The construction phase may include the transport of gasoline and diesel fuel to the project site and onsite storage for the sole purpose of fueling construction equipment. BMPs stipulating proper storage of hazardous materials and vehicle fueling will be implemented during construction. All transport, handling, use and disposal of substances such as petroleum products, solvents and paints related to operation and maintenance of the proposed project will comply with all Federal, State and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts related to creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials will be less than significant.

Source: Project Design

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?*

Less than Significant Impact. Since the proposed project will comply with measures including construction BMPs, transport and handling laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials, potential impacts will be less than significant. See response VII.a).

Source: Project Design

c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

No Impact. Existing or proposed schools are not located within one-quarter mile of the proposed project site. See Section VII.a).

Source: Project Design

d) *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?*

Less Than Significant Impact. A review of the Department of Toxic Substances Control's Hazardous Waste and Substances List (Cortese List) indicated that the project is not located on any identified hazardous materials sites. In addition, a review of the State Water Resources Control Board's Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Geotracker database indicates that there are no currently active hazardous material cleanup sites within the project area. However, in the unlikely event of discovery of previously unknown hazardous wastes or materials are encountered in the field during construction, ground disturbance activities in the vicinity of the discovery shall cease until a qualified hazardous materials management specialist can assess the potentially hazardous substances and, if necessary, develop appropriate management measures in coordination with the appropriate regulatory agencies.

Source: DTSC, SWRCB, EPA

e) *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?*

No Impact. The proposed project is not located within an airport's land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts are anticipated.

Source: RCIP; GIS; Project Design

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

No Impact. The proposed project is located approximately 5.5 miles from the Lake Matthews Airport. However, the project does not include permanent habitable structures that would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within the project area. No impacts are anticipated.

Source: Project Design

g) <i>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact. Neither the construction nor subsequent maintenance of the proposed project is expected to impair implementation of or physically interfere with the County's Emergency Operation Plan and Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. Vehicular access will be maintained and/or detours will be provided during project construction. It is also standard practice for the District to notify public safety agencies prior to commencing project construction activity.

Source: Project Design

h) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. During the construction process, construction equipment will be used to clear vegetation within the outlet area. As a result, there will be an increased potential for wildfire during construction. To ensure that potential impacts remain less than significant, the following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the project:

MM HAZ 1: *When work is conducted adjacent to flammable vegetation appropriate fire-fighting equipment (e.g., extinguishers, shovels, water trucks) shall be available onsite during all phases of project construction to help minimize the chance of human-caused wildfires. Shields, protective mats, and/or other fire preventative methods shall be used during grinding, welding, and other spark-inducing activities.*

Source: Project Design

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) <i>Violate or conflict with any adopted water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less Than Significant Impact. The District is required to comply with the NPDES Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit issued by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB). The project will implement appropriate BMPs to prevent new sources of stormwater pollutants and, therefore, would be in compliance with the MS4 Permit.

Source: Project Design; NPDES

b) <i>Result in substantial discharges of typical stormwater pollutants (e.g. sediment from construction activities, hydrocarbons, and metals from motor vehicles, nutrients and pesticides from landscape maintenance activities, metals of other pollutants from industrial operation,) or</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

<i>substantial changes to surface water quality including, but not limited to, temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, or turbidity?</i>				
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. The project would not create new sources of stormwater pollutants. Although it would change the timing of the delivery of storm runoff from adjacent developed area to Temescal Creek, the impact is not expected to be significant. See response VIII.a).</p>				
<p>c) <i>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)?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. The project will not result in the withdrawal or use of groundwater. The proposed project will collect and convey stormwater runoff within an underground storm drain system and will outlet into the newly created outlet area within Temescal Creek where the stormwater will have the opportunity to percolate.</p> <p>Source: Project Design</p>				
<p>d) <i>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a watercourse or wetland, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project lies within areas that are already developed or within disturbed vacant land and will not alter the existing or proposed land use within the project area. Stormwater will continue to flow to the Temescal Creek through the proposed project area. Drainage patterns within the project area will not be altered in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite.</p> <p>Source: Project Design</p>				
<p>e) <i>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 which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project will collect and convey stormwater runoff through the project area and discharge it into same outlet destination, Temescal Creek. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite.</p> <p>Source: Project Design</p>				
<p>f) <i>Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>No Impact. See response VIII.e). The proposed project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.</p> <p>Source: Project Design</p>				
<p>g) <i>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on Federal Flood Hazard boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>flood hazard delineation map?</i>				
<p>No Impact. A portion of the proposed project is located within a FEMA mapped SFHA; however, the project is not a housing project. The proposed project will reduce the exposure of people and property to local flood hazards.</p> <p>Source: Project Design</p>				
h) <i>Place structures or fill within a 100-year flood hazard area, which would impede or redirect flood flows?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>No Impact. The proposed storm drain system will be designed to convey the estimated 100-year peak flow through the project area and outlet into Temescal Creek 100-year floodplain. Construction within the SFHA will not consist of fill to impede or redirect flood flows.</p> <p>Source: Project Design; FEMA</p>				
i) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>No Impact. The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Conversely, the proposed project will increase the level of flood protection for local residents.</p> <p>Source: Project Design</p>				
j) <i>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>No Impact. The proposed project area is not subject to inundation by a seiche or tsunami. The proposed flood control facility will not increase the potential for mudflows.</p> <p>Source: Project Design</p>				
IX. LAND USE PLANNING				
<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) <i>Physically divide an established community?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>No Impact. The proposed project consists of an underground storm drain system and would not physically divide an established community.</p> <p>Source: Project Design</p>				
b) <i>Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less Than Significant Impact. As described in Section IV.f), a portion of the proposed project is located within existing MSHCP Additional Reserve Lands (ARL). The post-project condition within ARL would not change the current land use and would be biologically equivalent or superior to the pre-project condition. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with any land use designations or policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Source: Project Design; MSHCP; JPR

