truck transfer facilities). The proposed Project does not include such uses; therefore, due to the lack of stationary source emissions, no long-term localized significance threshold analysis is needed. No impact would occur under long-term operation associated with LSTs. (Urban Crossroads, 2013a, p. 29)

Table EA-5 Summary of Peak Operational Emissions

Summer Months

Operational Activities	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Area Source Emissions [a]	15.91	0.63	44.57	0.09	5.71	5.71
Energy Source Emissions [b]	0.13	1.09	0.47	0.01	0.09	0.09
Mobile Emissions [c]	6.22	16.03	63.51	0.11	12.62	0.79
Maximum Daily Emissions	**22.26**	**17.75**	**108.55**	**0.21**	**18.42**	**6.59**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant?	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**

Winter Months

Operational Activities	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Area Source Emissions [a]	15.91	0.63	44.57	0.09	5.71	5.71
Energy Source Emissions [b]	0.13	1.09	0.47	0.01	0.09	0.09
Mobile Emissions [c]	6.58	17.27	61.30	0.10	12.63	0.80
Maximum Daily Emissions	**22.62**	**18.99**	**106.34**	**0.20**	**18.43**	**6.60**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant?	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**

Note: Refer to Appendix A of the Air Quality Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix C) for the CalEEMod™ output files and additional supporting information for the estimated emissions.
Emissions shown are pounds per day.
a Includes emissions of landscape maintenance equipment and architectural coatings emissions
b Includes emissions of natural gas consumption
c Includes emissions of vehicle emissions and fugitive dust related to vehicular travel
(Urban Crossroads, 2013a, Table 3-4)

Conclusion

As indicated in the above analysis, no impacts would occur based on the SCAQMD regional thresholds during construction activities or long-term operation. Additionally, long-term operation of the proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD LSTs. Implementation of the proposed Project does, however, have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD LSTs during construction activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1 and M-AQ-2 have been imposed on the Project and would reduce the Project's emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ during construction to below the SCAQMD LSTs for these pollutants. Accordingly, and as shown in Table EA-4, with implementation of the required mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a level below significant.

d) The proposed Project has the potential to expose nearby sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during Project construction and long-term operation. Sensitive receptors can include uses such as long term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, and retirement homes. Residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities can also be considered as sensitive receptors. Potential sensitive receptors in the Project vicinity include existing residences that may be located in close proximity to the Project site. Based on an aerial review, the nearest sensitive receptors include existing residential units located north of Yates Road and east of Denali Way immediately adjacent to the Project's western boundary. (Urban Crossroads, 2013a, p. 33).

Construction and Operational LST Analysis

As indicated above under the discussion and analysis of Thresholds 6.b) and 6.c), near-term construction activities associated with the proposed Project have the potential to expose nearby sensitive receptors to PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions that exceed the SCAQMD LSTs (refer also to Table EA-3). However, Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1 and M-AQ-2 have been imposed on the Project and would reduce the Project's emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ during construction to below the SCAQMD LSTs for these pollutants. Accordingly, and assuming implementation of the required mitigation, impacts to nearby sensitive receptors that could occur during construction of the proposed Project would be reduced to a level below significance (as shown in Table EA-4). Due to the lack of stationary source emissions associated with the proposed Project, there would be no impacts due to the exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during long-term operation.

CO "Hot Spot" Analysis

A carbon monoxide (CO) "hot spots" analysis is conducted to determine whether the change in the level of service (LOS) of an intersection due to the Project would have the potential to result in exceedances of the California or National Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS or NAAQS). (Urban Crossroads, 2013a, p. 29)

It has long been recognized that CO exceedances are caused by vehicular emissions, primarily when idling at intersections. Vehicle emissions standards have become increasingly more stringent in the last twenty years. Currently, the CO standard in California is a maximum of 3.4 grams/mile for passenger cars (there are requirements for certain vehicles that are more stringent). With the turnover of older vehicles, introduction of cleaner fuels and implementation of control technology on industrial facilities, CO concentrations in the Project vicinity have steadily declined, as shown based on historical data presented in Table 2-3 of the Project's Air Quality Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix C). Accordingly, with the steadily decreasing CO emissions from vehicles, even very busy intersections do not result in exceedances of the CO standard. (Urban Crossroads, 2013a, p. 29)

The analysis prepared for CO attainment in the SCAB by the SCAQMD can be used to assist in evaluating the potential for CO exceedances in the South Coast Air Basin. CO attainment was thoroughly analyzed as part of the SCAQMD's 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (2003 AQMP) and the 1992 Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide (1992 CO Plan). As discussed in the 1992 CO Plan, peak carbon monoxide concentrations in the South Coast Air Basin are due to unusual meteorological and topographical conditions, and not due to the operation of particular intersections. Considering the region's unique meteorological conditions and the increasingly stringent CO emissions standards, CO modeling was performed as part of 1992 CO Plan and subsequent plan updates and air quality management plans. (Urban Crossroads, 2013a, p. 29) Table 3-7 of the Project's Air Quality Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix C) provides a summary of the modeled CO concentrations at the four intersections modeled in the 2003 AQMP. (Urban Crossroads, 2013a, pp. 29-30)

A comparison of the traffic volumes (for the four highest volume intersections) is included in Table 3-8 and (for the three intersections of the Project) in Table 3-9 of the Project's Air Quality Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix C), and shows that the proposed Project's traffic volumes would be considerably less than those included in the AQMP modeling analysis (Table 3-8). Consequently at buildout of the Project, according to the Project's Traffic Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix J), none of the intersections in the vicinity of the proposed Project site would have peak hourly traffic volumes

exceeding those at the intersections modeled in the 2003 AQMP, nor would there be any reason unique to Project area meteorology to conclude that this intersection would yield higher CO concentrations if modeled in detail. Additionally, the South Coast Air Basin has been designated as attainment for CO since 2007 (SCAQMD 2007) and even very busy intersections do not result in exceedances of the CO standard. Accordingly, the Project would not result in or contribute to any CO violations, and a less-than-significant impact would occur. (Urban Crossroads, 2013a, p. 30)

Conclusion

Based on the analysis presented above, and assuming incorporation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1 and M-AQ-2, the proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors which are located within one mile of the Project site to substantial point source emissions, and impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

e) Under existing conditions, land uses within one mile of the Project site largely consist of residential homes, undeveloped lands, agricultural uses, rural residential uses, and public facilities (including the Temecula Valley Charter School and Metropolitan Water District facilities associated with Lake Skinner). There are no uses within one mile of the Project site that comprise a "substantial point source emitter." In addition, according to SWAP Figure 3, there are no lands within one mile of the proposed Project site that are designated for Industrial land uses. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter, and no impact would occur.

f) The Project does not contain land uses typically associated with emitting objectionable odors. Potential odor sources associated with the proposed Project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities, and the temporary storage of typical solid waste (refuse) associated with the proposed Project's (long-term operational) uses. Standard construction requirements would minimize odor impacts resulting from construction activity. It should be noted that any construction odor emissions generated would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction activity and is thus considered less than significant. It is expected that Project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the County's solid waste regulations. The proposed Project would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, odors associated with the proposed Project construction and operations would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Urban Crossroads, 2013a, pp. 33-34)

Mitigation:

M-AQ-1 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.023) The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, "Fugitive Dust." Rule 403 requires implementation of best available dust control measures during construction activities that generate fugitive dust, such as earth moving activities, grading, and equipment travel on unpaved roads. Prior to grading permit issuance, the County shall verify that the following notes are included on the grading plan. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by County of Riverside staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.

- During grading and ground-disturbing construction activities, the construction contractor shall ensure that all unpaved roads, active soil stockpiles, and areas undergoing active ground disturbance within the Project site are watered at least three (3) times daily during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas by water truck, sprinkler system or other comparable means, shall occur in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work has been completed for the day.

- Temporary signs shall be installed on the construction site along all unpaved roads and/or unpaved haul routes indicating a maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour (MPH). The signs shall be installed before construction activities commence and remain in place during the duration of vehicle activities on all unpaved roads unpaved haul routes.

M-AQ-2 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.024) Prior to grading permit final inspection, the Project is required to provide proof of compliance with California Code of Regulations Title 13, Division 3, Chapter 10, Article 1, Section 2485, "Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling." Prior to grading permit issuance and building permit issuance, the County shall verify that the following note is included on the grading and building plans

- Temporary signs shall be placed on the construction site at all construction vehicle entry points and at all loading, unloading, and equipment staging areas indicating that heavy duty trucks and diesel powered construction equipment are prohibited from idling for more than five (5) minutes. The signs shall be installed before construction activities commence and remain in place during the duration of construction activities at all loading, unloading, and equipment staging areas.

Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the note and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by County of Riverside staff or its designee to confirm compliance. This note also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.

M-AQ-3 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.025) Active grading and ground-disturbing activities shall be limited to a maximum of five (5) acres on any given day.

Monitoring:

M-AQ-1 Prior to grading permit issuance, the County shall verify that the required notes are included on the grading plan. During construction activities, the construction contractor shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes. The construction contractor also shall allow for inspection by Riverside County staff or its designee to verify compliance.

M-AQ-2 Prior to grading or building permit issuance, the County shall verify that the required note is included on grading and/or building plans. During construction activities, the construction contractor shall be responsible for compliance with the idling restriction.

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

The construction contractor also shall allow for inspection by Riverside County staff or its designee to verify compliance.

M-AQ-3 Prior to grading permit issuance, the County shall verify that there is a note on the grading plan that limits active ground-disturbing activities to a maximum of five (5) acres per day. During construction activities, the construction contractor shall be responsible for compliance with the idling restriction. The construction contractor also shall allow for inspection by Riverside County staff or its designee to verify compliance.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project				
7. Wildlife & Vegetation a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) 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 Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☒	☐	☐
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: GIS database (Riverside County, 2013); WRCMSHCP; On-site Inspection; *Biological Technical Report.* Glenn Lukos Associates, November 24, 2013; *Updated and Final Biological Resources Report (Memorandum).* Glenn Lukos Associates, November 24, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

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

a) The Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) the applicable habitat conservation/planning program for Western Riverside County.

The Project site occurs within the Southwest Area Plan portion of the MSHCP. The proposed Project site does not occur within the Criteria Area of the MSHCP, and therefore is not subject to the Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS) process, or the Joint Project Review (JPR) process. (GLA, 2013a, p. 4)

Although habitat conservation is not required on the Project site pursuant to the MSHCP Criteria Area, all projects must demonstrate compliance with applicable MSHCP requirements pursuant to the following sections of the MSHCP: Section 6.1.2, "Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools;" Section 6.1.3, "Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species;" Section 6.1.4, "Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildland Interface;" and Section 6.3.2, "Additional Survey Needs and Procedures."

Project Compliance with MSHCP Section 6.1.2

Volume I, Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP establishes procedures through which the protection of Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools would occur within the Plan Area. The purpose of the procedures is to ensure that the biological functions and values of these habitat areas throughout the MSHCP Plan Area are maintained such that habitat values for species inside the MSHCP Conservation Area are maintained. (GLA, 2013a, p. 11)

The Project site (on and off site areas) supports 1.47 acres of riparian/riverine areas and only 0.11 acre of riparian/riverine resources would be permanently disturbed, including 0.08 acre of permanent impacts to southern willow scrub vegetation and 0.03 acre of permanent impact to herbaceous wetlands, while an additional 0.07 acre would be temporarily impacted by the Project. The Project has been designed to avoid the majority of the adjacent Charlois Channel, including nearly all southern willow scrub habitat located within the upper reach of the channel. Unavoidable impacts to southern willow scrub habitat along the upper reach would be limited to minor trimming of the canopy edge for the purpose of slope grading associated with the construction of Charlois Road. Additional unavoidable impacts along the middle reach of the channel would be limited to vegetation removal for the purpose of culvert installation and bridge construction. Remedial grading along the southern edges of the development would result in unavoidable temporary impacts to herbaceous wetland vegetation. (GLA, 2013c, pp. 48-49)

The MSHCP is intended to address the potential adverse hydrologic effects to downstream biological resources as a result of the modification of a riverine feature and/or the discharge of water into a riverine feature. The total volume of water flow entering the channel would be very similar to existing conditions, with minor changes being attenuated by a proposed water quality basin. The Project would comply with a Water Quality Management Plan, including BMPs that address the quality of water runoff. As such, changes in the quality of discharged water from the Project site would not have any potential to directly or cumulatively impact biological functions and values as it relates to downstream resources. (GLA, 2013c, p. 54)

Riparian/Riverine Areas

The MSHCP defines Riparian/Riverine Areas as "lands which contain habitat dominated by trees, shrubs, persistent emergents, or emergent mosses and lichens, which occur close to or

which depend upon soil moisture from a nearby fresh water source, or areas with fresh water flow during all or a portion of the year." (GLA, 2013a, p. 54)

The proposed Project would permanently impact approximately 0.11 acre of MSHCP riparian/riverine areas, consisting of 0.08 acre of permanent impacts to southern willow scrub vegetation and 0.03 acre of permanent impacts to herbaceous wetlands. Temporary impacts would total approximately 0.07 acre. Impacts to riparian/riverine area must be mitigated such that the resulting project, with mitigation, is biologically equivalent or superior to the existing site conditions. Section 8.0 of the Biological Technical Report (MND Appendix D3) provides a Determination of Biological Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) analysis that discusses the unavoidable impacts to riparian/riverine areas and recommends mitigation to replace lost functions and values as it pertains to the MSHCP Covered Species. The DBESP analysis shall be provided to CDFW and USFWS for a 60-day review and response period. With the approval of the DBESP, which would occur prior to public hearings for the proposed Project, and with implementation of the required mitigation (refer to Mitigation Measures M-BI-1 and M-BI-2), the Project would be consistent the MSHCP riparian/riverine policies. (GLA, 2013c, pp. 48-49)

Least Bell's Vireo, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, and Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo

The Project would not impact habitat occupied by the least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, or western yellow-billed cuckoo. As such, the proposed Project would be consistent with MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.1.2 as it pertains to these species. (GLA, 2013a, p. 54)

Vernal Pools

The MSHCP defines vernal pools as "seasonal wetlands that occur in depression areas that have wetlands indicators of all three parameters (soils, vegetation, and hydrology) during the wetter portion of the growing season but normally lack wetland indicators of hydrology and/or vegetation during the drier portion of the growing season." (GLA, 2013a, p. 55)

The Project site and off-site impact areas do not contain, and therefore the Project would not impact, any MSHCP vernal pools. As such, the proposed Project would be consistent with MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.1.2 as it pertains to vernal pools. (GLA, 2013a, p. 55)

Fairy Shrimp

The Project site and off-site impact areas do not contain habitat suitable to support listed fairy shrimp, therefore the Project would not impact listed fairy shrimp. As such, the proposed Project would be consistent with MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.1.2 as it pertains to listed fairy shrimp. (GLA, 2013a, p. 55)

Project Compliance with MSHCP Section 6.1.3

Volume I, Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP requires that within identified Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Areas (NEPSSA), site-specific focused surveys for Narrow Endemic Plants Species will be required for all public and private projects where appropriate soils and habitat are present. The Project occurs within NEPSSA 4, which includes the following target plant species: Munz's onion, San Diego ambrosia, many-stemmed Dudleya, spreading navarretia, California Orcutt grass, and Wright's trichocoronis. Habitat assessments and focused plant surveys were conducted for each target species, and none were detected on site. As such, the Project would not

impact any of the NEPSSA species, and the Project would be consistent with MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.1.3. (GLA, 2013a, p. 55)

Project Compliance with MSHCP Section 6.1.4

The MSHCP Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines (UWIG) are intended to address indirect effects associated with locating development in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area. As the MSHCP Conservation Area is assembled, development is expected to occur adjacent to the Conservation Area. Future development in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area may result in edge effects with the potential to adversely affect biological resources within the Conservation Area. To minimize such edge effects, the guidelines shall be implemented in conjunction with review of individual public and private development projects in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area. (GLA, 2013a, p. 55)

The Project site is not located adjacent to existing Conserved Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) Lands, and is not within or adjacent to the MSHCP Criteria Area. The closest MSHCP criteria cell is approximately 1,300 feet easterly of the site on the eastern side of Washington Street. However, the MSHCP states that edge treatments shall also be addressed as part of the avoidance and minimization process for areas not to be included in the MSHCP Conservation Area. Therefore, the UWIG applies to the avoided habitat onsite (i.e., the Charlois Drainage), even though it may not be part of the MSHCP Conservation Area. (GLA, 2013a, p. 50)

In order to ensure consistency with the minimization measures specified in MSHCP Section 6.1.4, mitigation measures (refer to Mitigation Measures M-BI-2 through M-BI-6) have been imposed, where necessary, to ensure that indirect impacts to biological resource located in close proximity to the Project site do not occur (e.g., impacts due to drainage, toxic substances, lighting, noise, invasive species, and barrier measures). With the implementation of these measures adjacent to the preserved/avoided streambed, the proposed Project would be consistent with the UWIG guidelines contained in MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.1.4. A summary of the Project's potential indirect impacts is provided below. (GLA, 2013a, p. 55)

- Drainage. Proposed projects are required to incorporate measures, including measures required through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, to ensure that the quantity and quality of runoff discharged to sensitive areas is not altered in an adverse way when compared with existing conditions. In particular, measures are required to be put in place to avoid discharge of untreated surface runoff from developed and paved areas. Stormwater systems associated with the Project have been designed to prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials or other elements that might degrade or harm biological resources or ecosystem processes within the MSHCP Conservation Area and within the preserved/avoided streambed. Regular maintenance is required pursuant to the Project's WQMP (MND Appendix F2) to ensure effective operations of runoff control systems. The Project's contractor also is required pursuant to County requirements to develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to runoff and water quality during construction. The Project design also incorporates Best Management Practices (BMPs) to treat and control runoff. Based on the forgoing discussion, the Project would not result in adverse indirect impacts due to drainage. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 requirements for Drainage. (GLA, 2013a, p. 51)

- Toxics. Land uses that use chemicals or generate bioproducts such as manure that are potentially toxic or may adversely affect wildlife species, habitat or water quality are required to

incorporate measures to ensure that application of such chemicals does not result in discharge to sensitive areas. The proposed Project would be required by the County to implement a SWPPP that will address runoff during construction, and would further be required to implement long-term BMPs to address water quality as a result of development runoff. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 requirements for Toxics. (GLA, 2013a, p. 51)

- Lighting. Residential uses proposed by the Project would involve the installation of lighting elements associated with streets and residential structures. If such lighting is not directed away from sensitive areas or appropriately shielded, indirect impacts to sensitive species located within the preserved/avoided streambed could occur. This is evaluated as a potentially significant direct impact and a potential conflict with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 for which mitigation would be required. (GLA, 2013a, p. 51) With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-BI-3, indirect impacts due to lighting would be reduced to below a level of significant and the Project would fully comply with the lighting provisions of MSHCP Section 6.1.4.

- Noise. The proposed Project consists of a proposed residential community that is not associated with the generation of substantial amounts of noise. Accordingly, the Project would not result in the generation of noise that could adversely affect sensitive species within the preserved/avoided streambed. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 requirements for Noise.

- Invasives. Projects that are adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area are required to avoid the use of invasive plant species in landscaping, including invasive, non-native plant species listed in *Volume I*, Table 6-2 of the MSHCP. Although the Project's preliminary landscape plan does not include any plant species prohibited by Table 6-2 of the MSHCP, there is a potential that such species could be proposed in the future as part of implementing projects. This represents a potential conflict with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 for which mitigation would be required. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-BI-4, the Project would fully comply with the invasive plant species requirements of MSHCP Section 6.1.4, and impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

- Barriers. The MSHCP requires proposed land uses adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area to incorporate barriers, where appropriate in individual project designs to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal trespass or dumping in the MSHCP Conservation Area. Although the Project includes a preliminary fence and wall plan, mitigation measures are proposed to ensure compliance with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 for barriers; thus, impacts would be potentially significant prior to mitigation. These impacts would be reduced to a level below significance with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-BI-5 and M-BI-6.

- Grading/Land Development. The MSHCP states that manufactured slopes associated with development shall not extend into the MSHCP Conservation Area. The proposed Project site does not extend to the existing Conservation Area. As such, the grading/land development standards of MSHCP Section 6.1.4 do not apply to the proposed Project and a significant impact due to a conflict with MSHCP Section 6.1.4 would not occur.

Project Compliance with MSHCP Section 6.3.2

MSHCP Section 6.3.2 requires special surveys for certain plant species for lands located within the Criteria Area Plant Species Survey Areas (CAPSSA). MSHCP Section 6.3.2 also identifies lands requiring surveys for certain animal species (burrowing owl, mammals, amphibians). The proposed Project site occurs within the burrowing owl survey area, but does not occur within the amphibian or mammal survey areas, or within the CAPSSA. Focused burrowing owl surveys were conducted for the proposed Project site, and no burrowing owls were detected. However, there is a potential that the Project site could be occupied by burrowing owl individuals prior to the commencement of grading or ground disturbing activities. If present, impacts to the burrowing owl would represent a significant impact due to a conflict with the MSHCP and mitigation would be required in the form of pre-construction surveys. This is evaluated as a potentially significant impact for which mitigation would be required. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-BI-7 would reduce potential impacts to the burrowing owl to a level below significant.

Based on the analysis provided above, and with the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed Project would not conflict with MSHCP Section 6.3.2.

b & c) Implementation of the proposed Project has the potential to directly or indirectly impact endangered or threatened plant and animal species, if such species occur within areas planned for impact by the Project.

Impacts to Listed Plant Species

No special-status plants were observed on site during the focused plant surveys. Table 4-2 of the Biological Technical Report (MND Appendix D1) provides a list of special-status plants evaluated for the Project site. Plant species were considered based on a number of factors, including: 1) species identified by the CNDDB as occurring (either currently or historically) on or in the vicinity of the Project site; 2) target species for NEPSSA 4; and 3) any other special-status plants that are known to occur within the vicinity of the Project site, or for which potentially suitable habitat occurs within the Project site. (GLA, 2013a, p. 25)

As noted above, the Project site is within the NEPSSA 4. Target species within this survey area include California Orcutt grass (*Orcuttia californica*), many-stemmed dudleya (*Dudleya multicaulis*), Munz's onion (*Allium munzii*), San Diego ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila*), spreading navarretia (*Navarretia fossalis*), and Wright's trichocoronis (*Trichocoronis wrightii* var. *wrightii*). Of these species, portions of the on-site Riversidean sage scrub habitat have a low potential for many-stemmed dudleya to be observed; however, the other NEPSSA 4 species are not expected to occur onsite due to a lack of suitable habitat. Regardless, none of the NEPSSA 4 species (or any other special-status plants) were detected onsite during biological surveys. The following provides a brief discussion of many-stemmed dudleya. (GLA, 2013a, p. 30)

- Many-stemmed Dudleya (*Dudleya multicaulis*) - Many-stemmed dudleya is a member of the stonecrop family (CRASSULACEAE) that is designated as a CNPS List 1B.2 species but is not a federal or state listed species. This perennial herb is known to occur in chaparral, coastal scrub and valley and foothill grasslands and is often associated with clay soils. Many-stemmed dudleya is known to occur from Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and San Diego counties from 15 to 790 meters (50 to 2,590 feet) MSL. This species is known to bloom from April through July. Many-stemmed dudleya was not observed on site during focused plant surveys, but

has low to moderate potential for occurrence based on general habitat. This species was not detected during focused plant surveys and was also not detected on site during previous focused surveys conducted in 2005 and 2006. (GLA, 2013a, p. 30)

Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any direct or indirect impacts to listed plant species, and impacts would therefore be less than significant.

Impacts to Listed Animal Species

Seven special-status animals were observed within the Project site, including one listed species (coastal California gnatcatcher, *Polioptila californica californica*), and six non-listed species, including the California horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris*), Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), Lawrence's goldfinch (*Carduelis lawrencei*), San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus bennettii*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), and yellow warbler (*Setophaga petechia*). (GLA, 2013a, p. 30)

In addition to those species observed onsite, the Project site contains suitable habitat with the potential to support other special-status animals, including Bell's sage sparrow (*Amphispiza belli belli*), burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma coronatum*), coastal whiptail (*Aspidoscelis tigris*), Dulzura pocket mouse (*Chaetodipus californicus femoralis*), ferruginous hawk (*Buteo regalis*), least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), red-diamond rattlesnake (*Crotalus ruber ruber*), orangethroat whiptail (*Aspidoscelis hyperythra*), quino checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha quino*), rosy boa (*Charina trivirgata*), southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*), southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*), and yellow-breasted chat (*Icteria virens*). (GLA, 2013a, p. 30)

The burrowing owl, least Bell's vireo, and southwestern willow flycatcher were determined to be absent from the site based on the negative results of focused protocol surveys. The yellow-breasted chat is also assumed to be absent since it is associated with riparian habitats, and the chat was not observed while conducting vireo and flycatcher focused surveys. (GLA, 2013a, pp. 30-31)

Table 4-3 of the Project's Biological Technical Report (MND Appendix D1) provides a list of special-status animals evaluated for the Project site. Species were evaluated based on a number of factors, including: 1) species identified by the CNDDB as occurring (either currently or historically) on or in the vicinity of the property; 2) MSHCP species survey areas for which the Project site occurs within; and 3) any other special-status animals that are known to occur within the vicinity of the Project site, or for which potentially suitable habitat occurs within the Project site. (GLA, 2013a, p. 31)

The proposed Project would result in the loss of habitat for one listed species (coastal California gnatcatcher) and a number of non-listed, special-status species. The gnatcatcher is designated as a MSHCP Covered Species, without project-specific mitigation requirements. The loss of habitat occupied by the coastal California gnatcatcher would be both individually and cumulatively significant prior to mitigation. However, the MSHCP addresses biological impacts for take of Covered Species within the MSHCP Plan Area, including threatened and endangered species. Section 4.1.6 of the MSHCP Final EIR/EIS states that the implementation of MSHCP mitigation measures would reduce identified impacts to a level below significance for all impacts except those associated with Non-Covered Species. General measures include the Local Development

Mitigation Fee (LDMF), which is to be applied to all future development throughout the Plan Area, in order to address cumulative impacts to Covered Species throughout the region. As such, since the proposed Project complies with the MSHCP, and the Project applicant would pay the required MSHCP LDMF (as required by Mitigation Measure M-BI-1), impacts to the coastal California gnatcatcher would be reduced to a level below significance. (GLA, 2013a, p. 49)

Impacts to non-listed, special-status species include both MSHCP Covered Species and non-Covered Species that were either observed onsite, or have the potential to occur onsite. Covered Species include 1) Reptiles: orangethroat whiptail and red-diamond rattlesnake; 2) Birds: Bell's sage sparrow, California horned lark, Cooper's hawk, ferruginous hawk, loggerhead shrike, southern California rufous-crowned sparrow, and yellow warbler; and 3) Mammals: northwestern San Diego pocket mouse, San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit, and San Diego desert woodrat. Non-Covered Species include 1) Reptiles: rosy boa; 2) Birds: Lawrence's goldfinch; and 3) Mammals: Dulzura pocket mouse. Impacts to the non-listed, special-status species would be less than significant, both individually and cumulatively, as a result of a low level of sensitivity, marginal quality of habitat onsite, and/or limited impacts by the proposed Project. (GLA, 2013a, p. 49)

Impacts to Nesting Birds

The proposed Project has the potential to impact active bird nests if vegetation is to be removed during the nesting season (February 1 to September 15). Impacts to nesting birds are prohibited by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code. This is evaluated as a significant impact for which mitigation would be required. (GLA, 2013a, p. 50) Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-BI-8 would reduce the Project's potential impacts to nesting birds to a level below significance.

d) Under existing conditions, the portions of the Project site that are planned for development are used for agricultural production, and therefore these areas do not accommodate wildlife movement corridors under existing conditions. The Charlois Channel located in the southeastern corner of the Project site has the potential to facilitate wildlife movement through the area, although the Project proposes to avoid the majority of this drainage as part of future development, and would incorporate mitigation measures (refer to Mitigation Measures M-BI-2 through M-BI-6) to address potential indirect edge effects to the Charlois Channel. Additionally, the proposed Project site does not serve as a native wildlife nursery site, nor are any such sites located within the Project vicinity. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

e & f) Table EA-6, *Impacts to Vegetation Communities*, provides a summary of the vegetation communities that would be impacted by the proposed Project, including impacts to riparian communities. As shown, impacts within the Project site and off-site impact areas would include impacts to 38.48 acres of vegetation communities, including 5.68 acres of native upland sage scrub communities and 0.11 acre of riparian communities. A discussion of Project impacts to each of the vegetation communities located on-site and within the off-site impact areas is provided below:

- Agriculture: The Project would result in direct permanent impacts to approximately 28.67 acres of agriculture habitat, including 28.14 acres on-site and 0.53 acre off-site. Agriculture is not considered a sensitive natural plant community nor does it comprise riparian habitat; therefore, impacts to agriculture habitat would be less than significant.