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) <i>Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less Than Significant Impact. A portion of the proposed outlet area is located within a zoning classification of Mineral Resources. Uses permitted within this area include agricultural uses, public utilities, water development and storage. The proposed project is not expected to affect known mineral resources due to the relatively small impact area and previous disturbances. In addition, the proposed project will not change any land uses within the project area.

Source: Project Design; RCIP; GIS

b) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The proposed project is not located within a delineated mineral resource recovery area.

Source: RCIP

XI. NOISE

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No Impact. Riverside County Ordinance 847 Section 2 (b) states that capital improvement projects of a governmental agency are exempt from noise regulations. Therefore, the proposed project will not exceed standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

Source: County Ord.

b) <i>Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less than Significant Impact. There are approximately seven (7) residential buildings that are located within 50 feet of the proposed project impact area. The proposed project would involve the temporary intermittent use of construction equipment for various construction and maintenance activities over the life of the project and may result in temporary ground-borne vibration impacts to these residential buildings.

Caltrans' Transportation and Construction Induced Vibration Guidance Manual (Manual) provides methods to estimate construction induced ground-borne vibration, and provides criteria for acceptable levels of ground-borne vibration for human perception and potential damage to buildings. Tables 4 and 5, listed as Tables 19 and 20 in the Manual, list criteria for both human perception and building damage resulting from construction induced vibration.

Table 4: Guidance Vibration Annoyance Potential Criteria

Human Response	Maximum PPV (in/sec)
	Continuous/Frequent Intermittent Sources
Barely Perceptible	0.01
Distinctly Perceptible	0.04
Strongly Perceptible	0.10
Severe	0.40

Table 5: Guidance Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria

Structure and Condition	Continuous/Frequent Intermittent Sources Maximum PPV (in/sec)
Extremely fragile historic buildings, ruins, ancient monuments	0.08
Fragile buildings	0.10
Historic and some old buildings	0.25
Older residential structures	0.30
New residential structures	0.50
Modern industrial/commercial buildings	0.50

Ground-borne vibration resulting from construction of the proposed project would be similar to a large bulldozer and a vibratory roller. Table 6 lists the estimated minimum and maximum construction induced vibration impacts at various points in the proposed project area using methods described in the Manual. The threshold for building damage was based on older residential buildings. The industrial/commercial buildings within the project area were not included in the analysis due to the distance (approximately 80 to 170 feet) of the structures from the project construction.

Table 6: Project Construction Induced Impacts (in/sec)

Equipment	Estimated Construction Induced Vibration Impacts		Threshold Intermittent Construction Induced Vibration	
	Distance at 50 feet	Distance at 25 feet	Human Perception	Building Damage
Large Bulldozer	0.04	0.09	Distinctly Perceptible	0.30
Vibratory Roller	0.098	0.210	Strongly Perceptible	0.30

The maximum estimated vibration varies from levels categorized as "Distinctly Perceptible" to "Strongly Perceptible". However, vibration levels estimated using the Manual assumes worst-case situations and actual levels are typically lower. The vibratory roller, which will cause the highest level of human perception, will only be used during the paving phase of the project and is below the threshold described as severe in Table 4. Therefore, the project will not expose residents to excessive ground-borne vibration. The maximum estimated vibration is also below the threshold for potentially causing damage to buildings. Therefore, no damage to buildings because of construction induced ground-borne vibration is expected.

Source: Project Design; Caltrans

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

No Impact. The construction, operation or maintenance of a flood control facility will not result in a permanent substantial ambient noise increase. Potential noise impacts will be limited to the temporary impacts.

Source: Project Design

d) <i>A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. The proposed project would involve the temporary intermittent use of construction equipment for various construction and maintenance activities over the life of the project. Construction and maintenance equipment may result in temporary increases above existing noise levels. Construction equipment noise generally ranges from 70 to 95 dBA at 50 feet from the source. At about 500 feet from the source, intermittent levels from the loudest construction equipment would be about 75 dBA. Maintenance activities would be infrequent and involve less equipment than the initial construction of the proposed project. Residential areas are located adjacent to the project site and could be temporarily affected by increased noise levels during construction. The long-term operation and maintenance of the proposed project would not cause a significant increase in noise levels. To ensure that potential short-term impacts are less than significant, the proposed project will incorporate the following mitigation measures:

MM NOISE 1: *Heavy equipment that may impact adjacent residential structures shall be limited from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, except under special circumstances approved by the District's General Manager-Chief Engineer.*

MM NOISE 2: *Each resident adjacent to the storm drain construction site shall be notified in writing three days prior to operation of heavy construction equipment near the residences. The notice shall include the expected work schedule and the District's contact information. The District shall alert the construction contractor of any noise complaints and incorporate any feasible and practical techniques which minimize the noise impacts on adjacent residences.*

Source: Project Design, RCIP

e) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The Proposed project is not located within an airport's land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts are anticipated.