- Disturbed: The Project would result in direct permanent impacts to approximately 0.58 acre of disturbed habitat, including 0.39 acre on-site and 0.19 acre off-site. Disturbed habitat is not

considered a sensitive natural plant community nor does it comprise riparian habitat; therefore, impacts to disturbed habitat would be less than significant.

- Herbaceous Wetland: The Project would result in direct permanent impacts to 0.03 acre of herbaceous wetland habitat on-site, which is considered riparian habitat. Project impacts to 0.03 acre of herbaceous wetland habitat would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.

Table EA-6 Impacts to Vegetation Communities

Vegetation/Land Use Type	*On Site Acreage*	*Off Site Acreage*	*Total Acreage*
Agriculture	28.14	0.53	28.67
Disturbed	0.39	0.19	0.58
Herbaceous Wetland	0.03	0	0.03
Riversidean Sage Scrub	5.57	0	5.57
Ruderal	1.24	2.31	3.55
Southern Willow Scrub	0.08	0	0.08
Total	***35.45***	***3.03***	***38.48***

(GLA, 2013c, Table 5-1)

- Riversidean Sage Scrub: The Project would result in direct permanent impacts to 5.57 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, all of which occurs on-site. Riversidean sage scrub is addressed through the MSHCP, and the Project site is not identified for conservation by the MSHCP. Accordingly, and based on the mandatory payment of the MSHCP LDMF (Mitigation Measure M-BI-1), impacts to Riversidean sage scrub would be less than significant.

- Ruderal: The Project would result in permanent impacts to 3.55 acres of ruderal habitat, including 1.24 acres on-site and 2.31 acre off-site. Ruderal habitat is not considered a sensitive natural plant community or riparian habitat, and is addressed through the MSHCP; therefore, impacts to ruderal habitat would be less than significant.

- Southern Willow Scrub: The Project would result in permanent impacts to 0.08 acre of southern willow scrub, all of which occurs on-site. Southern willow scrub is considered a sensitive natural community and contains riparian habitat. Project impacts to southern willow scrub habitat would represent a potentially significant impact prior to mitigation.

As noted above, the Project would result in significant impacts to 0.08 acre of southern willow scrub habitat, 0.03 acre of herbaceous wetland habitat, and 5.57 acres of Riversidean sage scrub habitat for which mitigation would be required. Impacts to Riversidean sage scrub habitat would be reduced to less-than-significant levels through the payment of the MSHCP LDMF (Mitigation Measure M-BI-1). With implementation of the required mitigation for impacts to riparian habitat (refer to Mitigation Measure M-BI-2), impacts to herbaceous wetland and southern willow scrub habitats would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Additionally, the Project would temporarily impact approximately 0.06 acre of potential Corps and Regional Board jurisdiction, all of which consists of jurisdictional wetlands, and 140 linear feet of streambed. No permanent impacts are proposed. The Project also would permanently impact

approximately 0.11 acre of CDFW jurisdiction, all of which consists of vegetated riparian habitat. Impacts to jurisdictional waters also are potentially significant prior to mitigation. (GLA, 2013c, p. 5) With implementation of the required mitigation (refer to Mitigation Measure M-BI-2), impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

g) Aside from the MSHCP (which is addressed above under Issue 7.a), the only local policy/ordinance protecting biological resources within the Project area is the In the Riverside County Oak Tree Management Guidelines, which requires surveys of individual trees and the minimization and/or avoidance of oak trees, where feasible. Based on the results of the site-specific Biological Technical Report (MND Appendix D1), the proposed Project site and off-site impact areas do not contain any oak trees or oak woodland habitat. Accordingly, the proposed Project has no potential to conflict with the County's Oak Tree Management Guidelines, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation:

M-BI-1 (Condition of Approval 10.Planning.010) Prior to the issuance of either a certificate of occupancy or prior to building permit final inspection, the Project Applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 810, which requires payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance. Riverside County Ordinance No. 810 has been established to set forth policies, regulations and fees related to the funding and acquisition of open space and habitat necessary to address the direct and cumulative environmental effects generated by new development projects described and defined in this Ordinance. The fee shall be paid for each residential unit to be constructed by the Project. In the event Riverside County Ordinance No. 810 is rescinded, this requirement will no longer be applicable. However, should Riverside County Ordinance No. 810 be rescinded and superseded by a subsequent mitigation fee ordinance, payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance shall be required.

M-BI-2 (Condition of Approval 60.EPD.005) Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a biologist who holds an MOU with the County of Riverside shall submit documentation that the appropriate mitigation credits have been purchased in accordance with the mitigation measures described in Section 8, Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation Analysis (DBESP), of the document entitled "Biological Technical Report for the Yates Road/Hsieh Property," dated November 16, 2012, updated October 8, 2013, and prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc. Temporary impacts described in the report noted above must be restored to original conditions as described within the DBESP. Restoration of temporary impacts must be addressed by the biologist with a Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) that will be provided to the Environmental Programs Division for review and approval. The MMP shall include but not be limited to; time lines, success criteria, reporting standards, financial assurances, and plans for conveyance of lands to a conservation agency for long term management.

M-BI-3 (Condition of Approval 80.EPD.003) Prior to issuance of building permits, the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department shall review proposed building plans to ensure that all proposed lighting is directed away from the on- and off-site portions of the Charlois Channel, and shall further ensure that lighting elements would be appropriately shielded to prevent glare impacts to the Charlois Channel.

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

M-BI-4 (Condition of Approval 70.Planning.002) Prior to issuance of building permits or approval of improvement plans, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside County Transportation Department shall review all proposed landscaping elements to verify that none of the prohibited plant species as identified in Table 6-2 of the MSHCP are included in the plant palette.

M-BI-5 (Condition of Approval 60.EPD.004) The areas mapped as "CDFG Riparian" and are outside of the mapped project footprint on EXHIBIT 7B of the document entitled "Biological Technical Report for the Yates Road/Hsieh Property," dated November 16, 2012, updated October 8, 2013, and prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc., will be temporarily fenced to avoid impacts during grading and construction. Signs must clearly indicate that no impacts will occur within the fenced areas. Prior to issuance of grading permits, a report will be submitted by a biologist documenting that the fencing has been completed and encompasses the entire jurisdictional feature. The only areas of the jurisdictional feature that will not be fenced are those that have been proposed and accounted for in Section 8, "Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation Analysis," of the "Biological Technical Report," dated November 16, 2012, updated October 8, 2013, and prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates Inc. The document must be prepared by a biologist who has an MOU with the County of Riverside. EPD may also inspect the site prior to grading permit issuance.

M-BI-6 (Condition of Approval 60.EPD.006) Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a proposed permanent fencing and signage plan for the protection of all biologically sensitive areas. The areas mapped as "CDFG Riparian," and are outside of the "Project Footprint" on Exhibit 7B of the document entitled, "Biological Technical Report for the Yates Road/Hsieh Property," dated November 16, 2012, updated October 8, 2013, and prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc., shall be permanently fenced for protection as open space. The fencing shall provide a physical barrier to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal trespass or dumping in the delineated riparian area. The fence shall have a minimum height of three feet at its shortest point. Fence posts shall be no more than five feet apart. The fence design shall be such that a sphere with a diameter of three inches cannot pass through the plane of the fence at any point below the minimum height. The fencing plan will be reviewed and approved by the Riverside County Planning Department Environmental Programs Division (EPD). The fence shall not be installed until EPD staff has reviewed and approved the fencing plan. EPD staff shall have sole discretion in determining whether the proposed fencing will adequately protect the conservation area, and whether changes to the proposed fencing and signage plan are required.

M-BI-7 (Condition of Approval 60.EPD.001) Pursuant to Objective 6 and Objective 7 of the Species Account for the Burrowing Owl included in the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, within 30 days prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a pre-construction presence/absence survey for the burrowing owl shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and the results of this presence/absence survey shall be provided in writing to the Environmental Programs Department. If it is determined that the project site is occupied by the Burrowing Owl, take of "active" nests shall be avoided pursuant to the MSHCP and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. However,

when the Burrowing Owl is present, relocation outside of the nesting season (March 1 through August 31) by a qualified biologist shall be required. The County Biologist shall be consulted to determine appropriate type of relocation (active or passive) and translocation sites. Occupation of this species on the project site may result in the need to revise grading plans so that take of "active" nests is avoided or alternatively, a grading permit may be issued once the species has been actively relocated. If the grading permit is not obtained within 30 days of the survey a new survey shall be required.

M-BI-8 (Condition of Approval 60.EPD.002) Birds and their nests are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Codes. Since the project supports suitable nesting bird habitat, removal of vegetation or any other potential nesting bird habitat disturbances shall be conducted outside of the avian nesting season (February 1st through August 31st). If habitat must be cleared during the nesting season, a preconstruction nesting bird survey shall be conducted prior to the issuance of grading permits. The preconstruction nesting bird survey must be conducted by a biologist who holds a current MOU with the County of Riverside. The biologist shall prepare and submit a report, documenting the results of the survey, to the Riverside County Planning Department, Environmental Programs Division (EPD) for review and approval. If nesting activity is observed, appropriate avoidance measures shall be adopted to avoid any potential impacts to nesting birds.

Monitoring:

M-BI-1 Prior to issuance of either a certificate of occupancy or building permit final building inspection, the Project Applicant shall pay the required fee. Fee payment shall be verified by the Riverside County Building and Safety Department prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy or building permit final building inspection.

M-BI-2 Prior to final grading inspection, the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department shall verify that the appropriate mitigation credits have been purchased in accordance with the mitigation measures described in Section 8, Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation Analysis (DBESP), of the document entitled "Biological Technical Report for the Yates Road/Hsieh Property," dated November 16, 2012, updated October 8, 2013, and prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc.

M-BI-3 Prior to issuance of building permits, the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department shall review proposed lighting elements to ensure that lighting elements are shielded and directed away from the on- and off-site portions of the Charlois Channel.

M-BI-4 Prior to issuance of building permits or approval of improvement plans, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside County Transportation Department shall ensure that landscaping plans do not contain any of the MSHCP-prohibited plant species.

M-BI-5 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department shall review the report submitted by the biologist documenting that the

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

fencing has been completed and encompasses the entire jurisdictional feature as required by the "Biological Technical Report for the Yates Road/Hsieh Property," dated November 16, 2012, updated October 8, 2013, and prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc..

M-BI-6 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department (EPD) shall review the proposed permanent fencing and signage plan for the protection of all biologically sensitive areas. EPD shall ensure that the fencing encompasses the areas mapped as "CDFG Riparian," and are outside of the "Project Footprint" on Exhibit 7B of the document entitled, "Biological Technical Report for the Yates Road/Hsieh Property," dated November 16, 2012, updated October 8, 2013, and prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc. EPD shall also ensure that the fencing is appropriately designed as part of this review to adequately protect biologically sensitive areas.

M-BI-7 Prior to commencement of grading activities, the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department shall review a report to be provided by the Project applicant documenting the results of the pre-grading burrowing owl survey and shall verify compliance with the recommendations specified therein.

M-BI-8 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department (EPD) shall review the results of the preconstruction nesting bird survey (if grading activities are proposed during the avian nesting season), and shall verify that all measures specified therein to protect nesting migratory birds are adhered to during grading activities. Alternatively, if no grading is anticipated during the avian nesting season, then EPD shall ensure that implementing grading permits are conditioned to prohibit grading activities during the nesting season (February 1st and August 31st).

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project				
8. Historic Resources a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Site Inspection.

Findings of Fact:

a & b) The Project site and off-site impact areas have been disturbed by the past agricultural uses and do not contain any structures under existing conditions. As discussed below under Section 9, the Project site does not contain any historic sites or historical resources as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15063.5. Accordingly, there would be no impact to historic resources as a result of the proposed Project.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source: County Staff Discussion with County Archaeologist (March 2011); General Plan EIR, Figure 4.7-1 (Archaeological Sensitivity Areas); *Phase I Archaeological Assessment for the Yates Road Project (TTM 36437).* Brian F. Smith & Associates, August 1, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a & b) A Phase I Archaeological Survey was conducted for the site and off-site improvement areas by Brian F. Smith & Associates (BFSA), the results of which are contained in Appendix L1 to this IS/MND. The Phase I Archaeological Survey includes the results of a records search and field survey.

Based on the results of the records search and a field survey conducted by BFSA, the Project site does not contain any recorded or known archaeological resources. The records search determined that there are no known cultural resources within or immediately adjacent to the Project site (BFSA, 2013a, p. 5.0-1). The records search and literature review determined that there is a low to moderate potential for prehistoric sites to be contained within the Project boundary, primarily consisting of historic properties and bedrock-milling features. However, due to the small quantity of observable granitic outcrops on-site and the lack of recorded historic use of the property, the potential presence of these site types is considered low. (BFSA, 2013a, p. 5.0-2)

To further determine whether the site has the potential to contain archaeological resources, BFSA conducted a survey of the site on July 24, 2013. The archaeological survey consisted of an intensive reconnaissance consisting of a series of parallel survey transects of the entire 40.16-acre site and off-site improvement areas. The site survey indicated that the majority of the site has been disturbed by cultivation for several years, and no archaeological resources were identified on-site or within the off-site areas (including the proposed 18-inch off-site storm drain alignment). The field survey did not result in the identification of any historic or prehistoric cultural resources. (BFSA, 2013a, pp. 5.0-2 and 5.0-3)

As a result of the records search and field survey, BFSA concludes that there is little likelihood that archaeological deposits are present within the Project's impact boundaries. No cultural resources were identified on the property or off-site improvement areas, and the records search and previous surveys in the Project vicinity do not indicate that any sites are present in or within a half-mile radius of the property. The Project would not alter or destroy an archaeological site, nor would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5. Therefore, impacts are evaluated as less than significant, and mitigation measures and monitoring during ground disturbing activities is not required. (BFSA, 2013a, p. 6.0-1)

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

c) The Project site does not contain a cemetery and no known formal cemeteries are located within the immediate site vicinity. Field surveys conducted on the Project site did not identify the presence of any human remains and no human remains are known to exist beneath the surface of the site. Nevertheless, the remote potential exists that human remains may be unearthed during grading and excavation activities associated with Project construction. In the event that human remains are discovered during Project grading or other ground disturbing activities, the Project would be required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made by the Coroner. If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted and the NAHC must then immediately notify the "most likely descendant(s)" of receiving notification of the discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then make recommendations within 48 hours, and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Mandatory compliance with these requirements would ensure that potential impacts associated with the discovery of human remains would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

d) There are no religious or sacred uses occurring within the proposed Project site or off-site impact areas. The Project area has largely been disturbed by agricultural activities since the 1800s. Accordingly, no impact to religious or sacred uses would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

10. Paleontological Resources a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: General Plan, Figure OS-8 (Paleontological Sensitivity); Riverside County GIS (Riverside County, 2013); *Paleontological Resource Assessment for CEQA Compliance Review*, Brian F. Smith and Associates, September 5, 2013.

Findings of Fact: According to Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8, the proposed Project site is determined to have a "Low" and "Undetermined" potential for uncovering paleontological resources. In addition, and partly due to past disturbance associated with agricultural activities, there are no unique geologic features within the proposed Project site or off-site impact areas. Nonetheless, there is a potential that during grading of the property, unique paleontological resources or sites could be uncovered.

In order to address the site's potential for containing paleontological resources, a paleontological resources assessment was conducted by Brian F. Smith and Associates, the results of which are contained in IS/MND Appendix L2. Based upon the results of the analysis, it was concluded that the phyllite geological materials located in the higher elevations of the Project site along the northwest corner are unlikely to yield fossils, and no paleontological monitoring is recommended in this area. However, based on the collections and locality records of the San Bernardino County Museum, older alluvial valley and alluvial fan deposits, which occur on the lower elevations within the Project site,

have a moderate to high paleontological resource sensitivity and could yield terrestrial vertebrate fossils during grading and earth-moving activities. Although the site does not contain any known fossils or paleontological resources, the Project's potential to physically impact unique paleontological resources that could be buried beneath the surface represents a significant impact before mitigation. (BFSA, 2013b, pp. 1-2)

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-PR-1 would ensure that if any paleontological resources are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, such resources would be evaluated by a qualified paleontologist, and appropriate treatment measures would be identified and implemented in consultation with Riverside County staff. With implementation of the required mitigation, the Project's potential impact to paleontological resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation:

M-PR-1 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.026) Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) shall be prepared for review by the Riverside County Planning Department. The PRIMP shall identify monitoring measures for the portions of the Project site that encompass Quaternary sediments (i.e., within the lower elevations of the site). The PRIMP shall identify measures to be undertaken in the event that fossils are discovered, and shall identify the proper laboratory processing and curation for any fossils that may be uncovered during grading of the site. During grading activities within the portion of the site containing Quaternary sediments, a qualified paleontologist shall be present on-site at all times to monitor the ground disturbing activities for the presence of subsurface fossils, as specified in the PRIMP. If suspected paleontological resources (fossils) are encountered during ground-disturbing construction activities, the construction contractor shall temporarily halt ground-disturbing activities within 100 feet of the find until the resource is evaluated by the monitoring paleontologist to assess the significance of the find, and, if necessary, to develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with the County of Riverside's staff archaeologist and as required by the PRIMP. At the completion of grading activities, a final report shall be prepared that includes the following: dates of site monitoring; results of the monitoring program; a listing of any fossils that were uncovered; and a description of any laboratory and curation activities that were undertaken. The final report shall be provided to the Riverside County Planning Department prior to final grading inspection.

Monitoring:

M-PR-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide a PRIMP for review by the Riverside County Planning Department. During grading activities, grading within the portions of the site underlain by Quaternary sediments shall be monitored by a qualified paleontologist in accordance with the PRIMP, and shall identify any necessary measures to be undertaken in the event fossils are identifies. The monitoring paleontologist also shall prepare the final monitoring report, which shall be reviewed by the Riverside County Planning Department.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project				
11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?				
b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: General Plan, Figure S-2 (Earthquake Fault Study Zones); GIS database (Riverside County, 2013); *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Tentative Tract 30430, "Yates Road" Project,"* Alta California Geotechnical, Inc., January 11, 2012.

Findings of Fact:

a & b) The Project site is located on the northeast portion of the Riverside sub-block of the Peninsular Range Block of Structural Province I. The property is located in southern California, which is a tectonically active area. The site is located approximately 6.95 northeast of the Elsinore Fault Zone (Glen Ivy segment), 13.95 miles southwest of the San Jacinto Fault Zone (Anza segment) and approximately 29.09 miles southwest of the San Andreas Fault Zone (southern segment). The proposed Project site is not located within an "Alquist-Priolo" Special Studies Zone, nor is the site identified within a County fault hazard zone. (Alta, 2012, pp. 8-9; Riverside County, 2003a, Figure S-2)

The type and magnitude of seismic hazards affecting a site are dependent on the distance to the causative fault and the intensity and magnitude of the seismic event. The nearest active fault is the Glen Ivy segment of the Elsinore Fault Zone, which is located approximately 6.95 miles to the southwest. This fault is identified as a Fault Rupture Hazard Zone by the State of California. "Active" faults have not been identified on the proposed Project site, and therefore the probability of primary surface rupture or deformation at the site is considered remote. (Alta, 2012, pp. 9-10)

Ground shaking hazards caused by earthquakes along the Elsinore, San Jacinto and San Andreas Fault Zones and other active regional faults do exist. However, the 2010 California Building Code requires use-modified spectral accelerations and velocities for most structural designs. Seismic design parameters using soil profile types identified in the 2010 California Building Code are presented in Section 7.3 of the Project's geotechnical report (IS/MND Appendix E). With mandatory compliance with the 2010 California Building Code requirements, or applicable building code at the time of Project construction, future Project residents and structures would not be exposed to substantial adverse ground-shaking effects associated with Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones or County Fault Hazard Zones. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

12. Liquefaction Potential Zone a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☒	☐	☐

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

Source: General Plan, Figure S-3 (Generalized Liquefaction); Riverside County GIS (Riverside County, 2013); *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Tentative Tract 30430, "Yates Road" Project."* Alta California Geotechnical, Inc., January 11, 2012.

Findings of Fact: Seismic agitation of relatively loose saturated sands, silty sands, and some silts can result in a buildup of pore pressure. If the pore pressure exceeds the overburden stresses, a temporary quick condition known as liquefaction can occur. Liquefaction effects can manifest in several ways including: 1) loss of bearing; 2) lateral spread; 3) dynamic settlement; and 4) flow failure. Lateral spreading has typically been the most damaging mode of failure. In general, the more recent that sediment has been deposited, the more likely it will be susceptible to liquefaction. Other factors that must be considered are: groundwater, confining stresses, relative density, and the intensity and duration of seismically-induced ground shaking. (Alta, 2012, pp. 10-11)

Riverside County GIS shows the proposed Project site as having a "low" to no liquefaction potential (Riverside County, 2013). Additionally, due to the presence of groundwater beneath the proposed Project site, Alta Geotechnical performed a liquefaction analysis on the very old alluvial valley deposits. As part of the analysis, groundwater was modeled at five (5) feet below the existing ground surface. The analysis indicates that, due to the density and fines content of the underlying very old alluvial valley deposits, the potential for liquefaction to occur onsite is minimal. The results of the analysis are presented in Appendix E to the Project's geotechnical report (IS/MND Appendix E). (Alta, 2012, p. 11)

Accordingly, and based on information available from Riverside County GIS and a site-specific analysis conducted by the Project geologist, the proposed Project would not be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

13. Ground-shaking Zone Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: General Plan, Figure S-4 (Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map); General Plan Figures S-12 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk); *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Tentative Tract 30430, "Yates Road" Project."* Alta California Geotechnical, Inc., January 11, 2012.

Findings of Fact: According to information contained in the Project-specific soils report (IS/MND Appendix E), and as discussed above under the analysis of Thresholds 11.a) and 11.b), ground shaking hazards caused by earthquakes along the Elsinore, San Jacinto and San Andreas Fault Zones and other active regional faults do exist. However, the 2010 California Building Code requires use-modified spectral accelerations and velocities for most structural designs. Seismic design parameters using soil profile types identified in the 2010 California Building Code are presented in Section 7.3 of the Project's soils report (IS/MND Appendix E). With mandatory compliance with the 2010 California Building Code requirements, or the applicable building code at the time of Project construction, impacts due to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source: General Plan, Figure S-4 (Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map); *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Tentative Tract 30430, "Yates Road" Project."* Alta California Geotechnical, Inc., January 11, 2012.

Findings of Fact: The Project site was evaluated for geologic hazards, including slope stability, by Alta Geotechnical. The evaluation determined that the Project site and surrounding areas generally do not contain any slopes that could be subject to seismically induced landsliding, and the Project site would not be subject to landslide dangers (Alta, 2012, p. 12). Additionally, there is an existing hillside in the northwestern portions of the site that is composed of bedrock material. The Project proposes a 2:1 cut slope along the eastern face of this slope with maximum cut depths of 54 feet. The total height of this slope would be approximately 100 feet. Based on an analysis conducted by Alta Geotechnical), the cut slope is anticipated to be grossly stable, and would not pose a threat to future residents or structures on-site (Alta, 2012, p. 28). Alta Geotechnical also determined that the Project site contains dense and fine underlying very old alluvial deposits that are not subject to hazards associated with liquefaction, including lateral spreading (Alta, 2012, p. 11). The existing hill form in the northwestern portion of the site does not contain any sizeable rock materials, and would not subject the Project site to rockfall hazards. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source: General Plan, Figure S-7 (Documented Subsidence Areas); *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Tentative Tract 30430, "Yates Road" Project."* Alta California Geotechnical, Inc., January 11, 2012.

Findings of Fact: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 indicates that the proposed Project site is "susceptible" to ground subsidence, although no areas of documented subsidence occurs in the Project area. Based on a review of on-site soils by the Project's geologist (Alta Geotechnical), there is a potential for hydro-collapse in the upper portions (3 to 5 feet) of the "Very old alluvial fan deposits" onsite. This is considered a potentially significant impact for which mitigation would be required. Additionally, any undocumented artificial fill, the upper portions of the very old alluvial valley deposits, and highly weathered metasedimentary bedrock on the site are considered compressible and unsuitable to support the proposed development. Based on these factors, the Project would be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable and could potentially result in ground subsidence,

thereby requiring mitigation. Following the implementation of the required mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a level below significance. (Alta, 2012, p. 14)

Mitigation:

M-GS-1 (Condition of Approval 10.PLANNING.018) As a component of site grading activities, the Project Applicant shall be required to implement the following recommendations of the Project's soils report (IS/MND Appendix E). These recommendations include the following:

- Removal bottoms shall be observed by a qualified geotechnical consultant to make a final determination that suitable (non-weathered, limited porosity) soils have been exposed. Removal bottoms shall be tested to ensure that the exposed soils have a relative compaction of 85% of the laboratory maximum density (per ASTM test method D-1557).
- Subject to any recommendations by the qualified geotechnical consultant to the contrary, the upper three (3) to five (5) feet of very old alluvial deposits located on-site shall be removed and recompacted to limit the amount of differential settlement caused by hydro-collapse that could affect proposed structures. Removal bottoms shall be observed by a qualified geotechnical consultant to ensure that suitable (non-weathered, limited porosity) soils have been exposed. Removal may be ceased if saturated (percent saturation >85%) soils are encountered during grading.
- The highly weathered portions of the phyllite are unsuitable to support the proposed fills and/or structures and shall be removed and recompacted, subject to any direction to the contrary by a qualified geotechnical consultant. It is anticipated that the upper 2 to 3-feet of these deposits will require removal and recompaction.
- Lots should be underlain by a minimum of three (3) feet of compacted fill. As such, for lots where unsuitable soil removals do not provide that amount of fill such as cut lots and the cut portion of transition lots, overexcavation should be accomplished to provide the minimum three (3) feet of compacted fill.
- In order to facilitate trenching and backfill operations for underground utilities, and subject to the recommendations of a qualified geotechnical consultant, street areas that occur in rock should be over-excavated to a depth of one foot below the deepest utility and replaced with compacted fill containing rock no greater than 12-inches in diameter.
- All fill and processed natural ground shall be compacted to a minimum relative compaction of 90 percent, as determined by ASTM Test Method: D-1557. Fill material should be moisture conditioned to optimum moisture or above, and as generally discussed in Appendix F to the Project's soils report (IS/MND Appendix E). Compaction shall be achieved with the use of sheepsfoot rollers or similar kneading type equipment. Mixing and moisture conditioning will be required in order to achieve the recommended moisture conditions.
- Subject to recommendations to the contrary by a qualified geotechnical consultant, the rock size in the upper three (3) feet shall be limited to eight (8) to twelve (12) inches in maximum dimension; and between three (3) and ten (10) feet below grade, the rock size shall be limited to 2-feet or less in maximum dimension.