Source: Project Design

f) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The proposed project is located approximately 5.5 miles from the Lake Matthews Airport. However, the project does not include permanent habitable structures that would expose people residing or working within the project area to excessive noise levels. No impacts are anticipated.

Source: Project Design

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
---------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------

a) <i>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) resulting in substantial adverse physical impacts or conflicts with the adopted general plan, specific plan, or other applicable land use or regional plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The proposed project does not include the construction of any new homes or businesses and is not expected to result in any change to existing land use patterns or trigger substantial growth in the area. Portions of the project area are currently zoned for residential uses and are already developed. Any development that may occur is subject to the policies of the Riverside County General Plan and to further review by the Community.

Source: Project Design

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

No Impact. The proposed project will not displace any existing housing.

Source: Project Design

c) <i>Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The proposed project will not displace people, and therefore, will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Source: Project Design

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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 following public services:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------

i. <i>Fire protection?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No Impact. The proposed project would not require new fire protection services.				
ii. <i>Police protection?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No Impact. The proposed project would not require new police services.				
iii. <i>Schools?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No Impact. The proposed project would not affect existing schools or require new schools within the area.				
iv. <i>Parks?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No Impact. Additional demands on existing public parks would not occur. New or improved park facilities would not be necessary as a result of the proposed project.				
v. <i>Other public facilities?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>No Impact. Public roads and flood control facilities are the only public facilities that may be impacted by the proposed project. Once completed, the proposed project will reduce the potential for flood damages to public roads and reduce the need for flood control facilities located in the vicinity of the project area. Thus, the need to maintain and repair public facilities due to flood associated damage will be reduced. Other public facilities will not be impacted by the proposed project.</p> <p>Source: Project Design</p>				
XIV. RECREATION				
<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) <i>Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>No Impact. The proposed project would not impact or increase the use of recreational facilities, neighborhood parks or regional parks.</p> <p>Source: Project Design</p>				
b) <i>Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>No Impact. The proposed project does not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.</p> <p>Source: Project Design</p>				

XV. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
<p>a) <i>Conflict with an adopted plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures 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?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less than Significant Impact. The adopted Congestion Management Plan (CMP) includes a Travel Demand Management (TDM) element which consists of programs and strategies that are intended to reduce and reshape, use of the transportation systems. By promoting alternative modes of transportation, increasing vehicle occupancy, maximizing the efficient use of parking, reducing travel distances, and easing peak-hour congestion, these strategies and programs help to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the transportation system.

Examples of TDM programs include rideshare, bus rapid transit, and the development of a system of pedestrian and bike paths. The TDM also includes the Western Riverside County Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (WROCG-NMTP) which provides a regional network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. While the TDM does not provide a specific measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, which takes into account various alternative modes of transportation, disruption of TDM programs may conflict with the TDM goal of increasing the effectiveness of the transportation system.

Any potential traffic impacts will be limited to the construction phase. Long-term traffic impacts will not occur, as the Project would not create uses that would increase trip generation to the site. The project will include the implementation of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP). Temporary street and lane closures during construction will be kept at minimum and will be coordinated with the County to ensure that adverse impacts to traffic flow remain less than significant.

Since impacts to TDM elements will not occur, and the project will minimize temporary impacts with the implementation of a TCP, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Source: Project Design, CMP

<p>b) <i>Conflict with an adopted congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the appropriate congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project is not located within a State Highway or Principal Arterial designated within the RCTC 2011 CMP. Although the proposed project would generate a minor amount of daily construction-related trips during construction, and fewer maintenance-related trips, as discussed in Response XV.a), these trips would not be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load, capacity of intersections, street segments and freeways within the project area. Therefore, the project is not expected to conflict with the CMP.

Source: CMP, Project Design

<p>c) <i>Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The proposed project does not change the existing design of the roads. Infrequent maintenance traffic would be compatible with the road use in its post-project condition.

Source: Project Design

d) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. Although the operation and maintenance of the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access, the construction of the proposed project is expected to result in temporary lane closures of local roads for approximately eight (8) hours per day. The TCP will detail and coordinate all traffic movement through the project area and will be implemented throughout project construction. The TCP will also ensure that private property and emergency access will be maintained at all times. Methods to maintain access may include, but are not limited to: temporary bridge crossings (i.e., steel plates or structural design bridges) for all driveway entrances to be closed to vehicular access for any period exceeding four (4) hours; use of construction signs, barricades and delineators; and the use of flaggers during construction. With the implementation of the TCP, combined with the short-term nature of the lane closures and the inclusion of the following mitigation measure, impacts to emergency access will be less than significant.

MM TRANS 1: *Emergency vehicles shall have access through the project site at all times during construction.*

Source: Project Design

e) *Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?*

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project site will not affect any existing parking facilities. The project site is expected to provide sufficient temporary parking areas for construction workers and equipment. Temporary parking related to construction activities is typically on or adjacent to the construction site. The project will not create long-term trip generation requiring parking. Parking for residences and businesses along portions of Foster Road and Temescal Canyon Road will be unavailable during construction; however, due to the temporary nature of the project, the impact is expected to be less than significant.

Source: Project Design

f) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, pedestrian facilities, or other alternate transportation or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?*

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

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed in response XV.a) potential impacts to public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities are considered to be less than significant.

Source: Project Design, CMP

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) <i>Impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</i>				

<i>Electricity</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No Impact. The construction of the project would not require additional electrical facilities.				
<i>Natural Gas</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No Impact. The construction of the project would not require additional natural gas facilities.				
<i>Communication System</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No Impact. The construction of the project would not require additional communication systems facilities.				
<i>Public facilities, including roads and bridges</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No Impact. The construction of the project would not require additional public facilities. Source: Project Design				
b) <i>Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No Impact. The proposed project consists of the construction of a new storm drain facility and street improvements to alleviate flooding within the project area. Additional drainage facilities will not be required as a result of the proposed project. Source: Project Design				
c) <i>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No Impact. The proposed project will not require the long-term use of water supplies. The proposed project will only require the temporary use of water during construction. Existing water supplies are expected to be adequate. Source: Project Design				
d) <i>Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No Impact. The proposed project would not generate wastewater or require wastewater treatment services. No new wastewater facilities are required as a result of the proposed project. Source: Project Design				
e) <i>Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project may generate a limited amount of solid waste during construction. In addition, subsequent maintenance may involve occasional trash and debris removal from the				

facility. However, the limited amount of solid waste generated during construction and subsequent maintenance of the project would not be substantial or interfere with the capacity of nearby existing solid waste disposal facilities.

Source: Project Design

f) <i>Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. Any waste disposal that is required during project construction or maintenance will be done in compliance with the appropriate statutes and regulations.

Source: Project Design

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) <i>Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less than Significant Impact. As indicated in this Initial Study, the project's potential impacts to the environment, wildlife species, plant or animal community and cultural resources will not occur, and will be either less than significant or will be mitigated below a level of significance.

b) <i>Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed in this document, potential adverse impacts are temporary and will cease upon construction completion. Further, due to the project's relatively small area of impact and short construction duration, potential impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

c) <i>Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed previously in this document, the construction of the proposed project will temporarily increase noise levels to those persons who reside near the project alignment. With the incorporation of the mitigation measures described in Section XI, potential noise impacts will be less than significant. Other potential adverse impacts to human beings are not expected to occur.

REFERENCES

- Cited As: Source:
- AQMP South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Air Quality Management Plan 2007*, June 2007. (Available at: SCAQMD)
- BIO Glenn Lukos Associates, *General Biological Report*, September 23, 2011
- CalEEMod The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) 2011 model (version CalEEMod 2011.1.1). (Available at: <http://www.caleemod.com/>)
- Caltrans Jones & Stokes, 2004, Transportation and construction induced vibration guidance manual, June (J&S 02-039). Sacramento, CA. Prepared for California Department of Transportation, Noise, Vibration and Hazardous Waste Management Office, Sacramento, CA
- CARB California Air Resources Board, *Area Designation Maps / State and National*, 2006. (Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm>)
- CMP Riverside County Transportation Commission, *2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program*, December 14, 2011
- Conservation California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Important Farmland Map, Western Riverside County, 2004. (ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2006/riv06_west.pdf)
- County Ord County Ordinances. (Available at <http://rivcocob.com/ords.htm>)
- CULT Archaeological Associates, *Phase 1 Cultural Resources Assessment of the 11 ± Acre Temescal Creek – Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1 Project, Community of El Cerrito, Corona, Riverside County*, June 28, 2011
- DBESP Glenn Lukos Associates, *Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) Analysis for Impacts to MSHCP Riparian/Riverine Areas Temescal Creek – Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1 Project*, September 20, 2011
- DTSC California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List (Cortese List), website accessed September 27, 2005. (Available at: <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/default.htm>)
- EPA US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), EnviroMapper, (Available at <http://www.epa.gov/waters/enviromapper/>)
- EIC Eastern Information Center, Cultural Resources Records Search for the Temescal Creek – Foster Storm Drain, Stage 1 Project, February 1, 2010.
- GeoTech Inland Foundation Engineering, Inc., *Geotechnical Investigation Foster Road Storm Drain Project No. 2-8-00493-01*, June 27, 2011
- GIS County of Riverside, Geographic Information System Database. (Available at: <http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rcgis/index.html>)

- JD Glenn Lukos Associates, *Jurisdictional Report for the Temescal Creek Foster Road Storm Drain Stage 1 Project, Unincorporated Riverside County, California*, May 6, 2010
- JPR Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority, *JPR 12-01-21-01*, February 12, 2013
- MSHCP Western Riverside County, Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, Final Version, Adopted June 17, 2003. (Available at Riverside County Planning and at: <http://www.rctlma.org/mshcp/index.html>)
- NAHC Native American Heritage Commission, Request for Sacred Lands File Search and Native American Contacts list for a Proposed "Temescal Creek – Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1 Project," located in western Riverside County near the City of Lake Elsinore; Riverside County, California, January 29, 2010.
- NPDES National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System compliance documentation. (Available at: <http://rcflood.org/NPDES/>).
- PALEO Archaeological Associates, *Pre-Construction Paleontological Assessment of the Temescal Creek – Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1, Riverside County, California*, June 9, 2011
- RCIP Riverside County Integrated Project, County of Riverside General Plan, Final Version, Adopted October 7, 2003. (Available at Riverside County Planning and at: www.rctlma.org)
- SCAQMD South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 1993, with November 1993 Update. (Available at SCAQMD)
- SWRCB State Water Resources Control Board, Geotracker. (Available at: <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/>).