- Fill should be placed in eight-inch bulk maximum lifts, moisture conditioned to optimum moisture content or above, compacted and tested as grading/construction progresses until final grades are attained.
- Where the natural slope is steeper than 5-horizontal to 1-vertical and where designated by the Project geotechnical consultant, compacted fill material shall be keyed and benched into competent bedrock or firm artificial fill.
- Fill slopes should be overfilled to an extent determined by the contractor, but not less than two (2) feet measured perpendicular to the slope face, so that when trimmed back to the compacted core a minimum 90 percent relative compaction is achieved.
- Placement of fill over saturated very old alluvial valley deposits may result in time-dependent settlement/compression, depending on the amount of fill placed over the deposits. This settlement shall be monitored with the use of buried settlement plates, as detailed on Plate G-12 (Appendix G) of the Project's soil analysis (IS/MND Appendix E).

M-GS-2 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.007) Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the land divider/permit holder shall cause grading plans to be prepared which show all cut slopes located adjacent to ungraded natural terrain and exceed ten (10) feet in vertical height to be contour-graded incorporating the following grading techniques:

- The angle of the graded slope shall be gradually adjusted to the angle of the natural terrain.
- Angular forms shall be discouraged. The graded form shall reflect the natural rounded terrain.
- The toes and tops of slopes shall be rounded with curves with radii designed in proportion to the total height of the slopes where drainage and stability permit such rounding.
- Where cut and/or fill slopes exceed 300 feet in horizontal length, the horizontal contours of the slope shall be curved in a continuous, undulating fashion.

Monitoring:

M-GS-1 During Project grading activities, a qualified geotechnical consultant shall be present on-site to ensure the recommendations of the Project's soils report (IS/MND Appendix E) are implemented. Where applicable, the requirements of Mitigation Measure M-GS-1 shall be shown on the Project's grading plans. Riverside County shall review implementing grading plans for compliance with Mitigation Measure M-GS-1 prior to the issuance of grading permits.

M-GS-2 Prior to grading permit issuance, the land divider/permit holder shall be responsible for providing the required grading plans. The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall be responsible for reviewing the proposed grading plans for conformance to the specified contour-grading requirements.

16. Other Geologic Hazards a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

Source: On-site Inspection; Project Application Materials; General Plan, Figure S-10 (Dam Failure Inundation Zones).

Findings of Fact: The proposed Project site is not located within an area which has a known risk of seiche, mudflow, or volcanic activity. In addition, and according to Riverside County General Plan Figure S-10, the proposed Project site is not subject to inundation due to the failure of any nearby dams. Accordingly, no impact would occur as a result of seiches, mudflows, volcanic hazards, or other geologic hazards not already addressed above or below.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

17. Slopes				
a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Project Application Materials; *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Tentative Tract 30430, "Yates Road" Project."* Alta California Geotechnical, Inc., January 11, 2012.

Findings of Fact:

a) Under existing conditions, elevations on-site generally decrease from northwest to southeast. Implementation of the proposed Project would require grading activities involving the lowering of the northwestern portions of the site and the raising of the southern, southeastern, and eastern portions of the site as necessary to accommodate residential development. As part of the Project's grading plan, the hillside in the northwestern portion of the site would be graded at a maximum 2:1 gradient to increase areas suitable for residential development while providing fill material to facilitate the construction of residential pads in other portions of the site. Although the Project would result in a change to the site's existing topography, there would be no adverse effects to the environment resulting from site grading beyond what is already evaluated and disclosed throughout this IS/MND.

Accordingly, impacts due to changes to the site's topography and ground surface relief features are a less-than-significant impact.

b) As shown on TTM 36437, all slopes proposed as part of the Project would be constructed at a maximum slope angle of 2:1. The only slopes that would be constructed at a height exceeding ten feet occurs in the northwestern portion of the site and between the residential development and the open space in Lot 'A.' Along the slope in the northwestern portion of the site, grading would lower the elevation of the southeastern face of the hillside by up to 54 feet and the slope would be constructed at a total height of approximately 100 feet. The Project's geologist (Alta Geotechnical) evaluated these slopes and determined that the slopes are expected to be grossly stable as designed (Alta, 2012, p. 28). The slope proposed northerly of Lot 'A' would be constructed at a gradient of 2:1 and would measure up to approximately 17 feet in height. This slope would be constructed with hardened slope protection (of a type to be determined with future implementing grading permits) along the first

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

two feet of the base of the slope, which would assure that this slope is grossly stable. Accordingly, although the Project would result in the creation of slopes exceeding 10 feet in height, based on the analysis conducted by the Alta Geotechnical, such slopes would not result in any adverse impacts to the environment. Accordingly, impacts associated with the creation of cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet in height would be less than significant.

c) There are no subsurface sewage disposal systems within the areas that would be permitted for physical disturbance as part of the proposed Project. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

18. Soils				
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Project Application Materials; Riverside County Municipal Code Chapter 15.12; On-site Inspection; *Tentative Tract 36437 Preliminary Hydrology Report,* MDS Consulting, November 24, 2013; *Preliminary Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan,* MDS Consulting, August 16, 2012.

Findings of Fact:

a) Proposed grading activities associated with the Project would temporarily expose underlying soils to water and air, which would increase erosion susceptibility while the soils are exposed. Exposed soils would be subject to erosion during rainfall events or high winds due to the removal of stabilizing vegetation and exposure of these erodible materials to wind and water. Erosion by water would be greatest during the first rainy season after grading and before the Project's structure foundations are established and paving and landscaping occur. Erosion by wind would be highest during periods of high wind speeds when soils are exposed.

Pursuant to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board, the Project Applicant is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for construction activities. The NPDES permit is required for all projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area. Additionally, during grading and other construction activities involving soil exposure or the transport of earth materials, Chapter 15.12 (Uniform Building Code) of the Riverside County Municipal Code, which establishes, in part, requirements for the control of dust and erosion during construction, would apply to the Project. As part of the requirements of Chapter 15.12, the Project Applicant would be required to prepare an erosion control plan that would address construction fencing, sand bags, and other erosion-control features that would be implemented during the construction phase to reduce the site's

potential for soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Requirements for the reduction of particulate matter in the air also would apply, pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 403. Mandatory compliance with the Project's NPDES permit and these regulatory requirements would ensure that water and wind erosion impacts would be less than significant. Mitigation is not required.

Following construction, wind and water erosion on the Project site would be minimized, as the areas disturbed during construction would be landscaped or covered with impervious surfaces. Only nominal areas of exposed soil, if any, would occur in the site's landscaped areas. The only potential for erosion effects to occur during Project operation would be indirect effects from storm water discharged from the property. A majority of the Project's storm water is proposed to be collected by catch basins provided within on-site streets, which would convey the water to the water quality/detention basin in Lot 108 prior to being discharged to the proposed 18" storm drain to be constructed within the Allegre Vista Road alignment. The remaining drainage on-site (i.e., drainage areas outside of proposed residential areas) would largely mimic existing conditions. Based on the analysis presented in the Project's hydrology study (IS/MND Appendix F1), post-development runoff from the site would slightly decrease during 10-year (24-hour duration) storm events (i.e., from 9.10 CFS under existing conditions to 8.94 CFS under post-development conditions), and would very slightly increase during 100-year (24-hour duration) storm events (i.e., from 16.78 CFS under existing conditions to 16.84 CFS under post-development conditions). Accordingly, total runoff from the site would not substantially increase with Project implementation, thereby demonstrating that the Project would not substantially increase erosion hazards as compared to the existing condition. Since the drainage associated with the Project would be fully controlled via the on-site drainage plan and/or would be similar to existing conditions, soil erosion and the loss of topsoil would not increase substantially as compared to existing conditions.

In addition, the Project Applicant is required to prepare and submit to the County for approval of a Project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). The SWPPP and WQMP must identify and implement an effective combination of erosion control and sediment control measures (i.e., Best Management Practices) to reduce or eliminate discharge to surface water from storm water and non-storm water discharges. Adherence to the requirements noted in the Project's required WQMP (refer to IS/MND Appendix F2) and site-specific SWPPP would further ensure that potential erosion and sedimentation effects would be less than significant.

b) According to the Project's soils report (IS/MND Appendix E), the very old alluvial valley deposits may contain discrete intervals of highly expansive soils. If not addressed during Project grading activities, these soils have the potential to create substantial risks to future buildings on-site, as well as future residents. This condition is a potentially significant impact for which mitigation, in the form of geotechnical monitoring during construction and overexcavation where recommended by the geotechnical monitor, would be required. With the implementation of M-GS-3, the impact would be reduced to below a level of significance.

c) No septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems are proposed to be constructed or expanded as part of the Project. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

Mitigation:

M-GS-3 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.027) During Project grading activities within areas of the site containing very old alluvial valley deposits, grading activities shall be

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

monitored by a qualified geotechnical consultant. If very old alluvial deposits with expansion potential are present near final pad grade, and if warranted based on the recommendations of the geotechnical consultant, additional overexcavation shall be required.

Monitoring:

M-GS-3 A qualified geotechnical consultant shall be responsible for monitoring grading activities within the areas of the site containing very old alluvial valley deposits. As appropriate, the geotechnical consultant shall be responsible for directing the construction contractor to conduct overexcavation activities as necessary to eliminate adverse effects associated with expansive soils.

19. Erosion a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Project Application Materials; On-site Inspection; *Tentative Tract 36437 Preliminary Hydrology Report,* MDS Consulting, November 24, 2013; *Preliminary Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan,* MDS Consulting, August 16, 2012.

Findings of Fact:

a & b) As indicated under the discussion and analysis of Threshold 18.a), above, proposed grading activities associated with the Project would temporarily expose underlying soils to water and air, which would increase erosion susceptibility while the soils are exposed. Exposed soils would be subject to erosion during rainfall events or high winds due to the removal of stabilizing vegetation and exposure of these erodible materials to wind and water. Erosion by water would be greatest during the first rainy season after grading and before the Project's structure foundations are established and paving and landscaping occur. Erosion by wind would be highest during periods of high wind speeds when soils are exposed.

Pursuant to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board, the Project Applicant is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for construction activities. The NPDES permit is required for all projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area. Additionally, during grading and other construction activities involving soil exposure or the transport of earth materials, Chapter 15.12 (Uniform Building Code) of the Riverside County Municipal Code, which establishes, in part, requirements for the control of dust and erosion during construction, would apply to the Project. As part of the requirements of Chapter 15.12, the Project Applicant would be required to prepare an erosion control plan that would address construction fencing, sand bags, and other erosion-control features that would be implemented during the construction phase to reduce the site's potential for soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Requirements for the reduction of particulate matter in the air also would apply, pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 403. Mandatory compliance with the Project's NPDES permit and these regulatory requirements would ensure that erosion impacts during construction activities would be less than significant. Mitigation is not required.

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

Following construction, erosion on the Project site would be minimized, as the areas disturbed during construction would be landscaped or covered with impervious surfaces. Only nominal areas of exposed soil, if any, would occur in the site's landscaped areas. The only potential for erosion effects to occur during Project operation would be indirect effects from storm water discharged from the property. A majority of the Project's storm water is proposed to be collected by catch basins provided within on-site streets, which would convey the water to the water quality/detention basin in Lot 108 prior to being discharged to the proposed 18" storm drain to be constructed within the Allegre Vista Road alignment. The remaining drainage on-site (i.e., drainage areas outside of proposed residential areas) would largely mimic existing conditions. Based on the analysis presented in the Project's hydrology study (IS/MND Appendix F1), post-development runoff from the site would very slightly decrease during 10-year (24-hour duration) storm events (i.e., from 9.10 CFS under existing conditions to 8.94 CFS under post-development conditions), and would very slightly increase during 100-year (24-hour duration) storm events (i.e., from 16.78 CFS under existing conditions to 16.84 CFS under post-development conditions). Accordingly, total runoff from the site would not substantially increase with Project implementation, thereby demonstrating that the Project would not substantially increase erosion hazards as compared to the existing condition. Since the drainage associated with the Project would be fully controlled via the on-site drainage plan and/or would be similar to existing conditions, the rate and amount of erosion would not increase substantially as compared to existing conditions; thus, impacts due to water erosion would be less than significant under long-term conditions. Furthermore, because the Project would not substantially alter the drainage patterns of the site as compared to the existing condition, there would be no impact due to changes in the deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required beyond mandatory compliance with the BMPs specified in the site-specific WQMP, which would be enforced as part of the Project's conditions of approval.

Monitoring: Annual inspections will verify compliance with the Project's conditions of approval.

20. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site. a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: General Plan, Figure S-8 (Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map); Ord. 460, Sec. 14.2; Ord. 484

Findings of Fact:

Proposed grading activities would expose underlying soils at the Project site, which would increase erosion susceptibility during grading and construction activities. Exposed soils would be subject to erosion due to the removal of stabilizing vegetation and exposure of these erodible materials to wind. Erosion by wind would be highest during periods of high wind speeds.

The Project site is considered to have a "moderate" susceptibility to wind erosion (Riverside County, 2003a, Figure S-8). During grading and other construction activities involving soil exposure or the transport of earth materials, significant short-term impacts associated with wind erosion would be precluded with mandatory compliance with the Project's SWPPP and WQMP (described above) and Riverside County Ordinance No. 484.2, which establishes requirements for the control of blowing sand. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management

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

District (SCAQMD) Rule 403, which addresses the reduction of airborne particulate matter with mandatory compliance to these regulatory requirements. Wind erosion impacts would be less than significant during construction and mitigation is not required.

Following construction, wind erosion on the Project site would be very negligible, as the disturbed areas would be landscaped or covered with impervious surfaces. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not significantly increase the risk of long-term wind erosion on- or off-site, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required beyond mandatory compliance with the BMPs specified in the site-specific WQMP, which would be enforced as part of the Project's conditions of approval.

Monitoring: Construction contractors shall ensure compliance with the BMPs specified in the site-specific WQMP. The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall verify that the various BMPs have been adhered to during both construction and prior to final grading inspection.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project				
21. Greenhouse Gas Emissions a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: *Tentative Tract Map No. 36347 Greenhouse Gas Analysis,* Urban Crossroads, Inc., July 28, 2013; *Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold,* South Coast Air Quality Management District, October 2008.

Findings of Fact:

a & b) Provided below is a discussion and analysis of the Project's potential to emit air pollutants that would result in significant impacts associated with greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

Background

Global Climate Change (GCC) refers to the change in average meteorological conditions on the Earth with respect to temperature, wind patterns, precipitation and storms. Global temperatures are regulated by naturally occurring atmospheric gases such as water vapor, CO_2 (Carbon Dioxide), N_2O (Nitrous Oxide), CH_4 (Methane), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride. These particular gases are important due to their residence time (duration they stay) in the atmosphere, which ranges from 10 years to more than 100 years. These gases allow solar radiation into the Earth's atmosphere, but prevent radioactive heat from escaping, thus warming the Earth's atmosphere. GCC can occur naturally as it has in the past with the previous ice ages. According to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the climate change since the industrial revolution differs from previous climate changes in both rate and magnitude (CARB, 2004, Technical Support document for Staff Proposal Regarding Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Motor Vehicles). (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 6)

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are often referred to as GHG's. GHG's are released into the atmosphere by both natural and anthropogenic (human) activity. Without the natural greenhouse gas effect, the Earth's average temperature would be approximately 61° Fahrenheit (F) cooler than it is currently. The cumulative accumulation of these gases in the Earth's atmosphere is considered to be the cause for the observed increase in the Earth's temperature. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 6)

Although California's rate of growth of GHG emissions is slowing, the state is still a substantial contributor to the U.S. emissions inventory total. In 2004, California is estimated to have produced 492 million gross metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) GHG emissions. Despite a population increase of 16 percent between 1990 and 2004, California has substantially slowed the rate of growth of GHG emissions due to the implementation of energy efficiency programs as well as adoption of strict emission controls. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 6)

An individual project like the proposed Project cannot generate enough GHG emissions to effect a discernible change in global climate. However, the proposed Project may participate in the potential for GCC by its incremental contribution of GHG combined with the world-wide increase of all other sources of GHG, which when taken together constitute potential influences on GCC. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 4)

Methodology

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 (b) (1) states that a lead agency may use a model or methodology to quantify GHG emissions associated with a project. On February 3, 2011, the SCAQMD released the California Emissions Estimator Model (CALEEMOD) Emissions Inventory Model™. The purpose of this model is to more accurately calculate air quality and GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources and quantify applicable air quality and GHG reductions achieved from mitigation measures. As such, the February 2011 CALEEMOD™ was used for this Project. The CalEEMod™ model includes GHG emissions from the following source categories: construction, area, energy, mobile, waste, water. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 26)

Thresholds for Determining Significance

In order to assess the significance of a proposed project's environmental impacts it is necessary to identify quantitative or qualitative thresholds which, if exceeded, would constitute a finding of significance. While Project-related GHG emissions can be estimated, the direct impacts of such emissions on climate change and global warming cannot be determined on the basis of available science. There is no evidence at this time that would indicate that the emissions from a project the size of the proposed Project would directly affect global climate change. As set forth by CEQA, lead agencies are allowed to follow their own discretion in making their significance determination, though they are encouraged to consider as many factors as possible. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, pp. 24-25)

The CEQA Guidelines indicate that a project would potentially result in a significant impact on climate change if a project were to: a) generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, or b) conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Section 15064.4 of the CEQA Guidelines state that a lead agency may establish significance criteria by way of model or method and the resulting qualitative analysis may be relied upon to determine significance. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 25)

The County of Riverside has determined that there are three appropriate numeric thresholds that may be used to determine significance of the Project along with following the policies, programs, and reduction measures set forth in Assembly Bill 32(AB 32). (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 25)

1. 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year.
   a. A potentially significant impact would occur if the project exceeds the SCAQMD's interim screening threshold of 3,000 MT/yr of CO_2e. If a project exceeds the screening threshold, additional analysis is required to determine whether mitigation measures are needed to reduce the project's cumulative impact due to GHGs to a level below significant.

2. 28.5% Less Emissions than Business As Usual.
   a. The emissions from implementing the Project will be compared to similar projects. If the Project achieves a reduction of at least 28.5% with implemented mandatory measures, the project is considered less than significant.

3. 4.1 MT CO_2 Annual per Capita Threshold. This is adopted from SCAQMD and based on emission rate per population for the year 2035. If the emissions are below this threshold, the project is considered less than significant.

Based on guidance from the SCAQMD and for purposes of this analysis the appropriate threshold for use is whether or not the project would result in greater than 3,000 MT/yr of CO_2e. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 25) Pursuant to the SCAQMD *Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans*, a screening threshold is recommended to determine whether additional analysis is required. If a project is below the screening threshold, additional mitigation is not required. As noted by the SCAQMD:

> "...the...screening level for stationary sources is based on an emission capture rate of 90 percent for all new or modified projects...the policy objective of [SCAQMD's] recommended interim GHG significance threshold proposal is to achieve an emission capture rate of 90 percent of all new or modified stationary source projects. A GHG significance threshold based on a 90 percent emission capture rate may be more appropriate to address the long-term adverse impacts associated with global climate change because most projects will be required to implement GHG reduction measures. Further, a 90 percent emission capture rate sets the emission threshold low enough to capture a substantial fraction of future stationary source projects that will be constructed to accommodate future statewide population and economic growth, while setting the emission threshold high enough to exclude small projects that will in aggregate contribute a relatively small fraction of the cumulative statewide GHG emissions. This assertion is based on the fact that [SCAQMD] staff estimates that these GHG emissions would account for slightly less than one percent of future 2050 statewide GHG emissions target (85 [MMTCO2e/yr]). In addition, these small projects may be subject to future applicable GHG control regulations that would further reduce their overall future contribution to the statewide GHG inventory. Finally, these small sources are already subject to [Best Available Control Technology] (BACT) for criteria pollutants and are more likely to be single-permit facilities, so they are more likely to have few opportunities readily available to reduce GHG emissions from other parts of their facility." (SCAQMD, 2008)

Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction Emission Assumptions

Construction activities associated with the proposed Project would result in emissions of CO and CH_4 from the following construction activities:

- Site Preparation
- Grading and Infrastructure Construction
- Building Construction
- Paving
- Architectural Coatings (Painting)
- Construction Workers Commuting

CalEEMod™ model defaults were utilized for duration of specific construction activity and the number and type of equipment that would be used. Please refer to specific detailed modeling inputs/outputs contained in Appendix "A" of the Project's Greenhouse Gas Analysis (IS/MND Appendix G). A detailed summary of construction equipment assumptions by phase is provided in IS/MND Table 3-3. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, pp. 26-27)

Construction emissions for construction worker vehicles traveling to and from the Project site, as well as vendor trips (construction materials delivered to the Project site) were estimated based on CalEEMod™ defaults. For construction phase Project emissions, GHGs are quantified and amortized over the life of the Project. To amortize the emissions over the life of the Project, the SCAQMD recommends calculating the total GHG emissions for the construction activities, dividing it by the project life (i.e., 30 years) then adding that number to the annual operational phase GHG emissions (SCAQMD, 2009). As such, construction emissions were amortized over a 30 year period and added to the annual operational phase GHG emissions. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 27)

Operational Emission Assumptions

Operational activities associated with the proposed Project would result in emissions of CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O from the following primary sources (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 28):

- Building Energy Use
- Water Supply, Treatment and Distribution
- Solid Waste
- Mobile Source Emissions

GHGs are emitted from buildings as a result of activities for which electricity and natural gas are typically used as energy sources. Combustion of any type of fuel emits CO_2 and other GHGs directly into the atmosphere; these emissions are considered direct emissions associated with a building. GHGs are also emitted during the generation of electricity from fossil fuels; these emissions are considered to be indirect emissions. Unless otherwise noted, CalEEMod™ default parameters were used. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 28)

Indirect GHG emissions result from the production of electricity used to convey, treat and distribute water and wastewater. The amount of electricity required to convey, treat and distribute water depends on the volume of water as well as the sources of the water. Unless otherwise noted, CalEEMod™ default parameters were used. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, pp. 28-29)

Residential land uses generate and require disposal of solid waste. A large percentage of this waste would be diverted from landfills by a variety of means, such as reducing the amount of waste generated, recycling, and/or composting. The remainder of the waste not diverted would be disposed

of at a landfill. GHG emissions from landfills are associated with the anaerobic breakdown of material. GHG emissions associated with the disposal of solid waste associated with the proposed Project were calculated by the CalEEMod™ model using default parameters. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 29)

GHG emissions would also result from mobile sources associated with the Project. These mobile source emissions would result from the typical daily operation of motor vehicles by residents and visitors., Trip characteristics are taken from the Project's traffic impact analysis (IS/MND Appendix J). (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 29)

Emissions Summary

The annual GHG emissions associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Project are estimated to be 2,343.31 $MTCO_2e$ per year as summarized in Table EA-7, *Total Annual Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 29)

Table EA-7 Total Annual Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Emissions (metric tons per year)			
Emission Source	**CO_2**	**CH_4**	**N_2O**	**Total CO_2E**
Annual construction-related emissions amortized over 30 years	24.479	0.003	--	24.53
Area Source Emissions	72.04	--	--	75.52
Energy	455.47	0.01	0.01	458.29
Mobile Sources	1,679.44	0.07	--	1,680.86
Waste	25.47	1.51	--	57.07
Water Usage	40.69	0.21	0.01	47.04
Total CO_2E (All Sources)		**2,343.31**		
Threshold MT CO_2E/Yr		**3,000.00**		
Significant?		**NO**		

Source: CalEEMod™ model output, See Appendix "A" of the Greenhouse Gas Analysis (IS/MND Appendix G) for detailed model outputs.
Note: Totals obtained from CalEEMod™ and may not total 100% due to rounding.
(Urban Crossroads, 2013b, Table 3-2)

Significance of Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Project-Related Emissions Impact Analysis

As shown in Table EA-7, direct and indirect construction and operational emissions associated with the Project would comprise approximately 2,343.31 MT CO_2e/yr, which is below the Riverside County/SCAQMD Interim screening threshold of significance for all land use projects of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year. Accordingly, and based on the interim guidance from the SCAQMD, the proposed Project would not result in GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. Project impacts would therefore be less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 30; SCAQMD, 2008)

Project Consistency with Applicable Plans, Policies, or Regulations

AB 32 is the State of California's primary GHG emissions regulation. The SCAQMD GHG significance threshold was designed to ensure compliance with AB 32 emissions reductions requirements in the South Coast Air Basin. Therefore, if a proposed project emits below the significance threshold it can

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

be assumed to comply with AB 32 within the SCAQMD's jurisdiction. As the Project would emit less than 3,000.00 $MTCO_2e/yr$, the Project would not conflict with the state's ability to achieve the reduction targets defined in AB 32. The Project would also comply with a number of regulations that would further reduce GHG emissions, including the following regulations that are particularly applicable to the Project and that would assist in the reduction of GHG emissions (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, p. 31):

- Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB32)
- Regional GHG Emissions Reduction Targets/Sustainable Communities Strategies (SB 375)
- Pavley Fuel Efficiency Standards (AB1493). Establishes fuel efficiency ratings for new vehicles.
- Title 24 California Code of Regulations (California Building Code). Establishes energy efficiency requirements for new construction.
- Title 20 California Code of Regulations (Appliance Energy Efficiency Standards). Establishes energy efficiency requirements for appliances.
- Title 17 California Code of Regulations (Low Carbon Fuel Standard). Requires carbon content of fuel sold in California to be 10% less by 2020.
- California Water Conservation in Landscaping Act of 2006 (AB1881). Requires local agencies to adopt the Department of Water Resources updated Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance or equivalent by January 1, 2010 to ensure efficient landscapes in new development and reduced water waste in existing landscapes.
- Statewide Retail Provider Emissions Performance Standards (SB 1368). Requires energy generators to achieve performance standards for GHG emissions.
- Renewable Portfolio Standards (SB 1078). Requires electric corporations to increase the amount of energy obtained from eligible renewable energy resources to 20 percent by 2010 and 33 percent by 2020.

As such, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact due to a conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. (Urban Crossroads, 2013b, pp. 30-31)

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project				
22. Hazards and Hazardous Materials a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Project Application Materials; *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*, GeoKinetics, May 22, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or environment based on existing site conditions, construction of the proposed Project, and long-term operation. Each is discussed below.

Impact Analysis for Existing Conditions

An environmental site assessment was conducted for the property by GeoKinetics to assess existing conditions (refer to IS/MND Appendix H). Based on the results of this analysis, GeoKinetics determined that the proposed Project site does not contain any underground storage tanks (USTs) or above-ground storage tanks (ASTs). Additionally, based on information from environmental agencies, it was concluded that hazardous materials were never used, stored, or generated at the site. There are no existing structures, nor have any structures ever existed on-site, that have the potential for containing asbestos, lead based paints, or fluorescent light fixtures (which may contain PCBs). The site also was found to have acceptable levels of radon gas, typical of lands throughout Riverside County. (GeoKinetics, 2013, pp. 6-8)

A majority of the Project site has been used for dry land wheat production since the late 1800s. Dry land wheat production is not associated with the use of organic and inorganic pesticides. Accordingly, and based on the recommendations of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (IS/MND Appendix H), impacts due to the potential presence of pesticides in site soils would be less than significant. (GeoKinetics, 2013, p. 15)

There are no other existing site conditions that have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

Impact Analysis for Project Construction Activities

Heavy equipment (e.g., dozers, excavators, tractors) would be operated on the subject property during construction of the Project. This heavy equipment would likely be fueled and maintained by petroleum-based substances such as diesel fuel, gasoline, oil, and hydraulic fluid, which is considered hazardous if improperly stored or handled. In addition, materials such as paints, adhesives, solvents, and other substances typically used in building construction would be located on the Project site during construction. Improper use, storage, or transportation of hazardous materials can result in accidental releases or spills, potentially posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment. This is a standard risk on all construction sites, and there would be no greater risk for improper handling, transportation, or spills associated with the proposed Project than would occur on any other similar construction site. Construction contractors would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding the transport, use, and storage of

hazardous construction-related materials, including but not limited requirements imposed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Because compliance with these regulatory requirements by construction contractors is mandatory, impacts due to hazardous materials used, transported, and/or stored during construction would be less than significant.

Impact Analysis for Long-Term Operational Activities

The Project site would be primarily developed with residential land uses and supporting recreational and open space land uses, which are land uses not typically associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Although residential land uses may utilize household products that contain toxic substances, such as cleansers, paints, adhesives, and solvents, these products are usually in low concentration and small in amount and would not pose a significant risk to humans or the environment during transport to/from or use at the Project site. Pursuant to State law and local regulations, residents would be required to dispose of household hazardous waste (e.g., batteries, used oil, old paint) at a permitted household hazardous waste collection facility. Accordingly, the Project would not expose people or the environment to significant hazards associated with the disposal of hazardous materials at the Project site. Long-term operation of the Project would not expose the public or the environment to significant hazards associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Accidents involving hazardous materials that could pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment would be highly unlikely during the construction and long-term operation of the Project and are not reasonably foreseeable. As discussed above under Threshold 22.a), the transport, use and handling of hazardous materials on the Project site during construction is a standard risk on all construction sites, and there would be no greater risk for upset and accidents than would occur on any other similar construction site. Upon buildout, the Project site would operate as a residential community, which is a land use type not typically associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials that could be subject to upset or accident involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Accordingly, impacts associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials would be less than significant during both construction and long-term operation of the Project.

c) The Project site does not contain any emergency facilities nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route. Under existing conditions, roadways that would access the site are not currently improved, including Yates Road at the southwestern Project boundary and Charlois Road southerly of Abelia Street. Thus, during near-term construction activities, Project implementation would have no impact on emergency evacuation routes as compared to the existing condition, as all nearby residents would continue to be afforded emergency evacuation routes via existing improved roadways. Under long-term operational conditions, the proposed Project would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles via Yates Road, Charlois Road, and connecting on-site roadways as required by the County. Furthermore, the Project would not result in a substantial alteration to the design or capacity of any existing public road that would impair or interfere with the implementation of evacuation procedures. Because the Project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, no impact would occur.

d) The proposed Project site is located immediately adjacent to and west of an existing K-8 school facility (Temecula Valley Charter School). No other schools are located or proposed within 0.25-mile of the Project site. The potential for the Project to emit or handle hazardous or acutely

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

hazardous materials is addressed above under the response to Threshold 22.a). As noted, the site's existing conditions have no potential to expose nearby sensitive receptors to hazardous materials. Accordingly, impacts to the existing school facility located east of the site would be less than significant.

As also discussed under the response to Threshold 22.a), hazardous materials used during construction of the proposed Project is a standard risk on all construction sites, and there would be no greater risk for upset and accidents than would occur on any other similar construction site. Construction contractors would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding the transport, use, and storage of hazardous construction-related materials, including but not limited requirements imposed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), and Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Due to mandatory compliance with these regulatory requirements by construction contractors, impacts due to hazardous materials generated during construction and that could affect the adjacent school site would be less than significant.

As further noted under the response to Threshold 22.a), long-term operation of the Project site would not involve the emission or handling of hazardous materials that could pose a significant hazard to people or the environment, including the school. As such, Project operation would result in a less-than-significant impact.

e) The proposed Project site and off-site improvement areas are not included on any list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (GeoKinetics, 2013, pp. 11-12). Accordingly, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

23. Airports a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: General Plan, Figure S-19 (Airport Locations); GIS database (Riverside County, 2013); *Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Development Review*, Riverside County ALUC, July 15, 2013; *Airport Master Plan for French Valley Airport*, Riverside County ALUC, April 2009; *Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Volume I*, Riverside County ALUC, October 14, 2004; *French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*, Riverside County ALUC, October 2007.

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed Project site is located approximately 2.3 miles northeast of the French Valley Airport. The *Airport Master Plan for French Valley Airport* (April 2009) is the applicable Airport Master Plan for this facility. Exhibit 5A of the Airport Master Plan identifies the Master Plan Concept for the French Valley Airport. The nearest portion of the French Valley Airport property that is included in the Airport Master Plan occurs approximately 2.0 miles southwest of the Project site, and there are no facilities identified by the Airport Master Plan for lands extending beyond the airport property. There are no components of the Airport Master Plan that could be adversely affected by implementation of the proposed Project, nor are there any policies specified in the Airport Master Plan that would apply to the proposed Project site. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in an inconsistency with the Airport Master Plan for French Valley Airport, and no impact would occur.

b) The Project site is located approximately 2.3 miles northeast of the French Valley Airport. The French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) incorporates a Compatibility Map (Map FV-1) that designates lands surrounding the airport facility as part of compatibility zones. The majority of the Project site (i.e., the southwestern portions) is located within Compatibility Zone E of the French Valley ALUCP, while the extreme northeast corner of the Project site is located outside the French Valley ALUCP Compatibility Zones (ALUC, 2007, Map FV-1). Because a majority of the proposed Project is located within Compatibility Zone E and thus, occurs within the Airport Influence Area for the French Valley Airport, the Project requires review by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC).

The proposed Project was reviewed by the Riverside County ALUC on July 11, 2013, which determined that the proposed Project is consistent with the 2007 French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (refer to IS/MND Appendix K), subject to compliance with certain conditions. Although the Project would be fully compatible with the French Valley Airport facility, the conditions of approval specified by the Riverside County ALUC in its consistency determination are incorporated herein as mitigation measures. Compliance with the mitigation measures/conditions of approval imposed on the Project by the Riverside County ALUC would ensure that the Project does not result in any potential conflicts with operations at the French Valley Airport, and also would ensure that future Project residents are not subject to hazards associated with airport operations. Accordingly, and with implementation of the required mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

c) As indicated above under the discussion of Threshold 23.b), the proposed Project was reviewed by the Riverside County ALUC, which determined that the Project is fully consistent with the French Valley ALUCP subject to compliance with certain conditions of approval that have been imposed herein as mitigation measures. Compliance with the ALUC conditions of approval would ensure that future Project residents are not exposed to safety hazards associated with operation of the French Valley Airport. This finding is further supported by the policies established by the Riverside County ALUCP for lands located within Compatibility Zone E. As indicated in Table 2A of the 2004 Riverside County ALUCP, there are no density restrictions or restrictions to the number of persons per acre allowed within Compatibility Zone E, and the only prohibited uses within this zone are uses that would pose hazards to flight (ALUC, 2004, Table 2A). There are no components of the proposed Project that would pose hazards to flight. The Riverside County ALUCP also discourages spectator-oriented sports stadiums, amphitheaters, and concert halls within Zone E, and none of these uses are proposed by the Project. Finally, the Riverside County ALUCP indicates that airspace review would be required for objects within Zone E that are greater than 100 feet in height; however,

the Project's proposed zoning designation of "One Family Dwellings (R-1)" specifies a maximum structural height of 40 feet, and future structures on-site would therefore not exceed 100 feet in height. Assuming adherence to the conditions of approval imposed on the Project by the Riverside County ALUC, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area and impacts would be less than significant.

d) The Project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports or heliports. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project has no potential to result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area associated with private airstrips and heliports. No impact would occur.

Mitigation:

M-HM-1 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.028) Prior to issuance of grading, building, or occupancy permits, as appropriate, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure compliance with or implementation of the following requirements of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission:

a) All outdoor lighting proposed as part of the Project shall be hooded or shielded so as to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.

b) The following uses shall be prohibited:
   i. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator;
   ii. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport;
   iii. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area, including landscaping utilizing water features, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, and incinerators; and
   iv. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

c) All potential purchasers and/or tenants of the proposed residences shall be provided a copy of the following notice:

"Notice of Airport in Vicinity: This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influence area. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (for example: noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any, are

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

associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you. Business & Professions Code Section 11010 (b) (13)(A)"

d) Any new retention basins on the site shall be designed so as to provide for a maximum 48-hour detention period following the conclusion of the storm event for the design storm (may be less, but not more), and to remain totally dry between rainfalls. Vegetation in and around the retention basin(s) that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be incompatible with airport operations shall not be utilized in project landscaping.

Monitoring:

M-HM-1 The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall review implementing grading, building, and occupancy permit applications for compliance with the above-specified requirements of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.

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

Source: General Plan, Figure S-11 (Wildfire Susceptibility); Riverside County GIS (Riverside County, 2013).

Findings of Fact: According to Riverside County GIS data, the proposed Project site is not located within a "high fire area" (Riverside County, 2013). The nearest portion of Riverside County that is identified as occurring within a "high fire area" occurs approximately 1.25 miles east of the Project site and north of Lake Skinner. Additionally, the Project site is located adjacent to land uses that do not pose a high fire risk, including an existing school facility located east of the site, rural residential/agricultural support buildings located adjacent and to the west of the site, and areas north of the site that have been graded and are planned for development with urban residential uses as part of the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan. Additionally, the existing agricultural land to the south and southeast of the Project site is regularly tilled as part of on-going farming operations, which would reduce fire hazards associated with this property, and the land to the south and southeast is planned by the Riverside County General Plan for development with residential uses (Riverside County, 2003a). The only portion of the proposed Project site with a potential to expose future structures to fire risks occurs at the northwestern portion of the site, at the base of the existing hill form; however, the Project's landscape plan (IS/MND Figure 3-7) shows that the portions of the slope abutting future on-site residential uses would be fully landscaped and irrigated with fire resistant vegetation, which would reduce any potential wildland fire hazards associated with this hill form to a level below significant. Based on these considerations, the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source: *Tentative Tract 36437 Preliminary Hydrology Report.* MDS Consulting, November 25, 2013; *Preliminary Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan for Tract 36437*, MDS Consulting, August 16, 2012; *Eastern Municipal Water District 2010 Urban Water Management Plan*, Eastern Municipal Water District, June 2011.

Findings of Fact:

a) As proposed by TTM 36437, the Project site would be graded to facilitate the construction of 102 home sites and associated recreational land uses. As part of the Project's proposed grading plan, the western portions of the site would be lowered by up to 54 feet and the eastern and southern portions of the areas proposed for residential development would be raised by up to 18 feet. All drainage from the manufactured slope within Lot 'B,' as well as runoff from the residential portions of the development, would be collected within catch basins to be provided throughout the on-site street system and conveyed to a water quality/detention basin in Lot 103. Following treatment of the first flush flows, runoff collected in the water quality/detention basin would then be conveyed via a proposed 18" storm drain to be constructed approximately 3,000 feet southerly of the site via the Allegre Vista Road alignment and ultimately conveyed to the Benton Creek Channel. Additionally,

runoff from the southern portions of proposed Charlois Road would be conveyed via a proposed water quality inlet to a proposed sand filter basin to be constructed within Lot 'A,' after which it would be discharged into Lot 'A' and allowed to sheet flow towards the southern property line, as occurs under existing conditions. The remaining drainage within Lot 'A,' including the existing drainage from the Charlois drainage channel that traverses Lot 'A,' would not be substantially altered as part of the Project. Although the Project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site through grading to facilitate residential development, all runoff from the site and the southern portions of Charlois Road would be treated via water quality features (i.e., the water quality/detention basin in Lot 103 and the sand filter basin proposed at the southern terminus of Charlois Road). Based on the analysis presented in the Project's hydrology study (IS/MND Appendix F1), post-development runoff from the site would very slightly decrease during 10-year (24-hour duration) storm events (i.e., from 9.10 CFS under existing conditions to 8.94 CFS under post-development conditions), and would very slightly increase during 100-year (24-hour duration) storm events (i.e., from 16.78 CFS under existing conditions to 16.84 CFS under post-development conditions). Thus, runoff from the site under post-development conditions would not substantially increase such that erosion or siltation would increase on- or off-site. As such, following implementation of the Project, runoff from the site would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

b) The California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Section 13000 ("Water Quality") et seq., of the California Water Code), and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendment of 1972 (also referred to as the Clean Water Act (CWA)) require that comprehensive water quality control plans be developed for all waters within the State of California. The Project site is located within the jurisdiction of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Water quality information for the Santa Margarita River Watershed is contained in the San Diego RWQCB's Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (as most recently amended on April 4, 2011). This document is herein incorporated by reference and is available for public review at the San Diego RWQCB office located at 9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100, San Diego, CA 92123-4340.

The CWA requires all states to conduct water quality assessments of their water resources to identify water bodies that do not meet water quality standards. Water bodies that do not meet water quality standards are placed on a list of impaired waters pursuant to the requirements of Section 303(d) of the CWA. The Project site resides within the Santa Margarita Watershed. Receiving waters for the property's drainage are the Benton Creek Channel, Murrieta Creek, and Santa Margarita River, and the Santa Margarita Lagoon, which discharges into the Pacific Ocean. The Benton Creek Channel is not impaired; the Warm Springs Creek is impaired by pathogens, metals, nutrients, and pesticides; the Murrieta Creek is impaired by pathogens, nutrients, metals, and toxicity; the Santa Margarita River is impaired by pathogens, nutrients, and toxicity; and the Santa Margarita Lagoon is impaired by nutrients. (MDS, 2012, p. 8)

A specific provision of the CWA applicable to the proposed Project is CWA Section 402, which authorizes the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program that covers point sources of pollution discharging to a water body. The NPDES program also requires operators of construction sites one acre or larger to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and obtain authorization to discharge stormwater under an NPDES construction stormwater permit.

Impact Analysis for Construction-Related Water Quality

Construction of the proposed Project would involve clearing, grading, paving, utility installation, building construction, and landscaping activities, which would result in the generation of potential

water quality pollutants such as silt, debris, chemicals, paints, and other solvents with the potential to adversely affect water quality. As such, short-term water quality impacts have the potential to occur during construction of the Project in the absence of any protective or avoidance measures.

Pursuant to the requirements of the San Diego RWQCB and the County of Riverside, the Project would be required to obtain a NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit for construction activities. The NPDES permit is required for all projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with the San Diego RWQCB's Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. Compliance with the NPDES permit and the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin involves the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP for construction-related activities. The SWPPP is required to specify the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that the Project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are prevented, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property. Mandatory compliance with the SWPPP would ensure that the proposed Project does violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction activities. Therefore, with mandatory adherence to the Project's SWPPP, water quality impacts associated with construction activities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

Post-Development Water Quality Impacts

Storm water pollutants commonly associated with the land uses proposed by the Project (i.e., residential, park, and open space) include sediment/turbidity, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen-demanding substances, bacteria and viruses, oil and grease, pesticides, and metals. Based on current receiving water impairments (303(d) List) and allowable discharge requirements (USEPA TMDL List), the Project's pollutants of concern are pathogens (bacteria and viruses) and nutrients/oxygen demanding substances (MDS, 2012, p. 9). To meet NPDES requirements, the Project's proposed storm drain system is designed to route first flush runoff (85th percentile) to a water quality/detention basin located on-site prior to discharging to the Benton Creek Channel via a proposed 18-inch storm drain. The water quality/detention basin has been sized to treat the first flush volumes from the residential portions of the site, as well as runoff from the slopes and existing runoff from the property to the north (refer to the Project's WQMP in IS/MND Appendix F2).

Furthermore, the Project would be required to implement a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), pursuant to the requirements of the applicable NPDES permit. The WQMP is a post-construction management program that ensures the on-going protection of the watershed basin by requiring structural and programmatic controls. The Project's WQMP is included as IS/MND Appendix F2. The WQMP identifies structural controls (including the water quality/detention basin) and programmatic controls (including educational materials for property owners, activity restrictions, common area litter control, street sweeping, drainage facility and maintenance, etc.) to minimize, prevent, and/or otherwise appropriately treat storm water runoff flows before they are discharged from the site. Mandatory compliance with the WQMP would ensure that the Project does violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during long-term operation. Therefore, water quality impacts associated with post-development activities would be less than significant with mandatory WQMP compliance and no mitigation measures would be required.

c) No potable groundwater wells are proposed as part of the Project. The proposed Project would be served with potable water by the EMWD. Domestic water supplies from the EMWD are reliant on imported water from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), recycled water, local

groundwater production, and desalted groundwater (EMWD, 2011, p. 27). All municipal water entities that exceed their safe yield incur a groundwater replenishment obligation, which is used to recharge the groundwater basin with State Water Project Water. Thus, the Project's demand for domestic water service would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. For more detailed information about domestic water supply refer to the Utilities and Service Systems discussion below under Issue 45.

Development of the Project would increase impervious surface coverage on the site, which would in turn reduce the amount of direct infiltration of runoff into the ground. However, the Project's stormwater runoff is engineered to be conveyed through public street improvements and storm drains, which would discharge southerly to a proposed 18" storm drain, which would convey flows southerly to the Benton Creek Channel where groundwater recharge would continue to occur. Thus, with buildout of the Project, the local groundwater levels would not be significantly affected. Therefore, impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant, and mitigation would not be required.

d) On-site stormwater runoff associated with the Project is engineered to be conveyed through public street improvements and storm drains, which would discharge to the proposed water quality/detention basin in Lot 103 prior to being conveyed via a proposed 18" storm drain to the Benton Creek Channel, and thence to the Warm Springs Creek, Murrieta Creek, Santa Margarita River, Santa Margarita Lagoon, and ultimately to the Pacific Ocean. On-site storm drain lines, which are depicted on TTM 36437, would measure 18-inches in diameter. To meet NPDES requirements, the Project's storm drain system would route first flush flows from the residential portions of the site to the water quality/detention basin (within Lot 103) prior to discharge to the Benton Creek Channel. The existing natural drainage that traverses the southeastern corner of the site under existing conditions would be retained as part of the Project, while runoff from Charlois Road would be treated via a proposed sand filter basin prior to sheet flowing off-site near the southeastern Project boundary. The proposed water quality/detention basin and sand filter basin are designed to treat all of the first flush flows from the residential portions of the Project as well as runoff from Charlois Road.

With the improvements to be installed by the Project described above, the Project would not create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Additionally, with required adherence to a SWPPP and WQMP as discussed above under Threshold 25.b), the Project would not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, less-than-significant impacts would occur and mitigation is not required.

e & f) The proposed Project site is located within FEMA Flood Zone "C," which is defined as an "area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on [Flood Insurance Rate Maps] as above the 500-year flood level" (FEMA, 2013). Accordingly, the proposed Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, nor would the Project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. No impact would occur.

g) Mandatory compliance with the BMPs specified in the Project's WQMP (refer to Appendix F2) would ensure that the Project does not result in any other impacts to water quality. There are no conditions associated with the proposed Project that could result in the substantial degradation of water quality beyond what is described above in the responses to Thresholds 25.a), 25.b), or 25.d). Accordingly, no impact would occur.

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

h) The proposed water quality/detention basin in Lot 103 and the proposed sand filter basin in Lot 'A' are designed to treat runoff from the residential portions of the Project site and from proposed Charlois Road prior to discharging flows towards downstream areas. As such, these water quality BMPs would not result in the detention of water on-site for long periods of time such that vectors (e.g., mosquitoes) or odors could result. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure M-HM-1, identified above under Issue 22, requires that retention basins must be designed to drain within 48 hours, thereby precluding impacts associated with vectors. Impacts associated with the construction of the Project's BMPs are evaluated throughout this IS/MND, and where necessary, mitigation has been identified to address any impacts associated with their construction. Accordingly, the Project would not include any new or retrofitted stormwater BMPs that could result in significant environmental effects, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

26. Floodplains

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

NA - Not Applicable ☒ U - Generally Unsuitable ☐ R - Restricted ☐

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

Source: General Plan, Figure S-9 (100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones); SWAP Figure 10 (Southwest Area Plan Flood Hazards); GIS database (Riverside County, 2013); *Tentative Tract 36437 Preliminary Hydrology Report*, MDS Consulting, November 25, 2013; *Preliminary Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan for Tract 36437*, MDS Consulting, August 16, 2012.

Findings of Fact:

a) Based on the analysis presented in the Project's hydrology study (IS/MND Appendix F1), post-development runoff from the site would very slightly decrease during 10-year (24-hour duration) storm events (i.e., from 9.10 CFS under existing conditions to 8.94 CFS under post-development conditions), and would very slightly increase during 100-year (24-hour duration) storm events (i.e., from 16.78 CFS under existing conditions to 16.84 CFS under post-development conditions). Thus, runoff from the site under post-development conditions would not substantially increase such that flood hazards would be increased on- or off-site. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

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

b) Under existing conditions, all runoff from the site is conveyed overland to the Charlois Channel and ultimately conveyed to the Benton Creek Channel. Due to the undeveloped nature of the Project site, a portion of the site's natural drainage likely infiltrates into the groundwater table. Under the Project, a majority of the Project site would be improved with residential and recreational land uses, which would substantially increase impervious conditions on-site. However, runoff from the site would be conveyed to the Benton Creek Channel, which is a soft-bottomed channel that would allow for infiltration into the groundwater table, thereby ensuring that the developed nature of the Project site does not substantially reduce the total amount of water that infiltrates into the groundwater basin. Additionally, and based on the analysis presented in the Project's hydrology study (IS/MND Appendix F1), post-development runoff from the site would very slightly decrease during 10-year (24-hour duration) storm events (i.e., from 9.10 CFS under existing conditions to 8.94 CFS under post-development conditions), and would very slightly increase during 100-year (24-hour duration) storm events (i.e., from 16.78 CFS under existing conditions to 16.84 CFS under post-development conditions). Accordingly, the Project would not result in a substantial change in the rate or amount of surface runoff, and would not substantially affect absorption rates within the groundwater basin, and impacts would therefore be less than significant.

c) According to Figure 10 from the SWAP (Southwest Area Plan Flood Hazards), the proposed Project site is not located within areas subject to dam inundation hazards associated with Lake Skinner. The Project site is located immediately north of the nearest area identified as being subject to dam inundation hazards. (Riverside County, 2003a, SWAP Figure 10) Additionally, as part of the Project's grading plan, residential portions of the site would be raised above existing grades, which would further protect the site from potential dam inundation hazards. There are no levees within the Project vicinity that could expose the Project site to flood hazards. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

d) Under existing conditions, all runoff from the site sheet flows towards the Benton Creek Channel, located approximately 3,000 feet southerly of the Project site. With buildout of the Project, runoff from the developed portions of the site would be conveyed to the on-site water quality/detention basin, and would discharge to a proposed 18" storm drain channel towards the Benton Creek Channel. The natural drainage course in the southeastern portion of the site would continue to convey water overland towards the Benton Creek Channel, as occurs under existing conditions. Similarly, runoff within the southern portions of Charlois Road would discharge via a proposed sand filter basin and would sheet flow towards the south, and ultimately would reach the Benton Creek Channel. Accordingly, because all runoff leaving the site under post-development conditions would continue to discharge to the Benton Creek Channel, as occurs under existing conditions, Project implementation would not result in any changes in the amount of surface water in any water body. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project				
27. Land Use a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

Source: General Plan; Riverside County GIS (Riverside County, 2013), Project Application Materials; Temecula General Plan, Figure LU-3 (Land Use Policy Map).

Findings of Fact:

a) Under existing conditions, the proposed Project site is used for dry land agricultural crop production. With implementation of the proposed Project and approval of the Project's change of zone, the site would be converted from agricultural to medium density residential land uses, along with recreational and open space land uses. Although the change from agricultural uses to residential uses represents a change to the site's existing land use, environmental impacts associated with such conversion have been evaluated throughout this IS/MND and mitigation measures have been imposed where necessary to reduce potentially significant impacts to a level below significance. Furthermore, the land uses and zoning designation proposed by the Project is consistent with the site's existing General Plan land use designation of "Medium Density Residential," thereby indicating that the Project would not result in an alteration to the planned land uses for the site. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

b) The proposed Project site is located in unincorporated Riverside County, within the sphere of influence for the City of Temecula. According to Figure LU-3 of the Temecula General Plan, the Project site is pre-zoned for "Rural (0-0.2 du/ac)" land uses. Land uses shown on Figure LU-3 surrounding the Project site include "Low Medium (3-6 du/ac)" land uses to the west and north; "Open Space" to the west; "Public Institutional Facilities" to the east and southeast; "Very Low (0.2-0.4 du/ac)" land uses to the south; and "Rural (0-0.2 du/ac)" land uses to the southwest and west.

Although the Project would not be consistent with the site's pre-zoning designation of "Rural (0-0.2 du/ac)," the Project site abuts lands that are designated for "Low Medium (3-6 du/ac)" to the north. The 102 dwelling units on the 40.16-acre site proposed by the Project would result in a gross Project density of 2.5 du/ac, and would therefore serve as a transition between the "Low Medium" residential uses planned to the north and northwest of the Project site by the Temecula General Plan, and the "Very Low" and "Rural" residential uses planned to the south and southwest of the site. Additionally, development of the site with residential uses would not conflict with Temecula's pre-zoning of lands located to the east for "Public Institutional Facilities" because the residential development on-site would not result in a land use conflict with the existing school use located to the east. Furthermore, land uses proposed by the Project are fully consistent with the Riverside County General Plan Land Use Plan.