Appendix A

Air Quality CalEEMod

Temescal Creek - Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1
Riverside-South Coast County, Annual

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Months
User Defined Commercial	0	User Defined Unit
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0.08	Acre

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.4	Utility Company
Climate Zone	10	Precipitation Freq (Days)	26	

1.3 User Entered Comments

- Project Characteristics -
- Land Use - 0.08 acre will be paved after the underground storm drain installation.
- Construction Phase - Total duration of construction: 3 months.
- Off-road Equipment - 2 Crawler Tractors @ 8 hrs/day
- 2 Excavators @ 8 hrs/day
- 1 Rubber Tired Loader @ 8 hrs/day
- 2 Signal Boards @ 8 hrs/day
- 1 Tractor/Loader/Backhoe @ 8 hrs/day

Off-road Equipment - 1 Paver @ 8 hrs/day
1 Roller @ 8 hrs/day
1 Paving Equipment @ 8 hrs/day
Grading - 45334 CY Exported
Total Acres Disturbed: 3.56
Trips and VMT - Hauling Trip Length: 20 miles roundtrip
Vendor Trips: 1 Water Truck
Consumer Products - Consumer products emissions are not applicable to Flood Control Projects.
Land Use Change -
Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation - Water exposed area 3 times a day.
Street Sweeping.

2.0 Emissions Summary

2.1 Overall Construction

Unmitigated Construction

Year	t/yr										MTPa							
	CO2	NOx	SO2	CO	SO3	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	NO-CO2	MSW-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
2014	0.23	1.77	1.18	0.00	0.00	1.89	0.10	1.79	0.00	0.10	0.11	0.00	219.98	219.98	0.02	0.00	0.00	220.32
Total	0.23	1.77	1.18	0.00	0.00	1.89	0.10	1.79	0.00	0.10	0.11	0.00	219.98	219.98	0.02	0.00	0.00	220.32

Mitigated Construction

Year	t/yr										MTPa							
	CO2	NOx	SO2	CO	SO3	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	NO-CO2	MSW-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
2014	0.23	1.77	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.88	0.10	0.88	0.00	0.10	0.11	0.00	219.98	219.98	0.02	0.00	0.00	220.32
Total	0.23	1.77	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.88	0.10	0.88	0.00	0.10	0.11	0.00	219.98	219.98	0.02	0.00	0.00	220.32

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

Category	Energy											MTHr					
	RGIS	NOX	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SB-CO2	MB-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Area	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Energy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Mobile	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Waste					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Water					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

2.2 Overall Operational

Mitigated Operational

Category	tonnes/yr											MT/yr					
	SO ₂	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	Fugitive PM ₁₀	Exhaust PM ₁₀	PM ₁₀ Total	Fugitive PM _{2.5}	Exhaust PM _{2.5}	PM _{2.5} Total	Exhaust CO ₂	Mobile CO ₂	Total CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e	
Aves	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Waste	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Water	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

2.3 Vegetation

Vegetation

Category	tonnes			MT		
	SO ₂	NO _x	CO ₂ e	SO ₂	NO _x	CO ₂ e
Vegetation Land Change	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Water Exposed Area
Clean Paved Roads

3.2 Grading - 2014

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

Category	ton/day										MT/yr				
	NOx	SOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Onsite PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SOx-CO2	NOx-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Fugitive Dust					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Off-Road	0.14	0.94	0.70	0.00	0.07	0.07		0.07	0.07	0.00	97.14	97.14	0.01	0.00	97.39
Total	0.14	0.94	0.70	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.00	97.14	97.14	0.01	0.00	97.39

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

Category	ton/day										MT/yr				
	NOx	SOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Onsite PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SOx-CO2	NOx-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Hauling	0.07	0.75	0.40	0.00	1.68	1.71	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.00	110.35	110.35	0.00	0.00	110.42
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.69	0.69	0.00	0.00	0.69
Worker	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.84	4.84	0.00	0.00	4.84
Total	0.07	0.75	0.43	0.00	1.69	1.72	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.00	115.88	115.88	0.00	0.00	115.95

3.2 Grading - 2014

Mitigated Construction On-Site

Category	t/year										t/tyr					
	PM10	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Site-CO2	NRB-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Fugitive Dust					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Off-Road	0.14	0.84	0.70	0.00		0.07	0.07		0.07	0.07	0.00	87.14	87.14	0.01	0.00	87.39
Total	0.14	0.84	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.00	87.14	87.14	0.01	0.00	87.39

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

Category	t/year										t/tyr					
	PM10	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Site-CO2	NRB-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Hauling	0.07	0.76	0.40	0.00	0.57	0.03	0.60	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.00	110.35	110.35	0.00	0.00	110.42
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.89	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.89
Worker	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.84	4.84	0.00	0.00	4.84
Total	0.07	0.76	0.43	0.00	0.57	0.03	0.60	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.00	115.38	115.38	0.00	0.00	115.95

3.3 Paving - 2014

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

Category	Vendor										MT/yr						
	SO2	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SO2	NOx	CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Off-Road	0.01	0.08	0.05	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.62	0.00	0.00	6.64
Paving	0.00				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.01	0.08	0.05	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.62	0.00	0.00	6.64

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

Category	Vendor										MT/yr						
	SO2	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SO2	NOx	CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Worker	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.35
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.35

3.3 Paving - 2014

Mitigated Construction On-Site

Category	On-Site										Off-Site						
	SO ₂	CO	NOx	CO	SO ₂	Fugitive PM ₁₀	Exhaust PM ₁₀	PM ₁₀ Total	Fugitive PM _{2.5}	Exhaust PM _{2.5}	PM _{2.5} Total	Site CO ₂	Mobile CO ₂	Total CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
Off-Road	0.01	0.08	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	6.62	0.00	0.00	6.64
Paving	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.01	0.08	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	6.62	0.00	0.00	6.64

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

Category	On-Site										Off-Site						
	SO ₂	CO	NOx	CO	SO ₂	Fugitive PM ₁₀	Exhaust PM ₁₀	PM ₁₀ Total	Fugitive PM _{2.5}	Exhaust PM _{2.5}	PM _{2.5} Total	Site CO ₂	Mobile CO ₂	Total CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Worker	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.36
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.36

4.0 Mobile Detail

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

Category	Weekly										MT/yr			
	MOB	NOV	CO	SO2	PM10	PM10	PM2.5	PM2.5	PM2.5	PM2.5	SO2	NO2	CO2e	CO2e
Mitigated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Unmitigated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

4.2 Trip Summary Information

Land Use	Average Daily Trip Rate		Unmitigated Annual VMT	Mitigated Annual VMT
	Weekday	Weekend		
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
User Defined Commercial	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

4.3 Trip Type Information

Land Use	Piles			Trip %		
	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-MW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-MW
Other Asphalt Surfaces	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00
User Defined Commercial	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00

6.0 Energy Detail

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

Category	tCO ₂ e/yr										MT/yr					
	ROB	NOx	CO	SO ₂	Fugitive PM10	Estimate PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Estimate PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Site CO ₂	Non-CO ₂	Total CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
Electricity Mitigated						0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Electricity Unmitigated						0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NaturalGas Mitigated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NaturalGas Unmitigated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

6.2 Energy by Land Use - Natural Gas

Unmitigated

Land Use	Tons/yr											MT/yr				
	NOx	CO	SO ₂	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SOx-CO2	NOx-CO2	Total CO2	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e		
Industrial Gas Use MFTU																
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
User Defined Commercial	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		

Mitigated

Land Use	Tons/yr											MT/yr				
	NOx	CO	SO ₂	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SOx-CO2	NOx-CO2	Total CO2	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e		
Industrial Gas Use MFTU																
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
User Defined Commercial	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		

6.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity

Unmitigated

Land Use	Electricity Use MWh	tons/yr									
		ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Total CO2e	CH4	N2O	CO2e		
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
User Defined Commercial	0					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Mitigated

Land Use	Electricity Use MWh	tons/yr									
		ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Total CO2e	CH4	N2O	CO2e		
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
User Defined Commercial	0					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

Category	t/yr										MTP/yr					
	SO2	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Stationary PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Stationary PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Biogenic CO2	NRto CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Mitigated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Unmitigated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Unmitigated

SubCategory	t/yr										MTP/yr					
	SO2	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Stationary PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Stationary PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Biogenic CO2	NRto CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Architectural Coating	0.00					0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Consumer	0.00					0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Landscaping	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Mitigated

SubCategory	Yearly										MT/y					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Schedule PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Schedule PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SOx-CO2	NOx-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Architectural Coating	0.00					0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Consumer Products	0.00					0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Landscaping	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

Category	Mitigated						Unmitigated					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Total CO2	GH4	GH3	GH2	GH1	GH0	CO2e	
Mitigated					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Unmitigated					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	

7.2 Water by Land Use

Unmitigated

Land Use	Inflow/Outflow Use	Mitigated						Unmitigated					
		ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Total CO2	GH4	GH3	GH2	GH1	GH0	CO2e	
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0/0					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
User Defined Commercial	0/0					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Total						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		

7.2 Water by Land Use

Mitigated

Land Use	Other Customers Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0/0					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
User Defined Commercial	0/0					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

Category/Year

Category/Year	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Mitigated					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Unmitigated					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

8.2 Waste by Land Use

Unmitigated

Land Use	Waste Disposed (tons)	ton/yr						\$/yr						
		ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	ROG	NOx	CO2e		
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
User Defined Commercial	0					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Mitigated

Land Use	Waste Disposed (tons)	ton/yr						\$/yr						
		ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	ROG	NOx	CO2e		
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
User Defined Commercial	0					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