Accordingly, and based on the foregoing analysis, although the Project would result in a change to the site's planned land uses as shown in the Temecula General Plan, such impacts would be less than significant because the proposed change in land uses would not result in, induce, or require changes to surrounding planned land uses and would not result in land use compatibility conflicts. No mitigation is required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

28. Planning a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
zoning?				
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: General Plan Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS database (Riverside County, 2013), Riverside County Ord. 348

Findings of Fact:

a) Under existing conditions, the 40.16-acre site is zoned for "Residential Agriculture, 2½-acre minimum lot size (R-A-2½)." The 102 residential dwelling units proposed by the Project would not be consistent with this zoning designation. However, the Project also proposes a change of zone (CZ 07794) to change the site's zoning designation to "One Family Dwellings (R-1)," which would allow for development of the site with single-family residential uses on minimum 7,200 square foot (s.f.) lot sizes. It should be noted that the R-1 zoning designation proposed by the Project is fully consistent with the site's General Plan and SWAP land use designation of "Medium Density Residential (MDR)," which allows for single-family residential development at densities ranging from 2.0 to 5.0 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) and lot sizes ranging from 5,500 to 20,000 s.f. in size. The Project's gross density is 2.5 du/ac. Accordingly, and assuming approval of CZ 07794, the Project would be fully consistent with the site's proposed zoning designation of R-1, and no impact would occur.

b) Zoning designations surrounding the proposed Project site include the following: "Specific Plan Zone (SP Zone)" to the north; SP Zone to the east and southeast; R-A-2½ to the south; and R-A-2½ and SP Zone to the west. Areas within SP Zone are identified for development with medium density residential and ancillary uses as part of the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan. The proposed Project, which proposes medium density residential uses on the 40.16-acre site, would be fully compatible with the planned medium density residential land uses within the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan, which are located immediately west and north of the site. Additionally, the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan designates the property located east of and adjacent to the Project site for a school site, and this school has since been constructed as the Temecula Valley Charter School. Residential uses planned as part of the Project would be fully compatible with this existing school use.

Lands to the south and southwest of the Project site are zoned R-A-2½, which allows for large-lot single family development on minimum 2.5-acre lot sizes, along with limited agricultural uses. The single-family homes proposed as part of the Project would be fully compatible with large-lot single family land uses. TTM 36437 proposes lot sizes ranging from 7,275 s.f. to 15,297 s.f. Although there is a potential for the Project to conflict with agricultural uses that could occur within the R-A-2½ zone, the proposed Project would be required to comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 625.1. Ordinance No. 625.1 specifies that if any agricultural operation has been in place for at least three years and is not considered a nuisance operation at the time the operation began, no change in surrounding land uses may cause said operation to become a nuisance. Ordinance No. 625 requires

notification to future residents at the time homes on-site are purchased that agricultural operations are on-going in the area and that such uses may not be the subject of nuisance complaints.

Mandatory compliance with Ordinance No. 625 would ensure that potential conflicts between proposed residential uses on-site and existing agricultural zoning located south and southwest of the Project site do not occur, thereby ensuring that impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation beyond mandatory compliance with Ordinance No. 625 would be required.

c) Existing land uses surrounding the Project site include undeveloped land to the north that has been graded in anticipation of future development of residential uses in association with the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan. To the east of the Project site is the Temecula Valley Charter School, which provides educational services for grades K-8. To the south and southeast of the Project site is undeveloped land that has been used for dry land agricultural production, with several rural residences located to the southwest of the site. To the west are open space, an agricultural support building, and several large-lot single family homes, beyond which is an existing medium density residential community.

As indicated above, the residential uses proposed as part of the Project would be fully compatible with existing and proposed residential uses within the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan to the west and north. Additionally, the proposed residential uses also would be fully compatible with the existing school use to the east of the site. As indicated under the discussion and analysis of Threshold 28.b), although the residential uses proposed as part of the Project have the potential to conflict with the existing agricultural uses to the south and east, mandatory compliance with Ordinance No. 625 would ensure that potential conflicts between proposed residential uses on-site and existing agricultural uses do not occur, thereby ensuring that impacts would be less than significant

General Plan designations surrounding the proposed Project site include the following: MDR and "Open Space – Conservation (OS-C)" to the north; MDR and "Open Space – Recreation (OS-R)" to the east; "Rural Community – Very Low Density Residential (RC-VLDR)" and "Estate Density Residential (EDR)" to the south; and RC-VLDR and OS-C to the west. The residential land uses proposed as part of the Project would be fully consistent with the planned land uses in the surrounding area, as the majority of the surrounding area is planned for long-term development with residential development at varying densities. Land uses proposed as part of the Project also would not conflict with the OS-C land use designation to the west/northwest, as the Project proposes to preserve the northwestern corner of the site as open space.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the proposed Project would be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses, and impacts would be less than significant.

d) The proposed Project is located within the SWAP Highway 79 Policy Area. The purpose of the Highway 79 Policy Area is to address transportation infrastructure capacity within the policy area. Specifically, the following policies apply to projects located within the Highway 79 Policy Area:

SWAP 9.1 Accelerate the construction of transportation infrastructure in the Highway 79 Policy Area. The County shall require that all new development projects demonstrate adequate transportation infrastructure capacity to accommodate the added traffic growth. The County shall coordinate with cities adjacent to the policy area to accelerate the usable revenue flow of existing funding programs, thus assuring that transportation infrastructure is in place when needed.

SWAP 9.2 Establish a program in the Highway 79 Policy Area to ensure that overall trip generation does not exceed system capacity and that the system operation continues to meet Level of Service standards. In general, the program would establish guidelines to be incorporated into individual Traffic Impact Analysis that would monitor overall trip generation from residential development to ensure that overall within the Highway 79 Policy Area development projects produce traffic generation at a level that is 9% less than the trips projected from the General Plan traffic model residential land use designations. Individually, projects could exceed the General Plan traffic model trip generation level, provided it can be demonstrated that sufficient reductions have occurred on other projects in order to meet Level of Service standards.

The proposed Project would have no potential to conflict with Policy SWAP 9.1, as this policy merely provides direction to County staff and decision-makers for the construction of transportation-related facilities and for the coordination with other local jurisdictions in the funding and construction of transportation infrastructure.

According to Appendix E to the General Plan (Buildout Assumptions & Methodologies), the General Plan traffic model assumed that all residential lands would develop at their mid-point density. The proposed Project site is designated for "Medium Density Residential (MDR)" uses, which has a midpoint density of 3.5 dwelling units per acre. Accordingly, the General Plan traffic model assumed that the 40.16-acre site would be developed with approximately 141 dwelling units. Thus, in order to achieve the traffic-reducing requirements specified by Policy SWAP 9.2, a maximum of 128 dwelling units could be constructed on-site. The Project proposes to develop the site with only 102 dwelling units, and therefore meets the requirement of Policy SWAP 9.2. As such, no impact would occur. (Riverside County, 2003a, Appendix E, p. 2)

The proposed Project also would not conflict with any other policies of the General Plan or the SWAP, as the land uses proposed by the Project are fully consistent with the site's existing land use designation of "Medium Density Residential." There are no components of the proposed Project that would conflict with any applicable policy of the General Plan or SWAP; accordingly, no impact would occur.

e) With exception of the existing school site located immediately adjacent to the Project's eastern boundary and the rural residential land uses located southwest of the site, the area immediately surrounding the Project site does not comprise an "established community." Although lands to the north and west of the Project site are planned for development with residential uses as part of the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan, this planned development does not comprise an "existing community," and implementation of residential uses on-site would not result in a physical division of this community because the residential uses on-site would effectively serve as an extension of the residential uses proposed within Winchester 1800. Moreover, with buildout of the Project's proposed residential uses, public access would be afforded via public roads to be constructed on-site and immediately adjacent to the site. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project				
29. Mineral Resources a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: General Plan, Figure OS-5 (Mineral Resources)

Findings of Fact:

a & b) Based on available information, the Project site has never been the location of mineral resource extraction activity. No mines are located on the property. According to Figure OS-5 of the Riverside County General Plan, the Project site and off-site impact areas are designated within Mineral Resources Zone 3 (MRZ-3) pursuant to the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA), MRZ-3 is defined by the State of California Department of Conservation SMARA Mineral Land Classification Project as "Areas where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist, however, the significance of the deposit is undetermined." Furthermore, the Project site is not identified as an important mineral resource recovery site by the County General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State, nor would the Project 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. No impact would occur. (Riverside County, 2003a)

c & d) The Project site is not located within or near any lands that are classified as Mineral Resources Zone 2 (MRZ-3), which are areas known to have mineral resources deposits. Additionally, lands abutting the Project site do not include any State classified or designated areas, and there are no known active or abandoned mining or quarry operations on lands abutting the proposed Project site. Accordingly, no impact would occur. (Riverside County, 2003a)

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

NOISE Would the project result in				
Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings Where indicated below, the appropriate Noise Acceptability Rating(s) has been checked. NA - Not Applicable A - Generally Acceptable B - Conditionally Acceptable C - Generally Unacceptable D - Land Use Discouraged				
30. Airport Noise a) For a project located within an airport land use	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐				
b) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: General Plan, Figure S-19 (Airport Locations); Riverside County GIS (Riverside County, 2013); *Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Development Review*, Riverside County ALUC, July 15, 2013; *Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Volume I*, Riverside County ALUC, October 14, 2004; *French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*, Riverside County ALUC, October 2007.

Findings of Fact:

a) According to Map FV-3 of the 2007 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the French Valley Airport, the Project site is located approximately 1.6 miles east of the nearest portion of the County that is affected by airport-related noise exceeding 55 dBA CNEL (ALUC, 2007, Map FV-3). As such, future residents of the proposed Project would not be exposed to excessive noise levels associated with airport operations. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

b) There are no private use airports or private airstrips located within the vicinity of the Project site (Riverside County, 2013). Accordingly, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

31. Railroad Noise NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: General Plan, Figure C-1 (Circulation Plan); Riverside County GIS (Riverside County, 2013), On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact: The proposed Project site is not located near any railroad tracks (Google Earth, 2013) and no aspect of the proposed Project involves railroad use or rail transport. Accordingly, no railroad-related noise impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

32. Highway Noise NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials; Riverside County GIS (Riverside County, 2013).

Findings of Fact: The nearest highway to the proposed Project site is Highway 79/Winchester Road, located approximately 0.9-mile northwest of the site. Due to intervening development and topography, vehicular traffic along Highway 79/Winchester Road would not expose future on-site residents to noise levels in excess of the County General Plan standards and no impact would occur. Please refer also to Threshold 34.c) below for a discussion of the Project's potential to expose future Project residents to excessive noise levels associated with nearby roadways, and for a discussion of the Project's potential to create or contribute to substantial vehicular-related noise in off-site locations.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

33. Other Noise NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Project Application Materials, Riverside County GIS (Riverside County, 2013).

Findings of Fact: There are no other known sources of noise within the Project vicinity that could expose future Project residents to noise levels above the County General Plan standards. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

34. Noise Effects on or by the Project a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Table N-1 ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure"); Project Application Materials, *Tentative Tract Map No. 36437 Preliminary Noise Study*, Urban Crossroads, Inc., September 27, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project consists of a proposed residential community. Residential uses are not typically associated with a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above pre-existing levels. As discussed below under Threshold 34.c), the only potential for the Project to create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels is the result of future traffic generated by the proposed Project that has the potential to cause or contribute to elevated traffic-related noise volumes at off-site locations. The analysis presented under Threshold 34.c) concludes that the Project's incremental noise contributions to study area roadways would be considered "barely perceptible" (i.e., less than 3.0 dBA CNEL). Refer the analysis under Threshold 34.c) for more information. As it concludes, off-site transportation-related noise impacts would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

b) The Project's only potential to result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels would be during construction activities, as long-term operation of the Project as a residential community would not result in the generation of any measurable temporary or periodic noise increases.

Riverside County Ordinance 847 (Regulating Noise) exempts construction noise impacts provided that the construction activities do not occur between the hours of six p.m. to six a.m. during the month of June through September, and between the hours of six p.m. and seven a.m. during the months of October through May. The County of Riverside does not specify exterior noise level limits for construction related noise impacts.

Noise sensitive receptors are generally defined as locations where people reside or where the presence of unwanted sound could otherwise adversely affect the use of the land. Noise-sensitive receptors typically include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries and certain types of passive recreational uses. Four nearby sensitive receptor locations were identified to assess the off-site construction noise level impacts. Noise sensitive receptors R1, R2, R3 and R4 describe the following locations:

R1: The Temecula Valley Charter School located approximately 200 feet east of the project boundaries from the nearest classroom.
R2: The neighboring residential homes located approximately 70 feet west of the project boundaries
R3: Noise sensitive residential receptors located near the northwest corner of the project boundaries.
R4: The vacant residential lots located north of the project site approximately 40 feet from the project boundaries.

The Project construction noise impacts would include both short-term mobile equipment and long-term stationary equipment. Short-term mobile construction activities (e.g. nail guns, hammers, power saws, drills, etc.) generated throughout the Project site are not staged or stationary. During construction, all of the long-term construction equipment (generators, compressors, pumps) staging activities would be located in areas that would create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and the noise sensitive receptors (as required by Mitigation Measure M-N-1). It is expected that the Project construction activities would consist primarily of short-term mobile equipment.

Tables 9-2 to 9-6 of the Project's Noise Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix I) present the construction noise levels for each phase of construction. The construction noise analysis indicates that the unmitigated Project construction noise levels are expected to range from 77.0 to 87.1 dBA Leq at a

distance of 50 feet. Although impacts during construction are evaluated as less than significant due to mandatory compliance with the County's Noise Ordinance timing requirements for construction activities, mitigation measures are nonetheless recommended to help reduce near-term construction impacts to the greatest feasible extent.

The analysis shows that the highest construction noise level impacts will occur during the grading construction activities prior to installation of the recommended perimeter wall (refer to Mitigation Measure M-N-3). As shown on Table 9-7 of the Project's Noise Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix I), the peak short-term mobile construction noise levels at the nearby receptor locations are expected to range from 61.7 to 89.0 dBA Leq. While the recommended 5-foot high perimeter sound wall would benefit some of the noise receptor locations during the building, paving and architectural coating phases of construction, the recommended sound wall will not provide any noise attenuation for the site preparation or grading phases of construction. The construction noise analysis includes an estimated 5 dBA Leq noise level reduction during the building, paving and architectural coating phases of construction to account for the recommended 5-foot high perimeter sound wall at Lots 1 through 8 and 99 through 102 facing Charlois Road on the eastern project boundary; Lots 8, 9, 35 and 36 facing the northern project boundary; and, Lots 84 and 91 facing the Alegre Vista Road on the western project boundary. The construction of the recommended 5-foot high perimeter soundwall after grading will provide a "readily perceptible" 5 dBA Leq noise level reduction for the building, paving and architectural coating phases of construction.

To maximize the distance between construction-related noise sources and the noise sensitive receptors, the construction equipment staging shall be concentrated in the southeastern corner of the site, or along the southern property boundary in the eastern portion of the site, as required by Mitigation Measure M-N-1. Locating the long-term stationary construction noise in the southeastern portion of the site substantially lowers the expected noise receptor hourly noise levels. As shown on Table 9-8 of the Project's Noise Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix I), the expected long-term stationary construction noise levels are expected to range from 55.0 to 62.3 dBA Leq.

When compared with the short-term mobile construction noise analysis, the location of the long-term stationary construction away from nearby sensitive receptors (as required by Mitigation Measure M-N-1) is expected to reduce the noise levels at the noise receptor location by 6.7 to 26.7 dBA Leq as shown on Table 9-9 of the Project's Noise Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix I).

In addition, construction of the proposed Project would require the construction of a 18-inch storm drain within the alignment of Alegre Vista Road to a distance approximately 3,000 feet southerly of the Project site. Construction of this off-site storm drain would result in construction noise affecting sensitive receptors (i.e., residences) along the proposed alignment. However, construction-related noise is explicitly exempt from the noise limit requirements of County Ordinance 847. Moreover, construction of the off-site storm drain would require compliance with Mitigation Measures M-N-1, which would serve to reduce noise levels to the maximum practical extent and also would ensure compliance with the timing restrictions specified in County Ordinance 847. Accordingly, off-site construction activities associated with the proposed Project would be less than significant, assuming compliance with Mitigation Measure M-N-1.

Based on the five (5) phases of construction related noise impacts, the noise impacts associated with the proposed Project are expected to temporarily expose nearby sensitive receptors to high levels of noise; however, construction noise is temporary, intermittent and of short duration, and would not present any long-term impacts. Accordingly, and assuming implementation of Mitigation Measures M-

N-1 through M-N-3, near-term construction-related noise would represent a less-than-significant impact because construction-related noise is explicitly exempt from the noise limit requirements of County Ordinance 847, and because mitigation measures are identified to reduce construction-related noise levels to the maximum feasible extent.

c) The proposed Project has the potential to expose nearby sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the County standard. Sensitive receptors within the immediate vicinity of the Project site include existing residential uses to the west and southwest; future residential land uses to the north within the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan, and the Temecula Valley Charter School to the east, while additional sensitive receptors may be located along study area roadway segments that would experience increased traffic levels as a result of the Project. Riverside County Ordinance No. 847 establishes the County's noise standard, and establishes a maximum decibel level for residential and school uses during the daytime hours (7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.) as 55 dBA and during the nighttime hours (10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.) as 45 dBA. The Project has the potential to result in noise levels in excess of the County's standard during Project construction activities, under long-term conditions due to the potential exposure of future on-site residents to traffic-related noise from nearby streets, and under long-term conditions due to the potential for Project-related traffic to create or contribute to noise levels along off-site streets. Each of these conditions is discussed below.

Near-Term Construction-Related Noise

As noted in the discussion and analysis of Threshold 34.b), above, and assuming compliance with Mitigation Measures M-N-1 through M-N-3, near-term construction activities at the proposed Project site would not conflict with the noise standards established in the County's Noise Ordinance, and impacts would be less than significant.

On-Site Traffic-Related Noise Impacts

A Noise Impact Analysis technical report (IS/MND Appendix I) was prepared to evaluate the Project's potential to expose future on-site residents to noise levels exceeding the County's interior and exterior noise standards. For noise-sensitive uses, such as schools and single-family homes, the Riverside County General Plan indicates that exterior noise levels should remain below 65 dBA CNEL, while interior noise levels should remain below 45 dBA CNEL. (Riverside County, 2003a, pp. N-6 and N-18)

In order to evaluate future noise levels impacting the Project site, roadway noise levels from vehicular traffic were projected using a computer program that replicates the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Traffic Noise Prediction Model- FHWA-RD-77-108 (the "FHWA Model"). The FHWA Model arrives at a predicted noise level through a series of adjustments to the Reference Energy Mean Emission Level (REMEL). Adjustments are then made to the REMEL to account for: the roadway classification (e.g., collector, secondary, major or arterial), the roadway active width (i.e., the distance between the center of the outermost travel lanes on each side of the roadway), the total average daily traffic (ADT), the travel speed; the percentages of automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks in the traffic volume, the roadway grade, the angle of view (e.g., whether the roadway view is blocked), the site conditions ("hard" or "soft" relates to the absorption of the ground, pavement, or landscaping), and the percentage of total ADT which flows each hour throughout a 24-hour period. (Urban Crossroads, 2013c, p. 15) Refer to Section 6.0 of the Project-specific Noise Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix I) for a description of the various inputs used in the modeling of future on-site noise levels.

The primary source of noise impacts to the Project site would be traffic noise from Charlois Road. The Project would also experience some background traffic noise impacts from the Project's internal roads, however, based on the distance of other roads, topography and low traffic volume/speed, traffic noise from these roads will not make a significant contribution to the noise environment. (Urban Crossroads, 2013c, pp. 1-2)

Exterior Noise Levels

Using the FHWA traffic noise prediction model, the expected noise levels for on-site residential lots were calculated. The future traffic noise calculations are included in Appendix 6.1 to the Project's Noise Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix I). Table EA-8, *Future On-Site Exterior Noise Levels*, presents a summary of future exterior noise level impacts. Based on the FHWA traffic noise prediction model, the future unmitigated exterior noise levels for the lots analyzed would range from 67.7 to 67.8 dBA CNEL along Charlois Road. The unmitigated exterior noise levels are expected to exceed the County of Riverside 65 dBA CNEL exterior noise level standards for lots backing onto Charlois Road. This is a significant impact for which mitigation, in the form of noise barrier construction along the Project's frontage with Charlois Road, will be required. (Urban Crossroads, 2013c, p. 31)

Table EA-8 Future On-Site Exterior Noise Levels

Lot	Roadway	Unmitigated Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Mitigated Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Barrier Height (Feet)	Top Of Barrier Elevation (Feet)
2	Charlois Road	67.8	63.6	5.0	1423.2
5	Charlois Road	67.8	63.4	5.0	1420.2
8	Charlois Road	67.7	63.0	5.0	1418.2
10	Charlois Road	67.7	62.6	5.0	1417.0
12	Charlois Road	67.7	57.2	5.0	1419.0

(Urban Crossroads, 2013c, Table 8-1)

To satisfy the County of Riverside 65 dBA CNEL exterior noise level standards, the construction of a 5.0-foot high noise barrier is required along Charlois Road. Table EA-8 presents the predicted future exterior noise levels with the respective recommended noise barrier. With the recommended noise barrier, the mitigated exterior noise levels would range from 57.2 to 63.6 dBA CNEL. This noise analysis shows that the construction of the 5.0-foot high noise barrier will satisfy the County of Riverside 65 dBA CNEL exterior noise level standards. Thus, with construction of the 5.0-foot high noise barrier as required by Mitigation Measure M-N-3, impacts to future on-site residents due to an exceedance of the County's exterior noise level standard would be reduced to a level below significance. (Urban Crossroads, 2013c, p. 31)

Interior Noise Levels

To ensure that interior noise levels of proposed residential homes comply with the County of Riverside 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standards, future noise levels were calculated at the first and second floor building facades.

The interior noise level is the difference between the predicted exterior noise level at the building façade and the noise reduction of the structure. Typical building construction provides a noise reduction of approximately 12 dBA with "windows open" and a minimum 25 dBA noise reduction with "windows closed." However, sound leaks, cracks and openings within the window assembly can

greatly diminish its effectiveness in reducing noise. Several methods are used to improve interior noise reduction, including: (1) weather-stripped solid core exterior doors; (2) upgraded dual glazed windows; (3) mechanical ventilation/air conditioning; and (4) exterior wall/roof assembles free of cut outs or openings. (Urban Crossroads, 2013c, pp. 21-22)

Table EA-9, *First Floor Interior Noise Impacts*, and Table EA-10, *Second Floor Interior Noise Impacts*, show that the future first and second floor interior noise levels at the façade are estimated to range from 57.6 to 66.7 dBA CNEL for homes adjacent to Charlois Road. In order to meet the County of Riverside 45 dBA CNEL interior noise level standard, an interior noise level reduction ranging from 12.6 to 21.7 dBA CNEL is needed. To provide the necessary interior noise level reduction, Table EA-9 and Table EA-10 indicates that all homes will require a windows closed condition. This is a significant impact for which mitigation would be required. (Urban Crossroads, 2013c, p. 31)

Table EA-9 First Floor Interior Noise Impacts

Lot	Roadway	Noise Level At Façade	Interior Noise Level For Windows		Required Interior Noise Reduction
			Open[2]	Closed[3]	
2	Charlois Road	62.3	50.3	37.3	17.3
5	Charlois Road	62.0	50.0	37.0	17.0
8	Charlois Road	61.6	49.6	36.6	16.6
10	Charlois Road	61.5	49.5	36.5	16.5
12	Charlois Road	57.6	45.6	32.6	12.6

Notes:
All values shown in Table EA-9 are dBA CNEL.
1. Includes the noise attenuation provided by the barrier as shown on Table EA-8.
2. A minimum of 12 dBA noise reduction is assumed with a windows open condition.
3. A minimum of 25 dBA noise reduction is assumed with a windows closed and typical dual-glazed windows with a minimum STC (Sound Transmission Class) rating of 26.

(Urban Crossroads, 2013c, Table 8-2)

The interior noise analysis shows that windows with a minimum STC rating of 26 would satisfy the County of Riverside 45 dBA CNEL interior noise level standard for first and second floor windows on Lots 1-8 and 99-102 facing Charlois Road. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-N-4, the proposed Project is expected to meet the County of Riverside 45 dBA CNEL interior noise level standard for residential development. Thus, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-N-4 would reduce the Project's impacts due to interior noise levels to a level below significance. (Urban Crossroads, 2013c, p. 31)

As required by Mitigation Measure M-N-5, a final noise study shall be prepared prior to obtaining building permits for Lots 1-8 and 99-102 to confirm that the noise mitigation measures are effective to meet the 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard. This final noise study will finalize the mitigation measures recommended in the preliminary noise study using the precise grading plan and actual building design specifications, and suggest additional measures if needed to insure that the 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard is met. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-N-5 would further ensure that interior noise levels at Project buildout are reduced to below 45 dBA CNEL, and would ensure that impacts remain at a level below significance.

Table EA-10 Second Floor Interior Noise Impacts

Lot	Roadway	Noise Level At Façade	Interior Noise Level For Windows		Required Interior Noise Reduction
			Open[2]	Closed[3]	
2	Charlois Road	66.7	54.7	41.7	21.7
5	Charlois Road	66.7	54.7	41.7	21.7
8	Charlois Road	66.6	54.6	41.6	21.6
10	Charlois Road	66.6	54.6	41.6	21.6
12	Charlois Road	66.7	54.7	41.7	21.7

Notes:
All values shown in Table EA-10 are dBA CNEL.
1. Includes the noise attenuation provided by the barrier as shown on Table EA-8.
2. A minimum of 12 dBA noise reduction is assumed with a windows open condition.
3. A minimum of 25 dBA noise reduction is assumed with a windows closed and typical dual-glazed windows with a minimum STC (Sound Transmission Class) rating of 26.

(Urban Crossroads, 2013c, Table 8-3)

Off-Site Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts

Traffic associated with future operations of the proposed Project could potentially cause off-site noise impacts to off-site noise-sensitive uses located adjacent to road corridors. To assess the off-site traffic-related noise level impacts associated with the Project, the CNEL levels at a distance of 100 feet from the traffic study area roadway segments were developed for Existing and Year 2014 conditions. The off-site noise contours do not account for background noise associated with non-transportation stationary noise sources. (Urban Crossroads, 2013c, p. 23)

To quantify the Project's traffic noise effects on off-site areas, the changes in traffic noise levels on nine roadway segments surrounding the proposed Project site were estimated based on the changes in the average daily traffic volumes. The off-site noise contours were used to assess the Project's incremental off-site traffic-related noise impacts. Noise contours represent the distance to noise levels of a constant value and are measured from the center of the roadway for the 70, 65, 60 and 55 dBA noise levels. (Urban Crossroads, 2013c, p. 23)

The noise contours do not take into account the effect of any existing noise barriers or topography that may affect ambient noise levels. Tables 7-1 and 7-2 of the Noise Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix I) present the existing without and with Project noise level contour boundaries Tables 7-3 and 7-4 of the Project's Noise Study (IS/MND Appendix I) present the Year 2014 without and with Project noise contours. The off-site FHWA model printouts are included in Appendix 7.1 to the Noise Impact Analysis (IS/MND Appendix I). (Urban Crossroads, 2013c, p. 23)

A significant direct off-site traffic noise impact would occur if the Project were to create a noise level increase in the area adjacent to the roadway segment greater than 3 dBA and the resulting noise level increased above the 65 dBA CNEL exterior noise standard for residential and school uses. A cumulatively significant impact would result if the Project were to contribute more than 3 dBA to any roadway segment that already exposes nearby sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL. As shown on Table EA-11, *Existing Off-Site Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts*, for existing conditions, the Project would increase the off-site traffic noise levels from 0.0 to 2.4 dBA CNEL on the off-site roadway segments. Table EA-12, *Year 2014 Off-Site Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts*,

indicates that for Year 2014 conditions, the Project would increase the off-site traffic noise levels from 0.0 to 1.1 dBA CNEL. (Urban Crossroads, 2013c, p. 23)

Table EA-11 Existing Off-Site Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts

ID	Road	Segment	CNEL at 100 Feet (dBA)			Potential Significant Impact?[1]
			No Project	With Project	Project Addition	
1	Winchester Rd.	North of Abelia St.	67.3	67.6	0.3	No
2	Winchester Rd.	South of Abelia St.	67.7	67.9	0.2	No
3	Washington St.	North of Abelia St.	60.5	60.8	0.2	No
4	Washington St.	South of Abelia St.	61.0	61.3	0.3	No
5	Abelia St.	West of Winchester Rd.	52.1	52.1	0.0	No
6	Abelia St.	East of Winchester Rd.	56.4	57.2	0.9	No
7	Abelia St.	West of Charlois Rd.	51.1	53.5	2.4	No
8	Abelia St.	East of Charlois Rd.	51.1	52.5	1.4	No
9	Abelia St.	West of Washington St.	52.8	53.8	1.0	No

1. A significant impact occurs when the noise level exceeds 65 dBA CNEL and the project generates a noise level increase of greater than 3.0 dBA.