9.0 Vegetation

Category	NO2	NOx	CO	SO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Unmitigated					51.06	0.00	0.00	51.06
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

9.1 Vegetation Land Change

Vegetation Type

Vegetation Type	Indirect	ROE	ROF	CO	SO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Trees	0.38 / 0.85					51.06	0.00	0.00	51.06
Total						51.06	0.00	0.00	51.06

Temescal Creek - Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1
Riverside-South Coast County, Summer

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric
User Defined Commercial	0	User Defined Unit
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0.08	Acres

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.4	Utility Company
Climate Zone	10	Precipitation Freq (Days)	28	

1.3 User Entered Comments

- Project Characteristics -
 Land Use - 0.08 acre will be paved after the underground storm drain installation.
 Construction Phase - Total duration of construction: 3 months.
 Off-road Equipment - 2 Crawler Tractors @ 8 hrs/day
 2 Excavators @ 8 hrs/day
 1 Rubber Tired Loader @ 8 hrs/day
 2 Signal Boards @ 8 hrs/day
 1 Tractor/Loader/Backhoe @ 8 hrs/day

Off-road Equipment - 1 Paver @ 8 hrs/day
1 Roller @ 8 hrs/day
1 Paving Equipment @ 8 hrs/day
Grading - 45334 CY Exported
Total Acres Disturbed: 3.56
Trips and VMT - Hauling Trip Length: 20 miles roundtrip
Vendor Trips: 1 Water Truck
Consumer Products - Consumer products emissions are not applicable to Flood Control Projects.
Land Use Change -
Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation - Water exposed area 3 times a day.
Street Sweeping.

2.0 Emissions Summary

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

Year	t/day											t/day				
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	MBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
2014	7.54	60.57	39.25	0.08	68.51	3.37	69.88	0.17	3.37	3.54	0.00	8,423.50	0.00	0.88	0.00	8,435.69
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Mitigated Construction

Year	t/day											t/day				
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	MBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
2014	7.64	60.67	39.25	0.08	22.72	3.37	26.09	0.16	3.37	3.63	0.00	8,423.50	0.00	0.88	0.00	8,435.69
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

Category	t/day										t/day				
	NOx	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM10	PM10	PM2.5	PM2.5	PM2.5	PM2.5	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Area	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Mitigated Operational

Category	t/day										t/day				
	NOx	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM10	PM10	PM2.5	PM2.5	PM2.5	PM2.5	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Area	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Water Exposed Area
Clean Paved Roads

3.2 Grading - 2014

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

Category	On-Site										Off-Site					
	SO ₂	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	Fugitive PM ₁₀	Exhaust PM ₁₀	PM ₁₀ Total	Fugitive PM _{2.5}	Exhaust PM _{2.5}	PM _{2.5} Total	SO ₂	NO _x	CO	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
Fugitive Dust					0.17	0.00	0.17	0.02	0.00	0.02						0.00
Off-Road	5.09	33.95	25.01	0.04		2.41	2.41		2.41	2.41				0.45		3,854.96
Total	5.09	33.95	25.01	0.04	0.17	2.41	2.58	0.02	2.41	2.43				0.45		3,854.96

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

Category	On-Site										Off-Site					
	SO ₂	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	Fugitive PM ₁₀	Exhaust PM ₁₀	PM ₁₀ Total	Fugitive PM _{2.5}	Exhaust PM _{2.5}	PM _{2.5} Total	SO ₂	NO _x	CO	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
Hauling					66.07	0.96	67.02	0.14	0.96	1.09				0.11		4,387.12
Vendor	0.01	0.15	0.07	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01				0.00		27.24
Worker	0.09	0.10	1.22	0.00	0.26	0.01	0.27	0.01	0.01	0.02				0.01		206.39
Total	2.45	27.02	14.24	0.04	66.34	0.96	67.30	0.15	0.96	1.12				0.12		4,600.74

3.2 Grading - 2014

Mitigated Construction On-Site

Category	On-Site										Off-Site				
	SO ₂	CO	NO _x	CO ₂	Fugitive PM ₁₀	Exhaust PM ₁₀	PM ₁₀ Total	Fugitive PM _{2.5}	Exhaust PM _{2.5}	PM _{2.5} Total	SO ₂	CO ₂	CH ₄	NO _x	CO _{2e}
Fugitive Dust	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Off-Road	5.09	33.55	25.01	0.04	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	0.00	3,825.40	0.45	0.00	3,854.96
Total	5.09	33.55	25.01	0.04	2.41	2.41	2.48	0.01	2.41	2.42	0.00	3,825.40	0.45	0.00	3,834.95

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

Category	On-Site										Off-Site				
	SO ₂	CO	NO _x	CO ₂	Fugitive PM ₁₀	Exhaust PM ₁₀	PM ₁₀ Total	Fugitive PM _{2.5}	Exhaust PM _{2.5}	PM _{2.5} Total	SO ₂	CO ₂	CH ₄	NO _x	CO _{2e}
Hauling	2.35	26.77	12.85	0.04	22.58	0.95	23.51	0.14	0.85	1.09	0.11	4,364.72	0.11	0.00	4,367.12
Vendor	0.01	0.15	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	27.23	0.00	0.00	27.24
Worker	0.09	0.10	1.22	0.00	0.10	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	206.15	0.01	0.00	206.38
Total	2.45	27.02	14.24	0.04	22.68	0.96	23.62	0.15	0.86	1.12	0.12	4,598.10	0.12	0.00	4,600.74