(Urban Crossroads, 2013c, Table 7-5)

Table EA-12 Year 2014 Off-Site Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts

ID	Road	Segment	CNEL at 100 Feet (dBA)			Potential Significant Impact?[1]
			No Project	With Project	Project Addition	
1	Winchester Rd.	North of Abelia St.	68.6	68.7	0.1	No
2	Winchester Rd.	South of Abelia St.	68.9	68.9	0.0	No
3	Washington St.	North of Abelia St.	61.8	61.8	0.1	No
4	Washington St.	South of Abelia St.	62.5	62.6	0.1	No
5	Abelia St.	West of Winchester Rd.	52.8	52.8	0.0	No
6	Abelia St.	East of Winchester Rd.	58.6	59.0	0.5	No
7	Abelia St.	West of Charlois Rd.	54.6	55.7	1.1	No
8	Abelia St.	East of Charlois Rd.	54.6	55.3	0.7	No
9	Abelia St.	West of Washington St.	55.3	55.9	0.6	No

1. A significant impact occurs when the noise level exceeds 65 dBA CNEL and the project generates a noise level increase of greater than 3.0 dBA.

(Urban Crossroads, 2013c, Table 7-6)

Based on the traffic noise analysis significance threshold of 3 dBA for all project-related traffic noise level increases where the resulting noise levels would be in excess of 65 dBA, no significant off-site traffic noise impacts would be created by the Project. Therefore, the proposed Project would not create a substantial permanent increase in traffic-related noise levels or expose persons to noise levels in excess of the exterior noise level standards established by the County of Riverside, and the Project's traffic-related noise effects to sensitive receptors located off-site would be less than significant.

d) Under existing conditions, there are no known sources of ground-borne vibration or noise that affect the Project site. The Project would not generate ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise, except, potentially, during the construction phase from the use of heavy construction equipment. According to California Department of Transportation's Transportation and Construction-Induced

Vibration Guidance Manual, ground-borne vibration from heavy construction equipment does not create vibration amplitudes that could cause structural damage, when measured at a distance of 10 feet (California DOT, 2004, Tables 13 and 18). The nearest existing off-site structures, located immediately west of the southwestern site boundary and at various locations adjacent to the off-site 60-inch storm drain alignment, are located over 50 feet from the nearest point of construction activities and would not be exposed to substantial ground-borne vibration due to the operation of heavy construction equipment on the Project site. Furthermore, the Project is not expected to employ any pile driving, rock blasting, or rock crushing equipment during construction activities, which are the primary sources of ground-borne noise and vibration during construction. As such, impacts from ground-borne vibration and noise during near-term construction would be less than significant.

There are no conditions associated with the long-term operation of the proposed Project that would result in the exposure of on- or off-site sensitive receptors to excessive ground-borne vibration or noise. The proposed Project would develop the subject property with residential uses and supporting recreational and open space land uses, and would not include nor require equipment, facilities, or activities that would generate ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise. In addition, the Project site is not located in the vicinity of a railroad line or any other use associated with ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise; therefore, the Project would not expose future on-site residents or any off-site sensitive receptors to substantial ground-borne vibration or noise. Accordingly, under long-term operation, the Project would not expose on- or off-site sensitive receptors to substantial ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation:

Mitigation for Construction Noise Impacts:

Although construction-related noise impacts were determined to be less than significant, the following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize the potential short-term construction noise that could affect nearby sensitive receptors.

M-N-1 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.029) Prior to grading and building permit issuance, the County shall verify that the following notes are included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by Riverside County or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to perspective construction contractors:

- During construction activities, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards.

- The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment staging areas in locations in the southeastern portion of the site or along the southern site boundary in the eastern portion of the site in order to provide a maximum distance from nearby sensitive receptors (i.e., existing residential uses to the west; the existing school use to the east; and future residential uses to the north, if constructed and occupied prior to commencement of construction activities).

- All stationary construction equipment shall be placed so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors located nearest the Project site (i.e., existing residential uses to the west; the existing school use to the east; and future residential uses to the north, if constructed and occupied prior to commencement of construction activities).

- All construction activities and haul truck deliveries shall be prohibited between the hours of six p.m. to six a.m. during the months of June through September, and between the hours of six p.m. and seven a.m. during the months of October through May.

M-N-2 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.030) Prior to grading permit issuance, the County shall review and approve a Construction Haul Route Exhibit prepared by the Project Applicant that identifies all public and private roadways that will be used for haul truck deliveries. Haul routes shall minimize passage by noise-sensitive land uses. A requirement to comply with the Construction Haul Route Exhibit shall be noted on all grading and building plans and also shall be specified in bid documents issued to perspective construction contractors.

M-N-3 (Condition of Approval 80.Planning.021) Following completion of mass grading activities, and prior to issuance of any building permits, walls shall be constructed in the following locations in order to reduce construction-related noise effects to nearby sensitive receptors:

- Lots 1 through 8 and 99 through 102 facing Charlois Road on the eastern project boundary: construct a minimum 5-foot noise barrier (wall) along the boundary with Charlois Road;
- Lots 8, 9, 35 and 36 facing the northern project boundary: construct a minimum 5-foot m noise barrier (wall) along the northern Project boundary; and
- Lots 84 and 91 facing the Alegre Vista Road on the western project boundary: construct a minimum 5-foot noise barrier (wall).

All required noise barriers may be constructed using masonry block materials. The recommended barrier must present a solid face from top to bottom. Unnecessary openings or decorative cutouts shall not be made. All gaps (except for weep holes) shall be filled with grout, caulking, or like material.

Mitigation for Operational Noise Impacts:

M-N-4 (Condition of Approval 90.Plannining.013) Prior to issuance of building permits for Lots 1 through 8 and 99 through 102 of Tentative Tract Map 36437, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure that homes on Lots 1 through 8 and 99 through 102 have been provided with a "windows closed condition" through the provision of mechanical ventilation (e.g., air conditioning), in combination with standard building construction that includes dual-glazed windows. Specific window recommendations shall be as specified by the Final Noise Study required pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-N-5 once final architectural plans are available and detailed interior noise reduction calculations can be performed based on actual building assembly details. In order to meet the County of Riverside 45 dBA CNEL interior noise

standard, the following conditions are anticipated to be required, subject to confirmation by the Final Noise Study required pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-N-6:

- Provide a windows closed condition requiring a means of mechanical ventilation (e.g. air conditioning) for Lots 1 through 8 and 99 through 102, facing Charlois Road;
- Provide exterior walls with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 46. Typical walls with this rating will have 2x4 studs or greater, 16" on center with R-13 insulation, a minimum 7/8" exterior surface of cement plaster and a minimum interior surface of 1/2" gypsum board.
- Provide roof / ceiling building system utilizing minimum 1/2" plywood sheathing that is well sealed to form a continuous barrier with minimum R-19 batt insulation in the joist cavities.

M-N-5 (Condition of Approval 80.Planning.019) Prior to issuance of building permits for Lots 1 through 8 and 99 through 102 of Tentative Tract Map 36437, the Project Applicant shall prepare a Final Noise Study to confirm that the noise attenuation measures specified in Mitigation Measure M-N-4 would achieve the County's 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard. The Final Noise Study shall finalize the mitigation measures identified in Mitigation Measure M-N-4 using the precise grading plans and actual building design specifications, and shall identify additional mitigation if needed to ensure that the 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard is met. The Final Noise Study shall be subject to review and approval by the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health, Office of Industrial Hygiene. Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for Lots 1 through 8 and 99 through 102, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall verify that all noise attenuation measures specified in the Final Noise Study have been constructed.

Monitoring:

Monitoring for Construction Noise Impacts:

M-N-1 Prior to grading and building permit issuance, the County Department of Building and Safety shall review grading and building plans for the required notes. The Project Applicant shall ensure that the required notes are included in all construction bid documents. Construction contractors shall be required to abide by the notes listed on the grading and/or building plans, and shall permit periodic inspection by Riverside County or its designee.

M-N-2 The Project Applicant shall prepare a Construction Haul Route Exhibit, which shall be reviewed by the Riverside County Planning Department to ensure that the proposed haul route location minimizes passage by noise-sensitive land uses. Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits, Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall review grading and building plans to ensure a note is included specifying the required haul route location(s), per the approved exhibit from the Riverside County Planning Department. The Project Applicant shall ensure that all construction bid documents include the approved Construction Haul Route Exhibit.

M-N-3 The Project Applicant shall be responsible for ensuring construction of the required noise barriers. The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure that

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

the required noise barriers have been constructed to the standards Lots 1 through 8 and 99 through 102 of Tentative Tract Map 36437.

Monitoring for Operational Noise Impacts:

M-N-4 The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall review future applications for building permits to ensure that homes within Lots 1 through 8 and 99 through 102 of Tentative Tract Map 36437 have been provided with a "windows closed condition" and that the other elements specified in Mitigation Measure M-N-4 are required by the proposed building permits, where applicable. The Riverside County Building and Safety Department also shall ensure that all required noise attenuation measures have been constructed prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.

M-N-5 The Project Applicant shall be responsible for preparing a Final Noise Study as part of future building permit applications. The Final Noise Study shall be subject to review and approval by the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health, Office of Industrial Hygiene prior to the issuance of building permits. Additionally, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure that the required interior noise mitigation features, as specified in the Final Noise Study, have been constructed prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for Lots 1 through 8 and 99 through 102 of Tentative Tract Map No. 36437.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project				
35. Housing				
a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Project Application Materials, Riverside County GIS (Riverside County, 2013), General Plan, General Plan Housing Element

Findings of Fact:

a & c) Under existing conditions, there are no existing homes on-site, nor is the site occupied by a substantial number of people. The Project proposed to develop the site with 102 single family homes,

which would provide for new housing opportunities within the County. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not displace housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

b) The Project is a proposed residential community and would provide for 102 new homes providing housing for between 326 to 375 residents, based on the population generation standards specified in the Valley-Wide Recreation & Park District Master Plan (VWRPD, 2010, Table 14). The Project would provide for new housing opportunities on the site, which would help meet the current population growth trends in western Riverside County. The residential dwelling units proposed as part of the Project would not result in an increased demand for affordable housing. Therefore, the proposed Project would not create a demand for additional housing, including housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income, and no impact would occur.

d) According to Riverside County GIS, the proposed Project site and off-site impact areas are not located within or adjacent to any County Redevelopment Project Areas (Riverside County, 2013). Accordingly, the Project has no potential to affect a County Redevelopment Project Area, and no impact would occur.

e) Under existing conditions, the proposed Project site is designated by the Riverside County General Plan for "Medium Density Residential (2-5 du/ac)" land uses. The 102 single-family homes proposed as part of the Project would result in a gross Project density of 2.5 du/ac; accordingly, the residential uses would be consistent with the site's existing General Plan land use designation. Since regional and local population projections rely, in part, on land uses proposed as part of the County's General Plan, and since the proposed Project would be consistent with the site's existing General Plan land use designation, the 326 to 375 new residents that would be generated by the Project would not exceed the regional or local population projections for the site. As such, the proposed Project would not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections, and no impact would occur.

f) The proposed Project would develop the subject property with 102 residential homes. At full build-out, the Project is estimated to provide housing for between 326 to 375 residents, based on the population generation standards specified in the Valley-Wide Recreation & Park District Master Plan (VWRPD, 2010, Table 14).

It is unlikely that the Project could induce off-site population growth because the Project site is surrounded by existing development and/or developments that are currently under construction on three sides. Additionally, none of the improvements planned as part of the Project (e.g., improvements to Yates Road and Charlois Road) would remove impediments to growth such that the adjacent, largely undeveloped properties to the south and east would be induced to convert to urban uses. Furthermore, all lands surrounding the Project site are planned by the Riverside County General Plan for development with residential uses at various densities (with exception of the open space area located off-site and adjacent to the northwest corner of the site), and it is unlikely that development of the Project site with residential uses would induce these nearby properties to be developed in accordance with their existing General Plan land use designations because there are no regional improvements proposed by the Project that would remove obstacles to development, such as the construction of a regional sewer line. Although the Project proposes to construct a new 18-inch storm drain off-site, this facility would not remove any obstacles to development of surrounding parcels because the improvement is primarily intended to address existing flows that traverse the site,

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

and other surrounding properties are not precluded from developing due to the lack of this improvement.

Under CEQA, direct population growth by a project is not considered necessarily detrimental, beneficial, or of little significance to the environment. Typically, population growth would be considered a significant impact pursuant to CEQA if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services and requires the expansion or new construction of public facilities and utilities, or if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth results in a physical adverse environmental effect. As documented in this IS/MND, activities of the proposed Project's population would result in impacts associated with transportation/traffic. However, mitigation measures are provided in this IS/MND to address all impacts associated with the Project's population to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Project's direct impacts associated with population inducement would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source: General Plan Safety Element; Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees).

Findings of Fact:

The Riverside County Fire Department provides fire protection services to the Project area. Pursuant to the Riverside County Fire Department Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Master Plan, the Project would be classified as "Category II – Urban," which requires a fire station to be within three (3) roadway miles of the Project and a full first alarm assignment team operating on the scene within 15 minutes of dispatch. The proposed Project would be primarily served by the French Valley Fire Station (Station No. 83), located at 37500 Sky Canyon Drive in the City of Murrieta, or approximately 4.85 roadway miles from the site. Although the proposed Project site is not located within three (3) roadway miles of this fire station, the Project site would be accessed primarily via Highway 79, which would allow for fire protection vehicles (including a full first alarm assignment team) to arrive at the site in approximately 10 minutes (Google Maps, 2013), which would meet the Category II – Urban level of service criteria established by the Riverside County Fire Department. In addition, the Project has been reviewed by the Riverside County Fire Department, which determined that the Project would be served by adequate fire protection services in accordance with the Riverside County Fire Department Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Master Plan.

Development of the proposed Project would affect fire protection services by placing an additional demand on existing Riverside County Fire Department resources should its resources not be augmented. To offset the increased demand for fire protection services, the proposed Project would be conditioned by the County to provide a minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities, including compliance with State and local fire codes, fire sprinklers, a fire hydrant system,

paved access, and secondary access routes. Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County's Development Impact Fee (DIF) Ordinance (Riverside County Ordinance 659), which requires a fee payment to assist the County in providing for fire protection services. Payment of the DIF fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional public services, including fire protection services, which may be applied to fire facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand for fire protection services that would be created by the Project.

Based on the foregoing analysis, implementation of the Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, and would not exceed applicable service ratios or response times for fire protections services. Impacts are less than significant and mitigation is not required.

Mitigation:

Although Project-related impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities would be less than significant, Mitigation Measure M-PS-1 is recommended to ensure compliance with the provisions of the County's DIF Ordinance (Ordinance 659).

M-PS-1 (Condition of Approval 10.Planning.009) The Project shall comply with County's Development Impact Fee (DIF) Ordinance, which requires payment of a development mitigation fee to assist in providing revenue that the County can use to improve public facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand for public services that would be created by the Project. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy by Riverside County, the Project Applicant shall pay fees in accordance with the County's Ordinance 659.

Monitoring:

M-PS-1 The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure that appropriate fees have been paid in accordance with County Ordinance No. 659 prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for each residential dwelling unit within Tentative Tract Map No. 36437.

37. Sheriff Services	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: General Plan; Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees).

Findings of Fact: The Riverside County Sheriff's Department provides community policing to the Project area via the Southwest Sheriff's Station located at 30755-A Auld Road in the City of Murrieta, or approximately 3.0 roadway miles from the proposed Project site. The Riverside County Sheriff's Department has set a minimum level of service standard of 1.0 deputy per 1,000 people.

At full buildout, the Project would introduce between 326 and 375 residents, based on the population generation standards specified in the Valley-Wide Recreation & Park District Master Plan (VWRPD, 2010, Table 14). There is not a direct correlation between population growth, the number of crimes committed, and the number of Sheriff's Department personnel needed to respond to these increases. As the population and use of an area increases, however, additional financing of equipment and manpower needs are required to meet the increased demand. The proposed Project would result in an increase in the cumulative demand for services from the Riverside Sheriff's Department. To

maintain the desirable level of service, buildout of the proposed Project would generate a need for less than one deputy (0.4 deputy). The proposed Project would not, however, result in the need for new or expanded physical sheriff facilities because the addition of less than one new deputy would not necessitate the construction of new or modified sheriff facilities.

The proposed Project's demand on sheriff protection services would not be significant on a direct basis because the Project would not create the need to construct a new Sheriff station or physically alter an existing station. The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County's DIF Ordinance (Ordinance 659), which requires a fee payment to assist the County in providing for public services, including police protection services. Payment of the DIF fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional police protection services, which may be applied to sheriff facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand that would be created by the Project. The Project's incremental demand for sheriff protection services would be less than significant with the Project's required payment of DIF fees.

Mitigation:

Although Project-related impacts associated with of new or physically altered sheriff protection facilities would be less than significant, the Project applicant shall pay DIF fees as required by Mitigation Measure M-PS-1.

Monitoring:

Monitoring shall occur as specified above for Mitigation Measure M-PS-1.

38. Schools	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Riverside County GIS (Riverside County, 2013); California Senate Bill 50 (Greene).

Findings of Fact:

The proposed Project would be served by the Temecula Valley Unified School District (TVUSD). Elementary students generated by the Project would attend LaVorgna Elementary School, located at 31777 Algarve Avenue in the community of Winchester (approximately 1.2 roadway miles west of the Project site). Middle school students would attend Bella Vista Middle School, located at 31650 Browning Street in Murrieta (approximately 3.7 roadway miles south of the Project site). High school students would attend the Temecula Valley High School, located at 31555 Rancho Vista Road in Temecula (approximately 11 roadway miles south of the Project site).

Buildout of the proposed Project would result in an increase in demand for school services as compared to existing conditions. Table EA-13, *Project-Related School Services Demand*, provides an estimate of future students that would be generated by the Project, based on the student generation factors provided in the Riverside County General Plan EIR (Riverside County, 2003b, Table 4.15.E). As shown in Table EA-13, the Project would result in the generation of approximately 84 new students (annually), including 38 elementary students, 21 middle school students, and 25 high school students.

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

Table EA-13 Project-Related School Services Demand

School Type	Project Units	Student Generation Factor	Total Number of Students
Elementary	102	0.369	38
Middle School	102	0.201	21
High School	102	0.246	25
		Total Project-Related Students:	84

(Riverside County, 2003b, Table 4.15.E)

Although it is possible that the TVUSD may ultimately need to construct new school facilities in the region to serve the growing population within their service boundaries, such facility planning is conducted by TVUSD and is not the responsibility of the Project. Furthermore, the proposed Project would be required to contribute fees to the TVUSD in accordance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Senate Bill 50). Pursuant to Senate Bill 50, payment of school impact fees constitutes complete mitigation for project-related impacts to school services. Therefore, mandatory payment of school impact fees would reduce the Project's impacts to school facilities to a level below significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Mitigation:

Although Project-related impacts associated with of new or physically altered schools would be less than significant, Mitigation Measure M-PS-2 is recommended to ensure compliance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Senate Bill 50).

M-PS-2: (Condition of Approval 80.Planning.011) The Project shall comply with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Senate Bill 50), which requires payment of a school impact fee on a per dwelling unit basis to assist in providing revenue that school districts (including TVUSD) can use to ensure the adequate provision of public education facilities and services to service new development. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project Applicant shall pay required impact fees to the TVUSD following TVUSD protocol for impact fee collection.

Monitoring:

M-PS-2 The Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure that appropriate fees have been paid in accordance with Senate Bill 50 prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for each residential dwelling unit within Tentative Tract Map No. 36437.

39. Libraries	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: General Plan; Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees).

Findings of Fact: Implementation of the Project would result in an increase in the population in the Project area and would increase the demand for library services. The Project would not generate the need for the physical construction of new or expanded public facilities. There are no library facilities or expansion of library facilities proposed as part of the Project.

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

The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County's DIF Ordinance (Ordinance 659), which requires a fee payment to assist the County in providing public services, including library services. Payment of the DIF fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of library services, and these funds may be applied to the acquisition and/or construction of public services and/or equipment (including library books). Mandatory payment of DIF fees would ensure that Project-related impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Mitigation:

Although Project-related impacts associated with of new or physically altered library facilities would be less than significant, the Project Applicant shall pay DIF fees as required by Mitigation Measure M-PS-1.

Monitoring:

Monitoring shall occur as specified above for Mitigation Measure M-PS-1.

40. Health Services	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: General Plan, General Plan EIR; Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees).

Findings of Fact: The proposed Project would increase the regional population and would thereby result in an increased demand for medical facilities. The provision of private health care is largely based on economic factors and demand and is beyond the scope of analysis required for this IS/MND. The Project's projected population was accounted for in the Riverside County General Plan EIR (October 2003) analysis, as the Project would be consistent with the site's existing General Plan land use designation. As described in the Riverside County General Plan EIR, "the increase in total population at build-out is not substantial because the increase in the County's tax base will provide additional funding for [public] medical facilities that will be determined by periodic medical needs assessments." Additionally, mandatory compliance with County Ordinance No. 659 requires a development impact fee payment to the County that is partially allocated to public health services and facilities. As such, impacts to public medical facilities and resources associated with the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Mitigation:

Although Project-related impacts associated with of new or physically altered health services facilities would be less than significant, the Project Applicant shall pay DIF fees as required by Mitigation Measure M-PS-1.

Monitoring:

Monitoring shall occur as specified above for Mitigation Measure M-PS-1.

RECREATION

41. Parks and Recreation a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
environment?				
b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Riverside County GIS (Riverside County, 2013); Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications); Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees); *Valley-Wide Recreation & Park District Master Plan*, Valley-Wide Recreation & Park District 2010; Parks & Open Space Department Review.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project would develop the subject property with 102 single-family detached residential homes. Pursuant to the population estimates contained in the Valley-Wide Recreation & Park District Master Plan (VWRPD, 2010, Table 14), the proposed Project would result in a future population of between 326 and 375 residents. Based on the Valley-Wide Recreation & Park District's (VWRPD) goal of providing 5.0 acres of park land for each 1,000 residents, the Project would generate a demand for between 1.6 and 1.9 acres of park land.

The proposed Project would construct an approximately 0.9-acre neighborhood park on-site. Environmental impacts associated with the construction of the on-site park facility have been evaluated throughout this IS/MND, and, where appropriate, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce identified impacts to a level below significance.

Although the Project provides for a 0.9-acre park site, the VWRPD Master Plan indicates that "Where the amount of parkland to be dedicated is less than 5 acres, the developer will be required to pay in-lieu fees" (VWRPD, 2010, p. 28). Pursuant to the requirements of the VWRPD Master Plan, the Project would be required to pay in-lieu fees, the amount of which would be based on the fair market value of land which would otherwise be required for dedication. With the payment of mandatory park fees in accordance with Section 10.35 of Riverside County Ordinance 460, the Project would fully fund its fair share of park demand.

Although the Project would require additional parkland to meet the recreational needs of future Project residents, the construction of such parkland would be conducted by Riverside County and/or the VWRPD. As the precise nature of parkland improvements that would be constructed, in part, using the Project's in-lieu fee contribution cannot be determined at this time, it would be speculative to attempt to analyze impacts to the environment that may result from such future park construction. Prior to construction of any future park improvements, Riverside County and/or the VWRPD would need to approve such park improvements, and before issuing such approvals, Riverside County and/or the VWRPD would need to comply with CEQA. Since the precise nature of future park improvements warranted to serve the Project are unknown at this time, impacts due to the construction of such park facilities are evaluated as speculative pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15145.

Based on the foregoing analysis, it is concluded that the proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact due to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Nonetheless, mitigation is proposed to ensure that the Project contributes its fair-share towards the cost of acquiring and/or constructing new park facilities as needed to serve the proposed Project.

b) As indicated in the analysis of Threshold 41.a), the proposed Project would construct a 0.9-acre recreational facility on-site and would be required to contribute in-lieu fees for the acquisition and/or improvement of additional parkland facilities within the County. With the payment of in-lieu fees and the construction of on-site park facilities, the Project would not result in a substantial increase in the use of existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or recreational facilities such that overuse would lead to or substantially contribute to their physical deterioration. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur and mitigation is not required.

c) According to Riverside County GIS, the proposed Project site is not located within any County Service Areas (CSAs) (Riverside County, 2013). As indicated under the discussion and analysis of Threshold 41.a), the Project site is located within the VWRPD Master Plan service area. However, the Project already would be conditioned to comply with the provisions of Section 10.35 of Riverside County Ordinance 460 and would be conditioned to contribute in-lieu fees for the acquisition and/or improvement of additional parkland facilities within the County. Accordingly, no impacts to the environment would result.

Mitigation:

Although Project-related impacts associated with recreation resources would be less than significant, Mitigation Measure M-R-1 is recommended to ensure compliance with the in-lieu fee payment requirement specified in Section 10.35 of Riverside County Ordinance 460 and the VWRPD Master Plan.

M-R-1 (Condition of Approval 50.Planning.008) Prior to final building inspection, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure that the Project Applicant has contributed appropriate in-fees for parkland facilities as required by Section 10.35 of Riverside County Ordinance 460 and the Valley-Wide Parks & Recreation District Master Plan.

Monitoring:

M-R-1 Prior to final building inspection, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure that the appropriate fee amounts have been paid.

42. Recreational Trails	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: SWAP, Figure 8 (Trails and Bikeway System)

Findings of Fact: According to Figure 8 of the Southwest Area Plan, there are no recreational trails planned within or adjacent to the proposed Project site. Other than the construction of sidewalks along public streets within the proposed Project site, the Project does not propose any recreational trails on- or off-site. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in

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

environmental impacts associated with the construction of recreational trails, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project				
43. Circulation a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Riverside County GIS (Riverside County, 2013); *Tentative Tract Map No. 36437 Traffic Impact Analysis*, Urban Crossroads, Inc., October 30, 2012; *2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program*, Riverside County Transportation Commission, December 14, 2011.

Findings of Fact:

a) In order to assess the Project's potential to result in significant impacts to the surrounding circulation system, a Project-specific traffic impact analysis was conducted for the proposed Project. A

copy of the Project's traffic impact analysis is provided as Appendix J to this IS/MND. It should be noted that the Traffic Impact Analysis refers to Charlois Road as "Street 'H'." Thus, all references to "Street 'H'" within this section refer to Charlois Road. Additionally, the traffic study analyzes the construction of 107 residential homes whereas the Project proposes 102 homes; accordingly, the analysis of impacts to traffic provided below represents a conservative estimate of Project-related impacts to the circulation system. Please refer to the Traffic Impact Analysis in Appendix J for a discussion of traffic-related terms and methodologies.

Existing Conditions

Based on the scope of the proposed Project, a study area was established encompassing a total of three (3) existing intersections, as follows,

- Winchester Road (SR-79) / Abelia Street
- Ginger Tree Drive/Street "H" / Abelia Street
- Washington Street / Abelia Street

These three intersections were selected for analysis because the Project is anticipated to contribute 50 or more peak-hour trips to these intersections. There are no other intersections within the Project's vicinity that are projected to receive more than 50 Project-related peak hour trips. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 4)

In order to assess the existing conditions of the study area, manual weekday AM, weekday PM and weekend mid-day peak hour turning movement counts were conducted in January 2012 and May 2012 by the Project's traffic consultant (Urban Crossroads, Inc.). Table EA-14, *Existing (2012) Conditions Intersection Operations Analysis Summary*, summarizes the existing level of service (LOS) at the three study area intersections. The intersection operations analysis results indicate that the existing study area intersections are currently operating at acceptable LOS during the peak hours, with the exception of the following intersection:

- Washington Street / Abelia Street

The intersection of Washington Street at Abelia Street is located adjacent to the existing Temecula Valley Charter School. This school's influence on the traffic flows is substantial during a brief period within the morning peak hour as parents are dropping off students. The school's impact during the morning peak hour is not an uncommon occurrence for any intersection near-by/adjacent to a school. However, the fluctuation in traffic flows during the morning peak hour results in a low observed peak hour factor (PHF), thereby resulting in unacceptable peak hour operations during the morning peak hour. It is important to note that the existing intersection deficiency is related to high delays for the westbound left turning vehicles at the intersection of Washington Street at Abelia Street per the HCM methodology for unsignalized, cross-street stop controlled intersections. As such, existing northbound and southbound through traffic on Washington Street is unaffected by the deficiency as they are currently operating at acceptable levels. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, pp. 24-29)

In addition, based on a traffic signal warrants analysis, the intersection of Washington Street at Abelia Street appears to warrant a traffic signal under existing conditions.

Table EA-14 Existing (2012) Conditions Intersection Operations Analysis Summary

#	Intersection	Traffic Control[3]	Intersection Approach Lanes[1]												Delay[2] (secs.)		Level of Service	
			Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound						
			L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	AM	PM	AM	PM
1	Winchester Rd. (SR-79) / Abelia St.	TS	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	0	1	2	0	26.2	23.4	C	C
2	Ginger Tree Dr./Street "H" / Abelia St.	AWS	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	9.7	7.3	A	A
3	Washington St. / Abelia St.	CSS	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	49.1	12.3	E	B

1 When a right turn is designated, the lane can either be striped or unstriped. To function as a right turn lane there must be sufficient width for right turning vehicles to travel outside the through lanes (minimum of 19-feet). These lanes have been designated as de facto (d) right turn lanes. L = Left; T = Through; R = Right; > = Right-Turn Overlap Phasing; 1! = Shared Left-Through-Right Turn Lane; d = De facto Right Turn Lane

2 Per the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual, overall average intersection delay and level of service are shown for intersections with a traffic signal or all way stop control. For intersections with cross street stop control, the delay and level of service for the worst individual movement (or movements sharing a single lane) are shown. Delay and LOS calculated using the TRAFFIX operation analysis software, Traffix Version 8.0 (2008), based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) method.

3 TS = Traffic Signal; CSS = Cross Street Stop; AWS = All-Way Stop

(Urban Crossroads, 2012, Table 3-1)

Project Trip Generation and Distribution

Trip generation represents the amount of traffic which is both attracted to and produced by a development. Determining traffic generation for a specific project is therefore based upon forecasting the amount of traffic that is expected to be both attracted to and produced by the specific land uses being proposed for a given development. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 31)

A summary of the Project's trip generation is shown in Table 3-4, *Project Trip Generation Summary*, in the introduction to this IS/MND. The trip generation rates are based upon data collected by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 8th Edition, 2008. As shown in Table 3-4, the Project is anticipated to generate a total of approximately 80 net weekday AM peak hour trips, 108 net weekday PM peak hour trips and a net total of approximately 1,024 trip-ends per day on an average weekday. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 31)

Trip distribution is the process of identifying the probable destinations, directions or traffic routes that will be utilized by Project traffic. The potential interaction between the planned land uses and surrounding regional access routes are considered, to identify the route where the Project traffic would distribute. The Project trip distribution was developed based on anticipated travel patterns to and from the Project site. Exhibit 4-1 of the Project's traffic study (IS/MND Appendix J) shows the trip distribution patterns for the Project. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 31)

Background Traffic

Future year traffic forecasts are based upon two (2) years of background (ambient) growth at 2% per year for 2014 traffic conditions. The total ambient growth is 4.04% for 2014 traffic conditions (compounded growth of two percent per year over two years). This ambient growth rate is added to existing traffic volumes to account for area-wide growth not reflected by cumulative development projects. Ambient growth has been added to daily and peak hour traffic volumes on surrounding roadways, in addition to traffic generated by the development of

future projects that have been approved but not yet built and/or for which development applications have been filed and are under consideration by governing agencies. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 35)

According to information published by the Riverside County Center for Demographic Research (RCCDR) and used as the basis for completing the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) *TUMF Nexus Study – 2009 Program Update*, the population of Western Riverside County is projected to increase by 61.7% in the period between 2007 and 2035, a compounded rate of approximately 1.73% annually. During the same period, employment in Western Riverside County is expected to increase by 111.4% or 2.71% annually. Therefore, the annual growth rate of 2% in conjunction with cumulative project traffic would appear to be conservative and tend to overstate as opposed to understate traffic impacts. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 35)

Cumulative Development Traffic

CEQA Guidelines require that the impacts from the Project, along with the incremental cumulative impact from "closely related past, present and reasonable foreseeable probably future projects" to be analyzed. A cumulative project list was developed for the purposes of this analysis through consultation with County of Riverside staff. Exhibit 4-5 of the Project's traffic study (IS/MND Appendix J) illustrates the cumulative development location map. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 35)

A summary of the cumulative development trip generation as approved by County staff is provided on Table 4-3 of the Project's traffic study (IS/MND Appendix J). This region of Riverside County is not anticipated to fully construct and absorb 100% of the proposed residential development by 2014 (or Project opening year). As such, near-term cumulative conditions assume approximately 40%-50% absorption of the residential developments. Medical office and commercial retail uses have been assumed at 100% absorption under near-term cumulative traffic conditions. Based on both field review and an assessment of aerial imagery, it appears that there are a few tracts within the existing Northstar Ranch residential community that have not been built along the southeast side of the Hogback hills. It has been assumed that the traffic generated by these few undeveloped homes are accounted for in the 2% per year of background traffic assumed for near-term cumulative conditions. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, pp. 35-42)

The cumulative development projects assumed in this traffic analysis are estimated to generate 44,676 net trip-ends per day during a typical weekday with approximately 3,720 net vehicle trips during the weekday AM peak hour and 4,380 net vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 42)

Based on the identified trip distribution patterns for the cumulative development projects on arterial highways throughout the study area for future conditions, cumulative development ADT, weekday AM peak hour and weekday PM peak hour intersection turning movement volumes are shown on Exhibits 4-6, 4-7 and 4-8 of the Project's traffic study (IS/MND Appendix J), respectively. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 42)

Traffic Forecasts

To provide a comprehensive assessment of the potential Project-related and cumulative traffic impacts, the "buildup" analysis type was performed in support of this work effort. The "buildup"

method was used to approximate the EAP (2014) traffic condition, and is intended to identify the direct Project-related impacts on both the existing and planned near-term circulation system. The EAP (2014) traffic condition includes background traffic in addition to the traffic generated by the proposed Project. The "buildup" method was also utilized to approximate the EAPC (2014) conditions, and is intended to identify the cumulative impacts on both the existing and planned near-term circulation system. The EAPC (2014) traffic condition includes background traffic, traffic generated by other cumulative development projects within the study area and the traffic generated by the proposed Project. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 42)

Near-Term (2014) Conditions

The "buildup" approach combines existing traffic counts with a background ambient growth factor to forecast the near-term 2014 traffic conditions. An ambient growth factor of 4.04% accounts for background (area-wide) traffic increases that occur over time up to the year 2014 from the year 2012 (compounded two percent per year growth over a two year period). Traffic volumes generated by the Project are then added to assess the EAP (2014) traffic conditions. The 2014 roadway network is similar to the existing conditions roadway network with the exception of future roadways and intersections proposed to be developed by the Project. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 42)

The near-term traffic analysis includes the following traffic conditions, with the various traffic components specified below:

- EAP (2014)
  - Existing 2012 counts
  - Ambient growth traffic (4.04%)
  - Tentative Tract Map No. 36437 traffic
- EAPC (2014)
  - Existing 2012 counts
  - Ambient growth traffic (4.04%)
  - Cumulative development project traffic
  - Tentative Tract Map No. 36437 traffic (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 46)

EAP (2014) Traffic Conditions

Level of service calculations were conducted for the study intersections to evaluate their operations under Existing plus Ambient Growth plus Project (EAP) conditions for Year 2014. As shown in Table EA-15, *EAP (2014) Conditions Intersection Operations Analysis Summary*, no additional intersections were found to operate at an unacceptable LOS under the EAP (2014) traffic conditions in addition to those previously identified under Existing (2012) conditions. The intersection operations analysis worksheets for EAP (2014) conditions are included in Appendix "5.1" of the Project's traffic study (IS/MND Appendix J). (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 47)

As noted previously, the unacceptable peak hour operations at the intersection of Washington Street/Abelia Street during the morning peak hour are related to existing traffic conditions. Since the deficiency at this intersection currently occurs under existing conditions, and the Project is anticipated to contribute less than 50 peak hour trips to the intersection of Washington Street at Abelia Street, the Project's direct impacts to this intersection would be less-than-significant on a direct basis and no mitigation is required. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 61)

Table EA-15 EAP (2014) Conditions Intersection Operations Analysis Summary

#	Intersection	Traffic Control[3]	Intersection Approach Lanes[1]												Delay[2] (secs.)		Level of Service	
			Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound						
			L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	AM	PM	AM	PM
1	Winchester Rd. (SR-79) / Abelia St.	TS	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	0	1	2	0	27.0	24.3	C	C
2	Ginger Tree Dr./Street "H" / Abelia St.	AWS	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	10.6	7.3	B	A
3	Washington St. / Abelia St.	CSS	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	>50.0	12.9	F	B

1 When a right turn is designated, the lane can either be striped or unstriped. To function as a right turn lane there must be sufficient width for right turning vehicles to travel outside the through lanes (minimum of 19-feet). These lanes have been designated as (d) right turn lanes. L = Left; T = Through; R = Right; > = Right-Turn Overlap Phasing; 1! = Shared Left-Through-Right Turn Lane; d = Right Turn Lane

2 Per the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual, overall average intersection delay and level of service are shown for intersections with a traffic signal or all way stop control. For intersections with cross street stop control, the delay and level of service for the worst individual movement (or movements sharing a single lane) are shown. Delay and LOS calculated using the TRAFFIX operation analysis software, Traffix Version 8.0 (2008), based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) method.

3 TS = Traffic Signal; CSS = Cross Street Stop; AWS = All-Way Stop

4 Critical Volume/Capacity >1.0, Intersection Unstable, LOS "F."

(Urban Crossroads, 2012, Table 5-1)

EAPC (2014) Traffic Conditions

Level of service calculations were conducted for the study intersections to evaluate their operations under Existing plus Ambient plus Project plus Cumulative Development (EAPC) conditions for Year 2014 with existing roadway and intersection geometrics with the exception of the intersection of Washington Street at Abelia Street. The intersection of Washington Street at Abelia Street was not analyzed for "without improvements" conditions under EAPC (2014) traffic conditions because a future cumulative development project is anticipated to take access from the eastern leg of the intersection. As such, the analysis for EAPC (2014) traffic conditions cannot be conducted assuming the existing lane geometrics as they do not support future traffic entering and exiting the eastern leg. As shown in Table EA-16, *EAPC (2014) Conditions Intersection Operations Analysis Summary*, no additional intersections were found to operate at an unacceptable LOS under the EAPC (2014) traffic conditions in addition to those previously identified under Existing (2012) conditions. The intersection operations analysis worksheets for EAPC (2014) conditions are included in Appendix "5.2" of the Project's traffic study (IS/MND Appendix J). (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 56)

Nonetheless, the proposed Project would contribute to a need for traffic improvements at the intersection of Washington Street at Abelia Street under EAPC (2014) conditions. As such, the Project's impact to this intersection is a cumulatively significant impact for which mitigation would be required.

EAP (2014) and EAPC (2014) Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Traffic signal warrants for EAP (2014) and EAPC (2014) traffic conditions are based on EAP (2014) and EAPC (2014) ADT volumes. For EAP (2014) traffic conditions, no intersections are anticipated to warrant a traffic signal in addition to the location previously identified for the Existing (2012) traffic conditions (Washington Street at Abelia Street). For EAPC (2014) traffic conditions, no intersections are anticipated to warrant a traffic signal in addition to the one

Table EA-16 EAPC (2014) Conditions Intersection Operations Analysis Summary

#	Intersection	Traffic Control[3]	Intersection Approach Lanes[1]												Delay[2] (secs.)		Level of Service	
			Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound						
			L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	AM	PM	AM	PM
1	Winchester Rd. (SR-79) / Abelia St.	TS	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	0	1	2	0	30.5	29.7	C	C
2	Ginger Tree Dr./Street "H" / Abelia St.	AWS	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	11.7	7.6	B	A
3	Washington St. / Abelia St.[4]		Future Intersection															

1 When a right turn is designated, the lane can either be striped or unstriped. To function as a right turn lane there must be sufficient width for right turning vehicles to travel outside the through lanes (minimum of 19-feet). These lanes have been designated as (d) right turn lanes. L = Left; T = Through; R = Right; > = Right-Turn Overlap Phasing; 1! = Shared Left-Through-Right Turn Lane; d = Right Turn Lane

2 Per the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual, overall average intersection delay and level of service are shown for intersections with a traffic signal or all way stop control. For intersections with cross street stop control, the delay and level of service for the worst individual movement (or movements sharing a single lane) are shown. Delay and LOS calculated using the TRAFFIX operation analysis software, Traffix Version 8.0 (2008), based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) method.

3 TS = Traffic Signal; CSS = Cross Street Stop; AWS = All-Way Stop

4 Intersection does not exist without improvements under EAPC (2014) conditions as a future cumulative development project is anticipated to access Washington Street from the east leg of the intersection.

(Urban Crossroads, 2012, Table 5-2)

previously identified for the Existing (2012) traffic conditions. The EAP (2014) Traffic Signal Warrants Analysis Worksheets are included in Appendix "5.3" and the EAPC (2014) Traffic Signal Warrants Analysis Worksheets are included in Appendix "5.4" of the Project's traffic study (IS/MND Appendix J). Although impacts to the Washington Street/Abelia Street intersection are evaluated as a less-than-significant impact on a direct basis (i.e., under EAP 2014 conditions) because the Project contributes fewer than 50 peak hour trips and the need for a traffic signal is an existing condition, the Project's contribution of traffic to this intersection under EAPC 2014 conditions represents a cumulatively significant impact for which mitigation would be required. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, p. 61)

b) The congestion management program (CMP) applicable to the Project area is the Riverside County Transportation Commission's (RCTC) *2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program*. Within the Project's vicinity, Highway 79 and I-15 are identified as CMP facilities (CMP Highway and CMP Interstate, respectively) (RCTC, 2011, Exhibit 2-1). However, and consistent with the findings of the Project's traffic impact analysis (IS/MND Appendix J), the proposed Project would not contribute more than 50 peak hour trips to Highway 79, I-15, or any other CMP facility. 50 peak hour trips is considered the threshold above which an analysis of CMP facilities may be required (California DOT, 2002, p. 2). Accordingly, the Project has no potential to conflict with the level of service standards as specified in the 2011 CMP, nor would the Project interfere with the CMP's travel demand measures. Furthermore, the proposed Project would not conflict with any other standards established by the RCTC for designated roads or highways. Therefore, no adverse impact to the applicable CMP would occur. (RCTC, 2011, p. ES-3)

c & d) The proposed Project site is located approximately 2.3 miles northeast of the French Valley Airport. According to the ALUCP for the French Valley Airport, the western portions of the Project site occur within Compatibility Zone E. (ALUC, 2007) The only prohibited use within Zone E are "hazards to flight," which include physical (e.g., tall objects), visual and electronic forms of interference with the

safety of aircraft operations, and land use development that may cause the attraction of birds to increase. Projects within Zone E also are subject to airspace review for objects exceeding 100 feet in height. (ALUC, 2004)

The Project does not propose any development that would be considered a hazard to flight, as all structures on-site would be constructed in accordance with the site's proposed zoning designation of "One Family Dwellings (R-1)," which specifies a maximum structural height of 40 feet. Proposed structures measuring up to 40 feet in height would not represent a hazard to flight. Additionally, future buildings on-site would not require airspace review since none of the proposed structures would exceed 100 feet in height. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in any hazards to air traffic, and would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. Additionally, the Project would have no adverse effects to air traffic.

There are no rail lines or waterborne traffic in the Project area under existing conditions. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not alter waterborne or rail traffic.

Based on the foregoing analysis, no impact would occur as a result of Project implementation.

e) All roadway improvements planned as part of the Project would be in conformance with applicable Riverside County standards, and would not result in any hazards due to a design feature. Additionally, the Project area is currently characterized with rural and urban density residential units, with some areas that are still under cultivation with dry land crop production. Activities associated with dry land crop production would not result in any safety hazards due to incompatibility between Project-related traffic and farm equipment because this type of agricultural activity does not involve the routine use of tractors or other equipment that would need to utilize roadways that would serve future traffic generated by the site. Additionally, lands currently under agricultural production are planned by the County's General Plan for long-term development with residential uses. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

f) Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the establishment of several new roadways within and extending from to the Project site that would require maintenance. Maintenance of the major roadways planned for improvement by the Project would not result in any significant impacts to the environment. Impacts associated with the physical construction of these roadways already are evaluated in appropriate sections of this IS/MND, and any identified significant impacts have been mitigated to the maximum feasible extent. Maintenance of these major roadway facilities would be funded through the Project developer's payment of Development Impact Fees (DIF) and future Project residents' payment of property taxes. Therefore, the maintenance of roadways proposed by the Project would not result in any new impacts to the environment beyond that which is already disclosed and mitigated by this IS/MND, and impacts would therefore be less than significant.

g) All roadway facilities planned for improvement as part of the Project do not exist under existing conditions. As such, the Project has no potential to cause an effect upon circulation during the Project's construction, and no impact would occur.

h) The proposed Project site is not identified as an emergency access route under any local or regional plans. All roadway facilities planned for improvement as part of the Project do not exist under existing conditions. As such, none of the roadway facilities planned as part of the Project afford emergency access to any surrounding properties. Thus, during construction of the proposed Project, there would be no impact due to inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses.

Under long-term conditions, the proposed Project site would be served via a network of public roadway facilities constructed on and adjacent to the Project site. These proposed roadways would provide access to all areas of the proposed Project site, including access for emergency vehicles. Accordingly, under long-term conditions, no impact to emergency access or access to nearby uses would occur.

i) The Riverside County General Plan does not identify the proposed Project site for any public transit facilities, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities. There are no components of the proposed Project that would substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

Mitigation:

M-TR-1 (Condition of Approval 90.Trans.001) In order to address deficient levels of service at the intersection of Washington Street/Abelia Street that occur under EAPC (2014) conditions, the Project Applicant shall participate in the Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Program (TUMF) (Riverside County Ordinance 824) and the Riverside County Development Impact Fee (Riverside County Ordinance 659). Project contributions to TUMF and/or DIF would provide a fair-share towards the costs of the following improvements at this intersection that appear warranted under EAPC (2014) conditions:

- Install a traffic signal.
- Construct a 2nd through lane and a dedicated right turn for the northbound leg.
- Construct a dedicated left turn lane and a 2nd through lane for the southbound leg.
- Construct a through lane for the eastbound leg to connect with a future westbound leg.
- Construct a westbound leg with a left turn lane and a shared through-right turn lane.

Implementation of the above-listed improvements by Riverside County would improve the LOS at the intersection of Washington Street/Abelia Street to LOS D in the AM peak hour and LOS C during the PM peak hour, and would reduce the Project's cumulative impacts to this intersection to below a level of significance. (Urban Crossroads, 2012, Table 5-4 and p. 61)

Monitoring:

M-TR-1 Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy, the Riverside County Building and Safety Department shall ensure that appropriate fees have been paid in accordance with Riverside County Ordinances 824 and 659.

44. Bike Trails	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: SWAP Figure 8 (Trails and Bikeway System)

Findings of Fact: According to Figure 8 of the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP), there are no bike trails or facilities planned within the Project vicinity. No bike trails are proposed as part of the Project,

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

although public streets to be constructed as part of the Project would afford access to bicycles. Impacts associated with the construction of roadways by the Project have been evaluated throughout this IS/MND, and where necessary mitigation measures have been identified to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, impacts due to the construction of bike trails would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project				
45. Water				
a) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review; *Eastern Municipal Water District 2010 Urban Water Management Plan*, Eastern Municipal Water District, June 2011.

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed Project would construct an on-site network of water and sewer pipes. The Project also would construct an 8-inch water line within Charlois Road between the existing 8-inch connection point (located approximately 30 feet north of the site's northeastern corner) and the southern terminus of the roadway. An 8-inch water line also would be constructed within Yates Road westerly of the site's southwestern corner by approximately 90 feet.

The installation of water lines as proposed by the Project would result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of infrastructure alignments. These impacts are considered to be part of the Project's construction phase and are evaluated throughout this IS/MND accordingly. In instances where significant impacts have been identified for the Project's construction phase, mitigation measures are recommended in each applicable subsection of this IS/MND to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. The construction of water lines as necessary to serve the proposed Project would not result in any significant physical effects on the environment that are not already identified and disclosed as part of this IS/MND. Accordingly, additional mitigation measures beyond those identified throughout this IS/MND would not be required.

b) Water to the proposed Project site is provided by the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD). The EMWD has prepared an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) dated June 2011, which provides for the long-range planning efforts of water purveyance within its district.

According to the UWMP, EMWD has four existing sources of water supply: imported water from MWD, recycled water, local groundwater production and desalted groundwater. A detailed account of current and projected EMWD water supplies is available in the UWMP, which is herein incorporated by reference and available for review at the EMWD, 2270 Trumble Road, Perris, CA 92570, or on-line at http://www.emwd.org/index.aspx?page=281. Between 2004 and 2010, EMWD's reliance on

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

imported water has remained proportionally consistent or decreased, even as EMWD added over 20,000 new water connections. This has been achieved through the construction of desalination facilities, a commitment to increase recycled water use and through a decrease in demand resulting from water efficiency. These efforts have increased the reliability of supplies and decreased the dependence on imported water sources. (EMWD, 2011, p. 27)

Demands for EMWD were developed using projections provided by the Riverside County Center for demographic research, which develops its projections, in part, based on the General Plans for the various jurisdictions within the County. Although as of 2010 EMWD's service area was experiencing a slowdown in new development, EMWD's service area is at about 40 percent of build out. To track new developments EMWD uses a spatial database, which is updated quarterly. (EMWD, 2011, p. 21)

Under existing conditions, the proposed Project site is not served by potable water. However, the proposed Project site is designated by the Riverside County General Plan for "Medium Density Residential" land uses, and the land uses proposed by the Project are consistent with this designation. Since the EMWD's UWMP relies in part on population projections that are based upon buildout of the County's General Plan, future potable water demand associated with Project development is accounted for in EMWD's UWMP. As concluded in the UWMP, "...EMWD has the ability to meet current and projected water demands through 2035 during normal, historic single-dry and historic multiple-dry years using existing supplies and imported water from MWD with existing supply resources" (EMWD, 2011, pp. 31-32).

Accordingly, and based on the foregoing analysis, the EMWD would have sufficient supplies to serve the proposed Project from existing and projected sources, and new or expanded entitlements would not be required to provide water service to the Project. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

46. Sewer				
a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

a) Wastewater generated by the Project would be conveyed via a series of 8-inch sanitary sewer lines to be constructed within the on-site roadways (i.e., Streets 'A' through 'F'). These flows would then be conveyed via a proposed 8-inch sewer line to be constructed within Yates Road and westerly

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

to an existing 8-inch sewer line located at the intersection of Yates Road and Yellowstone Street, approximately 1,300 feet westerly of the site's southwestern corner.

The installation of sewer lines as proposed by the Project would result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of infrastructure alignments. These impacts are considered to be part of the Project's construction phase and are evaluated throughout this IS/MND accordingly. In instances where significant impacts have been identified for the Project's construction phase, mitigation measures are recommended in each applicable subsection of this IS/MND to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. The construction of sewer lines as necessary to serve the proposed Project would not result in any significant physical effects on the environment that are not already identified and disclosed as part of this IS/MND. Accordingly, additional mitigation measures beyond those identified throughout this IS/MND would not be required.

b) All sanitary sewer flows from the site would be conveyed to the EMWD's Temecula Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) for treatment, located at 42565 Avenida Alvarado in Temecula, or approximately 8.1 miles southwest of the Project site. The Temecula Valley Regional WRF provides secondary treatment of wastewater flows, and currently accepts approximately 12.0 million gallons per day (mgd) with a total capacity of 18.0 mgd, or an excess capacity of approximately 6.0 mgd. (EMWD, n.d.)

Residential uses within EMWD's service area are estimated to produce approximately 250 gallons of wastewater per household per day (gpd) (Riverside County, 2003b, p. 4.15-17). Thus, the Project's 102 single-family dwelling units would be expected to produce approximately 25,500 gpd, or approximately 0.03 mgd. The Project's level of wastewater contribution represents approximately 0.45% of the existing excess daily capacity for the Temecula Valley Regional WRF, or approximately 0.17% of the WRF's total daily capacity. With buildout of the Project and generation of 0.03 mgd of Project-related wastewater per day, the Temecula Valley Regional WRF would have an excess remaining capacity of approximately 5.97 mgd. Accordingly, adequate capacity exists at the Temecula Valley Regional WRF to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the EMWD's existing commitments, and impacts would therefore be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

47. Solid Waste a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: General Plan; Project Application Materials; *Countywide Disposal Tonnage Tracking System Disposal Reports –3rd Quarter 2012,* Riverside County Waste Management Department, May 14, 2013; CalRecycle Solid Waste Information System (web site), accessed July 25, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a) Construction and operation of the proposed Project would result in the generation of solid waste, requiring disposal at a landfill. During the third quarter of 2012 (July 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012), which is the most recent time period for which reporting data is available, waste collected from unincorporated portions from Riverside County were disposed of at a total of four separate landfills: Badlands Landfill, Blyth Landfill, El Sobrante Landfill, and Lamb Canyon Landfill (RCWMD, 2013a). It is anticipated that solid waste generated during construction and long-term operation of the Project would be disposed of at one of these landfills. Table EA-17, *Permitted and Remaining Capacity of Project-Related Landfills*, summarizes the maximum daily capacity, permitted capacity, and remaining capacity of each of these landfills, based on reporting provided by CalRecycle (CalRecycle, 2013).

Table EA-17 Permitted and Remaining Capacity of Project-Related Landfills

Landfill	Maximum Daily Capacity (Tons/Day)	Permitted Capacity (Cubic Yards)	Remaining Capacity (Cubic Yards)
Badlands	4,000	33,560,993	14,730,025
Blyth	400	6,034,148	4,159,388
El Sobrante	16,054	184,930,000	145,530,000
Lamb Canyon	3,000	34,292,000	18,955,000
Total:	**23,454**	**258,817,141**	**183,374,413**

Note: Data provided in Table EA-17 is taken from the CalRecycle Solid Waste Information System (CalRecycle, 2013).

Solid Waste Generation – Construction Activities

Table EA-18, *Estimated Construction Solid Waste Generation*, provides an estimate of the amount of solid waste that can conservatively be estimated to occur on a daily basis during construction of the proposed Project. As indicated, construction waste generated by the Project would amount to approximately 6,650 pounds per day, or 3.3 tons per day. Total waste generated by construction activities over the roughly 10 to 11 months of building construction would amount to approximately 1,995,000 pounds, or 998 tons. Using a conversion factor of 200 pounds of uncompacted solid waste per cubic yard, the 998 tons of solid waste generated during the building construction phase of the Project is equal to approximately 9,975 cubic yards (US EPA, 1994, Appendix C).

Table EA-18 Estimated Construction Solid Waste Generation

Land Use	Construction Rate[1]	Estimated Dwelling Unit Size	Solid Waste Generation Rate	Total	
				LBS/Day	Tons/Day
102 Dwelling Units	0.34 dwelling units/day	4,455 s.f.[2]	4.39 lb/s.f.[3]	6,650	3.3

1. Based on information presented in IS/MND Section 3.2.1.B, which indicates that building construction would occur over approximately 10 to 11 months (or approximately 300 to 330 days). Using the accelerated construction rate of 10 months, the Project would be anticipated to construct an average of approximately 0.34 dwelling units per day (102 dwelling units ÷ 300 days = 0.34 dwelling units/day).
2. Estimated average dwelling unit size is based on the minimum lot size specified on TTM 36437 (65' x 111') and application of the required setbacks specified by the R-1 zone (i.e., 20-foot minimum front yard, 5-foot minimum side yards, and 10-foot minimum backyard). Application of these factors would result in a maximum single-story building measuring 81' x 55', or 4,455 s.f.
3. Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. *Estimating 2003 Building-Related Construction and Demolition Materials Amounts.* Available on-line at:. Accessed July 26, 2013.

Due to the Project's location, it can reasonably be anticipated that solid waste generated by the Project would most likely be disposed of at the El Sobrante Landfill, Lamb Canyon Landfill, and/or

Badlands Landfill. These landfills have a permitted daily disposal capacity of between 3,000 and 16,054 tons per day, and the Project's daily demand for construction waste disposal at buildout amounts to between 0.11% and 0.02% of the available daily disposal capacity at these landfills. Total solid waste generated during the Project's building construction phase would represent approximately 0.06% to 0.007% of the total remaining capacity at these landfills.

Solid Waste Generation – Long-Term Operation

Utilizing the solid waste generation rates used in the General Plan EIR, residential uses are estimated to generate approximately 0.41 tons per unit per year (Riverside County, 2003b, Table 4.15.C). Thus, the 102 dwelling units proposed as part of the Project are estimated to generate approximately 41.82 tons per year (102 x 0.41 = 41.82), or approximately 0.11 tons per day. Using a conversion factor of 200 pounds of uncompacted solid waste per cubic yard, the 41.82 tons per year of solid waste generated by the Project is equal to approximately 418.2 cubic yards of solid waste per year (US EPA, 1994, Appendix C).

Due to the Project's location, it can reasonably be anticipated that solid waste generated by the Project would most likely be disposed of at the El Sobrante Landfill, Lamb Canyon Landfill, and/or Badlands Landfill. These landfills have a permitted daily disposal capacity of between 3,000 and 16,054 tons per day, and the Project's daily demand for solid waste (i.e., 0.11 tons per day) represents only 0.004% to 0.0003% of the permitted daily disposal capacity of these landfills. On an annual basis, the Project's anticipated generation of 41.82 tons per year would represent between 0.003% and 0.0003% of the total disposal capacity of these landfills.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis presented above, the proposed Project would be served by landfills with adequate capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste needs during both construction and long-term operation. Although the Project would likely contribute to the ultimate need for landfill expansion as needed to accommodate future growth within Riverside County, such potential landfill expansions would not be the direct result of the proposed Project. Furthermore, any environmental impacts that could result from such landfill expansions cannot be determined at this time, as the environmental impacts would be evaluated as part of a future CEQA document prepared in support of future landfill expansion efforts. Accordingly, environmental impacts that may result from future landfill expansions are herein evaluated as speculative in nature (CEQA Guidelines § 15145).

b) The California Integrated Waste Management Act (Assembly Bill (AB) 939), signed into law in 1989, established an integrated waste management system that focused on source reduction, recycling, composting, and land disposal of waste. In addition, the bill established a 50% waste reduction requirement for cities and counties by the year 2000, along with a process to ensure environmentally safe disposal of waste that could not be diverted. Per the requirements of the Integrated Waste Management Act, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors adopted the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) (adopted January 14, 1997), which outlines the goals, policies, and programs the County and its cities will implement to create an integrated and cost effective waste management system that complies with the provisions of AB 939 and its diversion mandates.

In order to assist the County of Riverside in achieving the mandated goals of the Integrated Waste Management Act, the Project Applicant would be required to work with future refuse haulers to develop and implement feasible waste reduction programs, including source reduction, recycling, and composting. Additionally, in accordance with the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of

1991 (Cal Pub Res. Code § 42911), the Project would provide adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials where solid waste is collected. The collection areas are required to be shown on construction drawings and be in place before occupancy permits are issued. Additionally, the Riverside County Waste Management Department requires development projects to prepare a Waste Recycling Plan (WRP) that identifies the materials (i.e., concrete, asphalt, wood, etc.) that would be generated by construction and development, the projected amounts, the measures/methods that will be taken to recycle, reuse, and/or reduce the amount of materials, the facilities and/or haulers that will be utilized, and the targeted recycling or reduction rate. The implementation of these requirements would reduce the amount of solid waste generated by the Project, which in turn will aid in the extension of the life of affected disposal sites. As such, the Project would comply with the mandates of applicable solid waste statutes and regulations and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

48. Utilities

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

a) Electricity?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Natural gas?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Communications systems?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Storm water drainage?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Street lighting?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Other governmental services?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: General Plan; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a through g) Implementation of the proposed Project would require the construction of numerous facilities as necessary to provide services to the site, including electrical facilities, natural gas lines, communication systems (telephone/cable), storm water drainage facilities, and street lighting. In addition, the project would introduce new public roads on-site that would require maintenance by Riverside County. Impacts associated with the provision of utility service to the site are discussed below for each type of utility.

Electricity, Natural Gas, and Communications Systems

Electrical service is currently available in the Project area and would be provided by Southern California Edison (SCE), natural gas would be provided by Southern California Gas Company (SCGC), and communication systems would be provided by Pacific Bell (telephone) and Adelphia Cable (cable service). Based on information provided by the Project's engineer (MDS Consulting), the current point of connection for electrical, natural gas, and communication systems is located approximately 400 feet northwest of the Charlois Road/Abelia Street intersection. Electrical, natural gas, and communication systems facilities would be constructed in conjunction with planned improvements to Charlois Road, impacts for which are evaluated throughout this IS/MND. The Project also would be required to install electrical, gas, and communication systems lines beneath the

improved segments of Charlois Road and Abelia Street, impacts for which also are evaluated throughout this IS/MND (e.g., Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, etc.). Where necessary, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce identified impacts to a level below significance. Accordingly, impacts due to the construction of new electrical facilities, natural gas lines, and communication systems as necessary to serve the Project are evaluated as less than significant.

Storm Water Drainage

As part of the Project, drainage from residential areas, off-site areas, and portions of the natural slope within Lot 'B' would be conveyed via a series of underground storm drains to be constructed throughout the Project site. Subsurface storm drain pipes proposed on-site would range in diameter from 18- to 60-inches in size. Drainage from these areas would be conveyed to the proposed water quality/detention basin to be constructed within Lot 103. Following treatment of first flush flows, this runoff would then be conveyed via a proposed 18-inch storm drain line westerly within Yates Road then southerly within the future alignment of Allegre Vista Road approximately 3,000 feet southerly of the Project site. The Project also would construct a proposed sand filter basin within Lot 'A' near the southerly terminus of Charlois Road to treat runoff from the southerly portions of proposed Charlois Road.

Areas subject to physical impacts in association with the construction of storm water drainage facilities as needed to serve the proposed Project have been accounted for throughout this IS/MND (e.g., Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, etc.). Where necessary, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce identified impacts to a level below significance. Accordingly, impacts due to the construction of Project-related storm drainage facilities are evaluated as less than significant.

Street Lighting

In accordance with Riverside County requirements, street lights would be provided along all roadways planned for improvement by the Project. Impacts associated with the construction of street lights have been evaluated in association with the physical impact of on- and off-site roadway construction throughout this IS/MND. Where necessary, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce identified impacts to a level below significance. Accordingly, impacts due to the construction of street lights are evaluated as less than significant.

Public Facilities Maintenance

The only public facilities proposed by the Project that would require maintenance include public roadways, the water quality/detention basin within Lot 103, and the park site within Lot 104. Public roadways would be maintained by Riverside County, while the water quality/detention basin and park site would be maintained by the Project's Homeowners' Association. There would be no impacts to the environment resulting from routine maintenance of public roads, the water quality/detention basin, or the park site. Accordingly, no impact would occur and mitigation is not required.

Other Governmental Services

There are no other governmental services or utilities needed to serve the proposed Project beyond what is evaluated and disclosed above and throughout the remaining sections of this IS/MND. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
49. Energy Conservation a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: Project implementation would result in the conversion of the subject site from its existing, undeveloped condition to a residential community that would feature 102 single-family dwelling units, a park site, and open space. This land use transition would increase the site's demand for energy. Specifically, the proposed Project would increase consumption of energy for space and water heating, air conditioning, lighting, and operation of miscellaneous equipment and appliances.

Table EA-19, *Estimated Project Energy Demand*, provides an estimate of energy demand at Project buildout. As shown in the table, build-out of the Project is conservatively estimated to require approximately 723,078 kilowatt-hours of electricity per year and approximately 41,585 therms of natural gas per year. Planning efforts by energy resource providers take into account planned land uses to ensure the long-term availability of energy resources necessary to service anticipated growth. The proposed Project would develop the site in a manner consistent with the County's General Plan land use designations for the property; thus, energy demands associated with the proposed Project are addressed through long-range planning by energy purveyors and can be accommodated as they occur. Therefore, Project implementation is not anticipated to result in the need for the construction or expansion of existing energy generation facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Furthermore, the State of California regulates energy consumption under Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards were developed by the CEC and apply to energy consumed for heating, cooling, ventilation, water heating, and lighting in new residential and non-residential buildings. Adherence to these efficiency standards would result in a "maximum feasible" reduction in unnecessary energy consumption. As such, the development and operation of the proposed Project would not conflict with applicable energy conservation plans, and impacts would be less than significant.

Table EA-19 Estimated Project Energy Demand

Land Use	Development Intensity	Generation Rate	Annual Demand
Electricity			
Residential	102 dwelling units	7,089 kWh/yr[1,2]	723,078 kWh/yr
Natural Gas			
Residential	102 dwelling units	407.7 therms/yr[1,2]	41,585 therms/yr

kWh/yr = kilowatt-hour per year; BTU = British Thermal Unit; 1 therm = 100,000 BTUs
[1]Based on the assumption of 2.98 persons per household
[2]Source: California Energy Commission. *Energy Aware Planning Guide (2011 Edition)* (2011).

Electricity and natural gas transmission and distribution lines are located in the Project site vicinity and all new service lines to the property and Project's buildings would be installed as part of the Project's construction phase. Environmental impacts associated with construction of energy transmission and distribution infrastructure have been addressed throughout this IS/MND, and mitigation has been provided in each applicable section for all potential short-term impacts. Therefore, a significant impact due to the construction of energy transmission and distribution infrastructure as necessary to serve

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

the proposed Project would not occur, or would be mitigated to below a level of significance with application of mitigation measures provided throughout this IS/MND.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

50. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: As indicated in the discussion and analysis of Wildlife & Vegetation (IS/MND Section 7.), and assuming the implementation of Mitigation Measures M-BI-1 through M-BI-8, impacts to biological resources would be reduced to a level below significance. As indicated in the discussion of Historical and Archaeological Resources (IS/MND Sections 8. and 9.), the proposed Project site is undeveloped under existing conditions, and does not contain any important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory, including archaeological or historical resources. Therefore, the proposed Project, with implementation of mitigation measures, would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self- sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Impacts would be less than significant.

51. Does the project have impacts which 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, other current projects and probable future projects)?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in cumulatively considerable effects associated with biological resources and transportation/traffic. These potentially significant effects have been evaluated and disclosed in IS/MND Sections 7 (Wildlife & Vegetation) and 43 (Circulation). Cumulative impacts to wildlife/vegetation and circulation were evaluated as potentially significant, but would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the incorporation of the mitigation measures specified in Sections 7 and 43 of this Initial Study. There are no other cumulatively considerable impacts associated with the proposed Project that are not already evaluated and disclosed throughout this IS/MND.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
52. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Staff review; Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The Project's potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings has been evaluated throughout this IS/MND (e.g., Air Quality, Geology/Soils, Noise, etc.). Where potentially significant impacts are identified, mitigation measures have been imposed on the Project to reduce these adverse effects to a level below significance. There are no components of the proposed Project that could result in substantial adverse effects on human beings that are not already evaluated and disclosed throughout this IS/MND. Accordingly, no additional impacts would occur.

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

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 as per California Code of Regulations, Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

Earlier Analyses Used, if any: None

Location Where Earlier Analyses, if used, are available for review: N/A

VII. AUTHORITIES CITED

Authorities cited: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21083.05; References: California Government Code Section 65088.4; Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095 and 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka (2007)* 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

VII. REFERENCES

The following documents were referred to as information sources during the preparation of this document.

Cited As:

Alta, 2012 — *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Tentative Tract 30430, "Yates Road" Project.* Alta California Geotechnical, Inc., January 11, 2012. (IS/MND Technical Appendix E)

ALUC, 2004 — *Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Volume 1, Policy Document.* Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, October 14, 2004. Available on-line at: http://www.rcaluc.org/plan_new.asp

ALUC, 2007 — *French Valley Airport Policies and Compatibility Maps.* Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, October 2007. Available on-line at: http://www.rcaluc.org/plan_new.asp

BFSA, 2013a — *Phase I Archaeological Assessment for the Yates Road Project.* Brian F. Smith and

Associates, August 1, 2013. (IS/MND Appendix L1)

BFSA, 2013b — *Paleontological Resource Assessment for CEQA Compliance Review.* Brian F. Smith and Associates, September 5, 2013. (IS/MND Appendix L2)

CEC, 2011 — *Energy Aware Planning Guide (2011 Edition).* California Energy Commission, 2011. Available on-line at: http://www.energy.ca.gov/energy_aware_guide/

California DOT, 2004 — *Transportation- and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual.* California Department of Transportation, June 2004. Available on-line at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/vibrationmanFINAL.pdf

California DOT, 2002 — *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies.* California Department of Transportation, December 2002. Available on-line at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/igr_ceqa_files/tisguide.pdf

CalRecycle, 2013 — *Solid Waste Information System (SWIS), Facility/Site Listing for Riverside County (Web Site).* CalRecycle, accessed July 25, 2013. Available on-line at: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/SearchList/List?COUNTY=Riverside

CARB Air Quality Almanac — *2009 Air Quality Almanac.* California Air Resources Board, 2009.

CARB Scoping Plan — *Climate Change Scoping Plan.* California Air Resources Board, December 2008.

CREED v. City of San Diego — *CREED v. City of San Diego* (2011), Super. Ct. No. 37-2009-00085307-CU-MC-CTL.

EMWD, 2011 — *Eastern Municipal Water District 2010 Urban Water Management Plan.* Eastern Municipal Water District, June 2011. Available on-line at: http://www.emwd.org/index.aspx?page=281

EMWD, n.d. — *EMWD Insights, Temecula Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility.* Eastern Municipal Water District, n.d. Available on-line at: http://www.emwd.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=1426

FEMA, 2013 — *FEMA Web Site.* Federal Emergency Management Agency, accessed July 25, 2013. Available on-line at: www.fema.gov.

GeoKinetics, 2013 — *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, CV Communities Site.* GeoKinetics, May 22, 2013. (IS/MND Appendix H).

GLA 2012 — *Submittal of Report for the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and Least Bell's Vireo at the Yates Road/Hsieh Property.* Glenn Lukos Associates, August 28, 2012. (IS/MND Appendix D3).

GLA, 2013a — *Biological Technical Report for the Yates Road/Hsieh Property.* Glenn Lukos Associates, October 8, 2013. (IS/MND Appendix D1).

GLA, 2013b — *Jurisdictional Delineation of Yates Road/Hsieh Property.* Glenn Lukos Associates,

October 1, 2013. (IS/MND Appendix D2).

GLA, 2013c — *Updated and Final Biological Resources Report (Memorandum).* Glenn Lukos Associates, November 24, 2013 (IS/MND Appendix D4).

Google Earth, 2013 — *Google Earth (Aerial Photos of Project Site and Surrounding Environs).* Google Earth, January 8, 2013

Google Maps, 2013 — *Google Maps (Web Site).* Google Maps, accessed July 15, 2013. Available on-line at: https://maps.google.com/.

MDS, 2012 — *Preliminary Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan for Tract 36437.* MDS Consulting, August 16, 2012. (IS/MND Appendix F2).

MDS, 2013 — *Preliminary Hydrology Report.* MDS Consulting, November 25, 2013. (IS/MND Appendix F1).

Ord. No. 460 — Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, Subdivision Regulations. June 3, 2010.

Ord. No. 484 — Riverside County Ordinance No. 484, An Ordinance of the County of Riverside Amending Ordinance No. 484 for the Control of Blowing Sand. March 14, 2000.

Ord. No. 625 — Riverside County Ordinance No. 625, Right-to-Farm Ordinance. March 18, 1986 (Amended November 8, 1994).

Ord. No. 655 — Riverside County Ordinance No. 655, Regulating Light Pollution.

Ord. No. 659 — Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, Establishing a Development Impact Fee Program. July 21, 2009.

RCTC, 2011 — *2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program.* Riverside County Transportation Commission, March 10, 2010. Available on-line at: http://www.rctc.org/uploads/media_items/congestionmanagementprogram.original.pdf

RCWMD, 2013a — *Countywide Disposal Tonnage Tracking System (CDTTS) Disposal Report Revisions – 3rd Quarter 2012 (July 1, 2012 – September 30, 2012).* Riverside County Waste Management Department, May 14, 2013. Available on-line at: http://www.rivcowm.org/opencms/ab939/pdf/DisposalReportsPDFs/2012-3QTR-RCDisposalReports.pdf

RCWMD, 2013b — *Landfill and Transfer Station Hours and Locations (Web Page).* Riverside County Waste Management Department, Accessed July 25, 2013. Available on-line at: http://www.rivcowm.org/opencms/landfill_info/landfill_hours.html

Riverside County, 2003a — *County of Riverside General Plan.* Riverside County, October 2003. Available on-line at: http://www.rctlma.org/planning/content/temp/rc_genplan.html

Riverside County, — *General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report, Volume I.* Riverside County, October 2003. Available on-line at:

2003b http://www.rctlma.org/genplan/content/eir/volume1.html

Riverside County, 2007 *Road Improvement Standards & Specifications.* Riverside County, December 20, 2007. Available on-line at: http://www.rctlma.org/trans/documents/ord461/ord461_package.pdf

Riverside County, 2013 *Riverside County Land Information System (GIS Web Site).* Riverside County, accessed July 26, 2013. Available on-line at: http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rclis/viewer.htm

SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds *SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds.* South Coast Air Quality Management District, March 2011. Available on-line at: http://aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/signthres.pdf

SCAQMD AQMP *Final 2012 Air Quality Management Plan.* South Coast Air Quality Management District, December 2012.

SCAQMD GHG Significance Threshold *Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold.* South Coast Air Quality Management District, October 2008. Available on-line at: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/GHG/2008/oct22mtg/GHGguidance.pdf

SWAP, 2003 *Riverside County General Plan – Southwest Area Plan.* Riverside County, October 2003. Available on-line at: http://www.rctlma.org/planning/content/temp/rc_genplan.html

Temecula, 2005 *Temecula General Plan.* City of Temecula, 2005. Available on-line at: http://www.cityoftemecula.org/Temecula/Government/CommDev/Planning/zoningdocuments/generalplan.htm

Urban Crossroads, 2012 *Tentative Tract Map No. 36437 Traffic Impact Analysis.* Urban Crossroads, Inc., October 30, 2012. (IS/MND Appendix J).

Urban Crossroads, 2013a *Tentative Tract Map No. 36437 Air Quality Impact Analysis.* Urban Crossroads, Inc., June 28, 2013. (IS/MND Appendix C).

Urban Crossroads, 2013b *Tentative Tract Map No. 36437 Greenhouse Gas Analysis.* Urban Crossroads, Inc., June 28, 2013. (IS/MND Appendix G).

Urban Crossroads, 2013c *Tentative Tract Map No. 36437 Preliminary Noise Study.* Urban Crossroads, Inc., September 27, 2013. (IS/MND Appendix I).

Urban Crossroads, 2013d *Tentative Tract Map No. 36437 Traffic, Air Quality, and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis Clarification.* Urban Crossroads, Inc., September 24, 2013.

US EPA, 1994 — *Waste Prevention, Recycling, and Composting Options: Lessons from 30 US Communities.* United States Environmental Protection Agency, February 1994. Available on-line at: http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/conserve/downloads/recy-com/

US EPA, 2003 — U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. *Estimating 2003 Building-Related Construction and Demolition Materials Amounts.* Available on-line at: http://epa.gov/osw/conserve/imr/cdm/pubs/cd-meas.pdf.

USDA, 1971 — *Soil Survey, Western Riverside Area California.* United States Department of Agriculture, 1971. Available on-line at: http://soils.usda.gov/survey/online_surveys/california/western_riversideCA1971/ca_w_riverside.pdf

VWRPD, 2010 — *Valley-Wide Recreation & Park District Master Plan.* Valley-Wide Recreation & Park District, 2010. Available on-line at: http://www.vwrpd.org/userimages/Master%20Plan%202010.pdf

WRCMSHCP — Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan. Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency, October 2003.

APPENDIX B:
MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
AIR QUALITY:				
6. AIR QUALITY IMPACTS				
Implementation of the proposed Project has the potential to exceed the SCAQMD LSTs during construction activities. Near--term construction activities associated with the proposed Project have the potential to expose nearby sensitive receptors to PM10 and PM2.5 emissions that exceed the SCAQMD LSTs (refer also to Table EA-3).	Less than Significant	M-AQ-1 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.023) The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, "Fugitive Dust." Rule 403 requires implementation of best available dust control measures during construction activities that generate fugitive dust, such as earth moving activities, grading, and equipment travel on unpaved roads. Prior to grading permit issuance, the County shall verify that the following notes are included on the grading plan. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by County of Riverside staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors. ▪ During grading and ground-disturbing construction activities, the construction contractor shall ensure that all unpaved roads, active soil stockpiles, and areas undergoing active ground disturbance within the Project site are watered at least three (3) times daily during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas by water truck, sprinkler system or other comparable means, shall occur in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work has been completed for the day. ▪ Temporary signs shall be installed on the construction site along all unpaved roads and/or unpaved haul routes indicating a maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour (MPH). The signs shall be installed before construction activities commence and remain in place during the duration of vehicle activities on all unpaved roads unpaved haul routes. M-AQ-2 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.024) Prior to grading permit final inspection, the Project is required to provide proof of compliance with California Code of Regulations Title 13, Division 3, Chapter 10, Article 1, Section 2485, "Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling." Prior to grading permit issuance and building permit issuance, the County shall	Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department/Construction Contractor Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department/Construction Contractor	M-AQ-1 Prior to grading permit issuance, the County shall verify that the required notes are included on the grading plan. During construction activities, the construction contractor shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes. The construction contractor also shall allow for inspection by Riverside County staff or its designee to verify compliance. M-AQ-2 Prior to grading or building permit issuance, the County shall verify that the required note is included on grading and/or building plans. During construction activities, the construction

IMPACTS	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY/ MONITORING PARTY	IMPLEMENTATION STAGE
		verify that the following note is included on the grading and building plans ▪ Temporary signs shall be placed on the construction site at all construction vehicle entry points and at all loading, unloading, and equipment staging areas indicating that heavy duty trucks and diesel powered construction equipment are prohibited from idling for more than five (5) minutes. The signs shall be installed before construction activities commence and remain in place during the duration of construction activities at all loading, unloading, and equipment staging areas. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the note and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by County of Riverside staff or its designee to confirm compliance. This note also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors. M-AQ-3 (Condition of Approval 60.Planning.025) Active grading and ground-disturbing activities shall be limited to a maximum of five (5) acres on any given day.	Project Applicant/Riverside County Planning Department/Construction Contractor	contractor shall be responsible for compliance with the idling restriction. The construction contractor also shall allow for inspection by Riverside County staff or its designee to verify compliance. M-AQ-3 Prior to grading permit issuance, the County shall verify that there is a note on the grading plan that limits active ground-disturbing activities to a maximum of five (5) acres per day. During construction activities, the construction contractor shall be responsible for compliance with the idling restriction. The construction contractor also shall allow for inspection by Riverside County staff or its designee to verify compliance
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:				
7.0 WILDLIFE AND VEGETATION				
The proposed Project has the potential to result in conflicts with MSHCP policies relating to riparian/riverine resources and the UWIW guidelines specified in MSHCP Section 6.1.4.	Less than Significant	M-BI-1 (Condition of Approval 10.Planning.010) Prior to the issuance of either a certificate of occupancy or prior to building permit final inspection, the Project Applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 810, which requires payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance. Riverside County Ordinance No. 810 has been	Project Applicant/Riverside County Building and Safety Department and Riverside County Environmental Programs Department	M-BI-1 Prior to issuance of either a certificate of occupancy or building permit final building inspection, the Project Applicant shall pay the