3.3 Paving - 2014

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

Category	On-Site										Off-Site			
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SO2	NOx	CO	CO2e
Off-Road	2.80	16.06	10.35	0.02		1.37	1.37		1.37	1.37		0.23		1,463.74
Paving	0.02					0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00				0.00
Total	2.82	16.06	10.35	0.02		1.37	1.37		1.37	1.37		0.23		1,463.74

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

Category	On-Site										Off-Site			
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SO2	NOx	CO	CO2e
Heating	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Worker	0.04	0.04	0.49	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	82.46	82.95
Total	0.04	0.04	0.49	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	82.46	82.95

3.3 Paving - 2014

Mitigated Construction On-Site

Category	On-Site										Off-Site					
	RO2	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SO2	NOx	CO	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Off-Road	2.80	16.05	10.35	0.02		1.37	1.37		1.37	1.37	0.00	0.00	1.458.82	0.23		1,463.74
Paving	0.02					0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00						0.00
Total	2.82	16.05	10.35	0.02		1.37	1.37		1.37	1.37	0.00	0.00	1,458.82	0.23		1,463.74

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

Category	On-Site										Off-Site					
	RO2	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SO2	NOx	CO	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00
Worker	0.04	0.04	0.49	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.01			82.46	0.00		82.55
Total	0.04	0.04	0.49	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.01			82.46	0.00		82.55

4.0 Mobile Detail

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

Category	Day										Night						
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Estimate PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Estimate PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SO2	NOx	CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Mitigated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Unmitigated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

4.2 Trip Summary Information

Land Use	Average Daily Trip Rate			Unmitigated Annual VMT	Mitigated Annual VMT
	Weekday	Subsudy	Sunday		
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
User Defined Commercial	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

4.3 Trip Type Information

Land Use	Miles				Tip %	
	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-S	H-O or C-M	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-S	H-O or C-M
Other Asphalt Surfaces	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00
User Defined Commercial	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00

5.0 Energy Detail

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

Category	Safety																
	NO2	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bi-CO2	MB-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
NaturalGas	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mitigated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NaturalGas Unmitigated	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Unmitigated

Land Use	Safety																
	NaturalGas Use (BFTU)	SO2	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bi-CO2	MB-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
User Defined Commercial	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

5.2 Energy by Land Use - Natural Gas

Mitigated

Land Use	Natural Gas Use MSTU	t/Day																
		ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	EtH- CO2	NRH- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
User Defined Commercial	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

Category	t/Day																
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	EtH- CO2	NRH- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Mitigated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Unmitigated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Unmitigated

SubCategory	t/day															
	SO2	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SB-CO2	NB-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Architectural Coating	0.00					0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00						0.00
Consumer Products	0.00					0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00						0.00
Landscaping	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00		0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00		0.00

Mitigated

SubCategory	t/day															
	SO2	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	SB-CO2	NB-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Architectural Coating	0.00					0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00						0.00
Consumer Products	0.00					0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00						0.00
Landscaping	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00		0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00		0.00

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

9.0 Vegetation

Temescal Creek - Foster Road Storm Drain, Stage 1
Riverside-South Coast County, Winter

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Usage	Size	Metric
User Defined Commercial	0	User Defined Unit
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0.08	Acres

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.4	Utility Company
Climate Zone	10	Precipitation Freq (Days)	28	

1.3 User Entered Comments

- Project Characteristics -
 Land Use - 0.08 acre will be paved after the underground storm drain installation.
 Construction Phase - Total duration of construction: 3 months.
 Off-road Equipment - 2 Crawler Tractors @ 8 hrs/day
 2 Excavators @ 8 hrs/day
 1 Rubber Tired Loader @ 8 hrs/day
 2 Signal Boards @ 8 hrs/day
 1 Tractor/Loader/Backhoe @ 8 hrs/day

Off-road Equipment - 1 Paver @ 8 hrs/day
1 Roller @ 8 hrs/day
1 Paving Equipment @ 8 hrs/day
Grading - 45334 CY Exported
Total Acres Disturbed: 3.56
Trips and VMT - Hauling Trip Length: 20 miles roundtrip
Vendor Trips: 1 Water Truck
Consumer Products - Consumer products emissions are not applicable to Flood Control Projects.
Land Use Change -
Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation - Water exposed area 3 times a day.
Street Sweeping.

2.0 Emissions Summary

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

Year	t/daily										t/daily					
	NOx	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO ₂	NRB-CO ₂	Total CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
2014	7.64	61.38	41.14	0.08	66.51	3.39	69.90	0.17	3.39	3.56	0.00	8,361.74	0.00	0.58	0.00	8,364.01
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Mitigated Construction

Year	t/daily										t/daily					
	NOx	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO ₂	NRB-CO ₂	Total CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
2014	7.64	61.38	41.14	0.08	22.72	3.39	26.12	0.16	3.39	3.55	0.00	8,361.74	0.00	0.58	0.00	8,364.01
Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA