

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 6-2, Traffic Study for the Thermal Project (July 3, 2013: Appendix E), Air Quality Impact Analysis (September 2009: Appendix F), CalEEMod Model Output (July 18, 2013: Appendix A)

Findings of Fact:

- a) The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is responsible for developing a regional air quality management plan (Salton Sea Air Basin) to ensure compliance with state and federal air quality standards. The current regional air quality management plan is the 2012 *Final AQMP* adopted by the SCAQMD on December 7, 2012. The 2012 *Final AQMP* proposes attainment demonstration of the Federal PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards through a more focused control of SO<sub>x</sub>, directly-emitted PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and NO<sub>x</sub> supplemented with ROG by 2015. The 8-hour ozone control strategy builds upon the PM<sub>2.5</sub> strategy, augmented with additional NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG reductions to meet the standard by 2024 assuming a bump-up<sup>2</sup> is obtained.

Coachella Valley and SCAQMD have a demonstrated history of adopting and implementing PM<sub>10</sub> dust controls (e.g., 1990 Coachella Valley PM<sub>10</sub> State Implementation Plan [CVSIP], 1994 Best Available Control Measures [BACM] SIP, SCAQMD Rules 403 and 403.1, local dust-control ordinances [Riverside County Ordinance No. 742], clean streets management program) to ensure healthful air for local residents and tourists. These efforts are summarized in the 1996 Coachella Valley PM<sub>10</sub> Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan (1996 CV Plan). EPA approved the Coachella Valley's local dust-control ordinances and SCAQMD's fugitive-dust rules, effective January 8, 1999. The attainment date for serious nonattainment areas to achieve the PM<sub>10</sub> NAAQS was 2001. After years of demonstrating attainment of the PM<sub>10</sub> standards, PM<sub>10</sub> levels in 1999–2001 did not demonstrate attainment of the annual average PM<sub>10</sub> NAAQS. For reference, Coachella Valley has attained the 24-hour PM<sub>10</sub> standard since 1993. The CVSIP was revised in June 2002 and forwarded to CARB and U.S. EPA for approval. U.S. EPA approved the 2002 CVSIP on April 18, 2003. At the time of adoption, the AQMD committed to revising the 2002 CVSIP with the latest approved mobile-source emissions estimates, planning assumptions, and fugitive-dust source emissions estimates when they became available. The 2003 CVSIP updates those elements of the 2002 CVSIP; the control strategies and control measure commitments have not been revised and remain the same as in the 2002 CVSIP. The 2003 CVSIP contains updated emissions inventories, emissions budgets, and attainment modeling. It requests that U.S. EPA replace the approved transportation conformity budgets in the 2002 CVSIP with those in the 2003 CVSIP. U.S. EPA approved these budgets on March 25, 2004, with an effective date of April 9, 2004.

The project would be consistent with the PM<sub>10</sub> dust controls described in the documents identified above through adherence to Riverside County Ordinance No. 742. The purpose of this ordinance is to establish minimum requirements for construction and demolition activities

<sup>2</sup> A "bump-up" is a voluntary reclassification of a nonattainment area to a higher classification allowing for an extension of an attainment deadline.

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

and other specified sources in order to reduce man-made fugitive dust and the corresponding PM<sub>10</sub> emissions. This requires that the project applicant submit a PM<sub>10</sub> Mitigation Plan identifying all reasonably available fugitive dust control measures and shall implement all identified dust control measures during grading and construction of the project site. This requirement is a condition of approval (COA 60.PLANNING.8 and COA 60.PLANNING.17).

To assess the environmental impacts as a result of new development accurately, environmental pollution and population growth are projected by the SCAQMD in the AQMP for future scenarios. The AQMP projections are based, in part, on the growth forecasts and General Plans from cities and counties located in the Basin. As the Growth Management Chapter of the SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP, projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Growth Management Chapter are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections. However, if feasible mitigation measures are implemented and shown to reduce the impact level from significant to less than significant, a project may be deemed consistent with the AQMP. The AQMP uses the assumptions and projections of local planning agencies to determine control strategies for regional compliance status. Since the AQMP is based on the local General Plan, projects that are deemed consistent with the General Plan are found to be consistent with the AQMP.

Although the proposed project was not included in the land use/emissions assumptions contained within the 2012 Final AQMP as the project requires a change of zone from A-1-5 to C-P-S, one of the main air pollution control strategies contained in the AQMP and the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Guidelines is the reduction of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and the creation of more jobs-producing land uses to create a better jobs-to-housing balance and to reduce commute times and vehicles miles traveled. The proposed project is consistent with this goal, by creating job opportunities in an area in need of them along existing transportation corridors.

Another similar measurement tool in determining consistency with the AQMP is to determine how a project accommodates the expected increase in population or employment. Generally, if a project is planned in a way that results in the minimization of VMT both within the project and the community in which it is located, and consequently the minimization of air pollutant emissions, that aspect of the project is consistent with the AQMP. The proposed project site is located in a relatively rural area along Avenue 66 (State Highway 195), which accommodates public transit service (at State Highway 86 and Avenue 66). Based on this information, the proposed project would not impair implementation of the AQMP, and would, therefore, have a less than significant impact on implementation of the AQMP.

The proposed project does not include a residential component; therefore, no significant population growth would result from the development and occupation of the proposed on-site uses than what was accounted for in the development of the 2012 AQMP. Additionally, and as set forth above, the development of commercial uses will create jobs in the local economy. The new employment opportunities resulting from development of the proposed commercial uses will improve the County's current jobs-to-housing ratio by providing jobs to local residents. While the place of residence of the persons accepting employment provided by the proposed uses is uncertain, due to the County's projected jobs/housing ratio, it is reasonable that a large percentage of these jobs would be filled by persons already living within the



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

project area; therefore, employment projections would remain consistent with regional (SCAG) growth projections and, therefore, consistent with the 2012 AQMP.

Emissions projections used to establish SCAQMD attainment objectives reflect adopted regional and local land use plans. As described in greater detail below, no significant short-term or long-term air quality emissions would occur. Therefore, no significant inconsistency with the AQMP would occur.

- b) The following analysis is based upon the results of output files of the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) software utilized to estimate project-related air quality emissions. Traffic data was obtained from the revised Traffic Study (July 3, 2013) prepared for the proposed project. Although an Air Quality Impact Analysis (September, 2009) has been previously prepared for the project, new calculations were required due to a reduction of average daily trips estimated for the project and incorporated into the revised Traffic Study (July 3, 2013). The reduction in average daily trips estimated for the project was warranted due to the absence of a representative pass-by trip reduction and diverted linked trip reduction for the intended use of the site that was unaccounted for in the 2009 study. Therefore the CalEEMod output files supersede the estimated construction and operational emissions identified in the 2009 Air Quality Impact Analysis and this analysis is based upon the output files for the CalEEMod software (July 18, 2013) which incorporates the reduction in average daily trips. Minor air quality impacts would occur during construction and operation of the proposed project as described below.

**Short-Term Impacts**

Grading and other construction activities would result in combustion emissions from heavy-duty construction vehicles, haul trucks, and vehicles transporting the construction crew. Exhaust emissions during these construction activities will vary daily as construction activity levels change. The grading phase of construction represents the most intense construction period in which daily emissions would be at their greatest level based on the potential amount of equipment and duration of use. The other construction phases would not result in any greater construction emissions due to less equipment being used and shorter construction duration. It is assumed that construction would begin no earlier than January 2014, and construction would last approximately six to eight months. Short-term construction emissions associated with the proposed project were calculated with the CalEEMod emissions model. Model outputs are provided in Appendix A.

Currently, the Basin is designated as a nonattainment area for ozone, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Project construction will be required to comply with regional fugitive dust reduction practices (SCAQMD Rule 403) that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. The purpose of SCAQMD Rule 403 is to reduce the amount of particulate matter in the atmosphere resulting from man-made fugitive dust sources. Among the requirements under this rule, fugitive dust must be controlled so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. This is achieved by requiring actions to prevent, reduce, or mitigate dust emissions. Adherence to Rule 403 is a standard requirement for any construction activity occurring within the Basin. Adherence to Rule 403 can reduce fugitive dust emissions by 50 percent or more. Furthermore, the project is required to adhere to Riverside County Ordinance No. 742 as a condition of approval (COA 60.PLANNING.8 and COA 60.PLANNING.17) which requires the project applicant to submit a PM<sub>10</sub> Mitigation Plan identifying all reasonably available fugitive dust control measures and

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

shall implement all identified dust control measures during grading and construction of the project site. Table A identifies peak day construction emissions for the most intense construction phase.

**Table A: Short-Term Construction Emissions**

Phase	Pollutant Emissions, lbs/day					
	CO	ROGs	NO <sub>x</sub>	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Site Preparation	44	9.5	75	0.07	11	7.5
Grading	52	11	91	0.1	7.9	5.5
Building Construction	24	4.8	33	0.04	2.2	2.0
Architectural Coating	2.0	21	2.8	0.00	0.26	0.24
Paving	22	6.6	32	0.03	3.0	2.8
<i>Peak Daily Emissions</i>	52	26	91	0.1	11	7.5
<b>SCAQMD Thresholds</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Localized Significance Thresholds</b>	<b>31,115</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>Exceed SCAQMD Thresholds?</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Exceed LST Thresholds?</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

Source: LSA Associates, Inc., July 2013.

CO = carbon monoxide

CO<sub>2</sub> = carbon dioxide

lbs/day = pounds per day

LST = localized significance threshold

NO<sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides

PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

ROGs = reactive organic gases

SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

SO<sub>x</sub> = sulfur oxides

As summarized in Table A, construction emissions would not exceed regional air quality thresholds. Adherence to SCAQMD Rule 403 is required of all development within the Basin. With adherence to Riverside County Ordinance No. 742 as a condition of approval (COA 60.PLANNING.8 and COA 60.PLANNING.17), impacts would remain less than significant.

**Long-Term Impacts**

Long-term air pollutant emission impacts result from stationary sources and mobile sources involving any project-related changes. The stationary source emissions (area and energy) would come from natural gas consumption for on-site buildings and electricity for the lighting in the buildings. Mobile source emissions would come from vehicular tail pipe exhaust from traffic generated by the proposed project. Long-term operational emissions associated with the proposed project were calculated with the CalEEMod emissions model. Model outputs are provided in Appendix A. As summarized in Table B, all criteria pollutants generated by the proposed project would be less than the applicable SCAQMD daily emission thresholds. Therefore, project-related long-term air quality impacts would not be significant.

**Table B: Long-Term Operational Emissions**

Category	Pollutant Emissions, lbs/day					
	CO	ROGs	NO <sub>x</sub>	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Area Source	0	0.5	0	0	0	0
Energy Source	1.0	0.13	1.2	0.01	0.09	0.09
Mobile Source	69	10	48	0.12	13	1.8



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

**Table B: Long-Term Operational Emissions**

Category	Pollutant Emissions, lbs/day					
	CO	ROGs	NO <sub>x</sub>	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Total Project Emissions	70	11	49	0.13	13	1.9
SCAQMD Thresholds	550	55	55	150	150	55
Localized Significance Thresholds	31,115	N/A	875	N/A	60	31
Exceed SCAQMD Thresholds?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Exceed LST Thresholds?	No	N/A	No	N/A	No	No

Source: LSA Associates, Inc., July 2013.

CO = carbon monoxide

CO<sub>2</sub> = carbon dioxide

lbs/day = pounds per day

LST = localized significance threshold

NO<sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides

PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

ROGs = reactive organic gases

SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

SO<sub>x</sub> = sulfur oxides

- c) The Basin is in nonattainment for PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and ozone at the present time. The project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment status pursuant to any applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected. The previous analysis in Checklist Response 6 a) indicates the traffic and related air quality impacts of the proposed project land uses would not hinder implementation of the existing AQMP. In evaluating the cumulative effects of the project, Section 21100(e) of CEQA states that "previously approved land use documents including, but not limited to, general plans, specific plans, and local coastal plans, may be used in cumulative impact analysis." In addressing cumulative effects for air quality, the AQMP utilizes approved general plans and, therefore, the General Plan is the most appropriate document to use to evaluate cumulative impacts of the project. This is because the AQMP evaluated air quality for the entire Basin using a future development scenario based on population projections and set forth a comprehensive program that would lead the region, including the project, into compliance with all federal and state air quality standards. Since the project is in compliance with the AQMP and both short-term and long-term emissions are below all applicable SCAQMD established regional and localized thresholds of significance, as outlined in Checklist Response 6 b) above, the project's cumulative impact to air quality is considered less than significant.
- d) A sensitive receptor is a person in the population who is particularly susceptible to health effects due to exposure to an air contaminant than the population at large. Sensitive receptors (and the facilities that house them) proximate to localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants or odors are of particular concern. High levels of CO are associated with major traffic sources, such as freeways and major intersections, and toxic air contaminants are normally associated with manufacturing and commercial operations. Land uses considered to be sensitive receptors include long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. There are no sensitive receptors within one mile of the project site. Surrounding land uses include agricultural uses and vacant land, which are not considered sensitive receptors; the project is not expected to generate substantial point-source emissions as demonstrated in Tables A and B above. The project will not include major transportation facilities. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

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

e) During construction, vehicle and equipment exhaust would create odors. These odors would be short-term (i.e., temporary) and not likely to be noticeable beyond the project limits. The painting of buildings or the installation of asphalt surfaces may create odors. SCAQMD Rule 1113 outlines standards for paint applications, while Rule 1108 identifies standards regarding the application of asphalt. Adherence to the standards identified in these SCAQMD Rules would reduce temporary odor impacts to a less than significant level.

Land uses generally associated with long-term objectionable odors include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting operations, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding facilities. The proposed project does not include uses that would generate long-term objectionable odors.

As previously noted, there are no sensitive receptors located within one mile of the project site. The project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

While no mitigation measures are required, the project is required to adhere to Riverside County Ordinance No. 742 as a condition of approval (COA 60.PLANNING.8 and COA 60.PLANNING.17) which requires the project applicant to submit a PM<sub>10</sub> Mitigation Plan identifying all reasonably available fugitive dust control measures and shall implement all identified dust control measures during grading and construction of the project site.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: GIS database, CV-MSHCP, General Biological Resources Assessment (Appendix G: August 6, 2009), Environmental Programs Division (EPD) review

Findings of Fact:

a-g) The proposed project site is not located within a Conservation Area of the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (CV-MSHCP). A review by the Environmental Programs Division (EPD) of the Planning Department was done to assure consistency with the CV-MSHCP. No inconsistencies were reported. The land is previously disturbed with former agricultural uses. The project site does not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

The project site is not known to contain special-status plant communities and has an overall low potential for special-status species to utilize or reside within areas proposed for development on the site. No special-status plant or animal species were detected on the site during the on-site field surveys. Construction activities are not expected to directly impact federal- or state-listed threatened or endangered species, jeopardize the continued existence of listed species (or special status species), or directly impact designated critical habitat. Implementation of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any federal or state endangered or threatened species and impacts are less than significant.

While the project site has been previously disturbed, there is the potential for the burrowing owl to occur on the project site. The burrowing owl is one of 27 focal species covered by the CV-MSHCP as it is a California Species of Special Concern, and Federal Species of Concern protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-711) and Section 3503 of California Fish and Game Code.

The project would be required to adhere to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-711) and Section 3503 of California Fish and Game Code. To ensure compliance with the MBTA, and to avoid potential impacts to other nesting birds the proposed project site shall be cleared of vegetation outside the general bird nesting season (February 1 through August 31). If vegetation cannot be removed outside the bird nesting season, a pre-construction nesting bird survey by a qualified biologist is required prior to vegetation removal. Should nesting birds be found, an exclusionary buffer shall be established by a qualified biologist. The buffer may be up to 500 feet in diameter depending on the species of nesting bird found. This buffer shall be clearly marked in the field by construction personnel under guidance of the biologist, and construction or clearing shall not be conducted within this zone

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

until the biologist determines that the young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. This requirement is consistent with Condition of Approval (60.EPD.1 – Nesting Bird Survey). Adherence to COA 60.EPD.1 – Nesting Bird Survey would ensure a less than significant impact.

The project site does not support any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community. Therefore, there is no impact. The project site does not include any waterways or wetlands and would not affect any federally protected natural features defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. No impact would occur.

No biological resources protected by policy or ordinance is located on the project site. The proposed project would not conflict with any policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No impact would occur.

The project would be conditioned to provide payment of CVMSHCP fees in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 875 (COA 10.Planning.36).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**CULTURAL RESOURCES** Would the project

**8. Historic Resources**

a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials; Phase I Archaeological Assessment (August 2009: Appendix B)

Findings of Fact:

- a-b) The site is currently vacant with no structures on-site. The project does not propose the disturbance of a historic site or the demolishing of historic structures. The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5. Therefore, the project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**9. Archaeological Resources**

a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials; Phase I Archaeological Assessment (August 2009: Appendix B)

Findings of Fact:

- a) Site disturbance has already occurred with the existing site due to its former agricultural use. The project site does not contain any known archaeological site. It is possible that previously unknown buried archaeological deposits could be discovered during grading and excavation work associated with construction. Prehistoric materials can include flaked-stone tools (e.g. projectile points, knives, choppers) or obsidian, chert, basalt, or quartzite tool making debris; bone tools; culturally darkened soil (i.e., midden soil often containing heat-affected rock, ash and charcoal, shellfish remains, faunal bones, and cultural materials); and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones). Prehistoric archaeological sites often contain human remains. Historical materials can include wood, stone, concrete, or adobe footings, walls and other structural remains; debris-filled wells or privies; and deposits of wood, glass, ceramics, metal, and other refuse. If during ground disturbance activities, cultural resources are discovered that were not assessed by the archaeological reports and/or environmental assessment conducted prior to project approval, the following procedures shall be followed. A cultural resources site is defined, for this condition, as being three or more artifacts in close association with each other, but may include fewer artifacts if the area of the find is determined to be of significance due to its sacred or cultural importance. The procedures listed below are a condition of approval (COA 10.Planning.39).

All ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the Project Archaeologist, the Native American Tribal Representative (or other appropriate ethnic/cultural group representative), and the County Planning Director to discuss the significance of the find.

At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed and after consultation with the Native American Tribal Representative (or other appropriate ethnic/cultural group representative) and the Project Archaeologist, a decision is made, with the concurrence of the Planning Director, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resource.

Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to the appropriate preservation. Depending on the nature of the artifacts, the handling will differ. However, it is understood that all artifacts with the exception of human remains and related grave goods or sacred objects belong to the property owner. All artifacts discovered at the development site shall be inventoried and analyzed by the professional archaeologist. All items found in association with Native American human remains will be considered grave goods or sacred in origin and subject to special handling. The remainder of the Native American artifact assemblage will be prepared in a manner for curation, and the

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

archaeological consultant will deliver the materials to an accredited curation facility approved by the County of Riverside within a reasonable amount of time.

Adherence to COA 10.Planning.39 would reduce impacts to previously undiscovered archaeological resources to a less than significant level.

- b) The proposed project is not expected to impact archaeological resources. If, however, during any building improvements or ground disturbing activities, unique cultural resources are discovered, all ground disturbances shall halt until a meeting is held between the developer, archaeologist, and Native American representative to discuss the significance of the find.

As a condition of approval, in the event of the discovery of archaeological resources on the project site, the project applicant must retain and enter into a monitoring and mitigation service contract with a qualified Archaeologist for monitoring and mitigation services. This professional shall be known as the "Project Archaeologist." The Project Archaeologist shall be included in the pre-grade meetings to provide cultural/historical sensitivity training including the establishment of set guidelines for ground disturbance in sensitive areas with the grading contractors and any required tribal or special interest monitors. The Project Archaeologist shall manage and oversee monitoring for all initial rough and mass grading ground disturbing activities and excavation of each portion of the project site including, but not limited to, clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading, trenching, stockpiling of materials, rock crushing, and structure demolition. The Project Archaeologist shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect, or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and potential recovery of cultural resources in coordination with any required tribal or special interest monitors. If after an initial period of monitoring no cultural deposits have been found and it is probable that there are no subsurface cultural deposits are likely to be found, monitoring may be stopped with the concurrence of the County Archaeologist. Tribal monitoring would also end if archaeological monitoring were stopped.

The Project Archaeologist is responsible for implementing mitigation using standard professional practices for cultural resources. The Project Archaeologist shall consult with the County, developer/permit holder, and any required tribal or special interest group monitor throughout the process. The developer/permit holder shall submit a copy of the fully executed contract to the Riverside County Planning Department to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Planning Department shall clear this condition.

This agreement shall not modify any approved condition of approval or mitigation measure.

Adherence to COA 10.Planning.39 and COA 60.Planning.19 would ensure a less than significant impact.

- c) There may be a possibility that ground disturbing activities will expose human remains. The project is subject to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 if human remains are discovered during ground disturbing activities. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made



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

the necessary finding as to origin. Further, pursuant to 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 their disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be contacted within the period specified by the law. Subsequently, the NAHC shall identify the "Most Likely Descendant." The Most Likely Descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation with the County and the property owner concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Human remains from other ethnic/cultural groups with recognized historical associations to the project area shall also be subject to consultation between appropriate representatives from that group and the County Planning Director. Adherence to the regulations identified above would ensure that impacts are less than significant. The requirements identified above are consistent with COA 10.Planning.38.

- d) The project will not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area. No religious or sacred uses are known to exist in the project area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**10. Paleontological Resources**

- a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?

Source: GIS database, County Geologist review, Paleontological Resources Assessment Report, August 31, 2009 (Appendix H).

Findings of Fact:

- a) According to the County's GIS database, this site has been mapped as having a high potential for paleontological resources. Due to a high potential for paleontological resources to occur on-site, a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan is required. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation:

- PAL-1:** The project applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist approved by the County of Riverside (Project Paleontologist) to create and implement a project-specific plan (Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan) for monitoring site grading/earthmoving activities (COA 60.Planning.18).

The Project Paleontologist retained shall review the approved development plan and shall conduct any pre-construction work necessary to render monitoring and mitigation requirements as appropriate. These requirements shall be documented by the Project Paleontologist in a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP). This

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

PRIMP shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to issuance of a grading permit.

- Information to be contained in the PRIMP, at a minimum and in addition to other industry standard and Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards, are as follows:
- The Project Paleontologist shall participate in a pre-construction project meeting with development staff and construction operations to ensure an understanding of any mitigation measures required during construction, as applicable.
- Paleontological monitoring of earthmoving activities shall be conducted on an as-needed basis by the Project Paleontologist during all earthmoving activities that may expose sensitive strata. Earthmoving activities in areas of the project area where previously undisturbed strata will be buried but not otherwise disturbed will not be monitored. The Project Paleontologist or his/her assign will have the authority to reduce monitoring once he/she determines the probability of encountering fossils has dropped below an acceptable level.
- If the Project Paleontologist finds fossil remains, earthmoving activities will be diverted temporarily around the fossil site until the remains have been evaluated and recovered. Earthmoving will be allowed to proceed through the site when the Project Paleontologist determines the fossils have been recovered and/or the site mitigated to the extent necessary.
- If fossil remains are encountered by earthmoving activities when the Project Paleontologist is not on-site, these activities shall be diverted around the fossil site and the Project Paleontologist shall be called to the site immediately to recover the remains.
- If fossil remains are found, fossiliferous rock shall be recovered from the fossil site and processed to allow for the recovery of smaller fossil remains. Test samples may be recovered from other sampling sites in the rock unit if appropriate.
- Any recovered fossil remains shall be prepared to the point of identification and identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible by knowledgeable paleontologists. The remains shall then be curated (assigned and labeled with museum repository [The County of Riverside must be consulted on the repository/museum to receive the fossil material prior to being curated] fossil specimen numbers and corresponding fossil site numbers, as appropriate; places in specimen trays and, if necessary, vials with completed specimen data cards) and catalogued, and associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data will be archived (specimen and site numbers and corresponding data entered into appropriate museum repository catalogs and computerized databases) at the museum repository by a laboratory technician. The remains shall then be accessioned into the museum repository fossil collection, where they will be permanently stored, maintained, and, along with associated specimen and site data, made available for future study by qualified scientific investigators.



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

- o A qualified paleontologist shall prepare a report of findings made during all site grading activity with an appended itemized list of fossil specimens recovered during grading (if any). This report shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to building final inspection.

All reports shall be signed by the Project Paleontologist and all other professionals responsible for the report's content (e.g., Professional Geologist, Professional Engineer, etc.), as appropriate. Two wet-signed original copies of the report shall be submitted directly to the office of the County Geologist along with a copy of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and the grading plan for appropriate case processing and tracking. These documents should not be submitted to the Project Planner, the Plan Check staff, the Land Use Counter, or any other County office.

These mitigation measures are consistent with COA 60.Planning.18.

Monitoring: Monitoring provided by Riverside County Geologist and Riverside County Paleontologist.

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS** Would the project

<b>11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, County Geologist review, Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Addendum and Response to Comments (Salem Engineering, 2013; Appendix C); County Geologic Report No. 2313

Findings of Fact:

- a) According to Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS; GIS database), the proposed project is not located within a fault zone. Based on the review of aerial photos, site mapping and literature research, there is no evidence of active faults crossing/trending toward the subject site that would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse risks. As described in the project's Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Addendum and Response to Comments (Salem Engineering, 2013) the nearest active fault is the San Andreas Fault Zone located approximately seven miles east of the project site. The project site is located within Seismic Zone 4 as defined by the Uniform Building Code (UBC). The extent of ground shaking associated with an earthquake is dependent upon the size of the earthquake and the geologic material of the underlying area. All future construction and development within the project site would be required to comply with applicable provisions of the most recent adopted version of the UBC (including all related mechanical, electrical, and plumbing codes), California Building Code (CBC), and the County's building requirements. These codes and regulations detail

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

specific measures including seismic design parameters to minimize the risk of loss, injury, or death resulting from strong ground shaking. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

- b) As previously described, the site is not located within one-half mile of an earthquake fault zone. The nearest fault is located approximately seven miles east of the project site. Therefore, the potential for this site to be affected by surface fault rupture is considered low and no impacts are expected.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**12. Liquefaction Potential Zone**

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 “Generalized Liquefaction”, GIS Database, County Geologist review, Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Addendum and Response to Comments (Salem Engineering, 2013: Appendix C); County Geologic Report No. 2313 (GEO 2213)

Findings of Fact:

- a) According to the Riverside County General Plan, the potential for liquefaction is high at this site. As described in the project’s Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Addendum and Response to Comments (Salem Engineering, 2013) a liquefaction analysis was conducted to determine appropriate foundation design. The site is subject to liquefaction induced settlement which is estimated at 1.14 inches. Dry sand settlement potential is estimated to be 0.85 inches. The analysis concluded that the potential for structural damage can be minimized by several methods including 1) the removal/replacement of highly compressible and/or liquefiable soils; 2) using a 4-foot thick geogrid-reinforced earth foundation layer; 3) using drilled caissons with a structural slab and grade beam; 4) using stone columns or geo-piers; or 5) using a driven pre-stressed, pre-cast concrete pile foundation system. The recommended design option is to install a geogrid-reinforced earth foundation layer. Additionally, GEO 2213 reviewed by the County Geologist recommends the upper 2 to 4 inches of the soils containing asphaltic concrete, vegetation, roots and other objectionable organic matter be removed from at least five feet outside the building perimeter, the building areas should be over excavated to a depth of five feet below existing surface or three feet below bottom of footings, and the resulting excavation should be backfilled with a layered system of Engineered Fill and geogrid reinforcing material (COA 10.Planning 41). Implementation of mitigation identified below would ensure a less than significant impact.

Mitigation:

- GEO-1** The project applicant shall demonstrate to the County that the siting, design and construction of all structures and facilities within the project limits are in accordance with the regulations established in the California Building Code (COA 10.Planning.41), as well as the recommendations identified in the project geotechnical investigation and the soils and foundation evaluations prepared for the project site (COA 60.BSGrade.4).



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

Monitoring: Monitoring provided by Riverside County Geologist and Riverside County Building and Safety Department.

**13. Ground-shaking Zone**

Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), County Geologist review, Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Addendum and Response to Comments (Salem Engineering, 2013: Appendix C); County Geologic Report No. 2313

Findings of Fact:

a) There are no known active or potentially active faults that traverse the site and the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The principal seismic hazard that could affect the site is ground shaking resulting from an earthquake occurring along several major active or potentially active faults in southern California. All future construction and development within the project site would be required to comply with applicable provisions of the most recent adopted version of the UBC (including all related mechanical, electrical, and plumbing codes), CBC, and applicable County building requirements. These codes and regulations detail specific measures including seismic design parameters to minimize the risk of loss, injury, or death resulting from strong ground shaking. Adherence to applicable codes and regulations would ensure impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are 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: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope", Geologist review; County Geologic Report No. 2313

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located near any area of potential landslide as it is not within an area of identified steep slopes or susceptible to landslide hazards; therefore, landslides are not a geotechnical constraint for the site. Since the project site is not within the areas that are susceptible to seismically induced landslides, the project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

**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: GIS database, County Geologist review; County Geologic Report No. 2313

Findings of Fact:

a) Subsidence is the sudden sinking or gradual downward settling of the earth's surface with little or no horizontal movement. Subsidence is caused by a variety of activities, which includes, but is not limited to, withdrawal of groundwater, pumping of oil and gas from underground, the collapse of underground mines, liquefaction, and hydrocompaction. According to the County GIS database, the site is located in an area susceptible to subsidence. Implementation of mitigation identified below would ensure a less than significant impact.

Mitigation:

**GEO-1** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the County that the siting, design and construction of all structures and facilities within the project limits are in accordance with the regulations established in the California Building Code, as well as the recommendations identified in the project geotechnical investigation and the soils and foundation evaluations prepared for the project site.

This mitigation measure is consistent with COA 60.BSGrade.4

Monitoring: Monitoring provided by Riverside County Geologist

**16. Other Geologic Hazards**

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

Source: Project Application Materials, County Geologist review; County Geologic Report No. 2313

a) Tsunamis are caused by displacement of ocean floor due to seismic activity that causes high waves. Tsunami hazard is not present in the County due to the elevation and distance from the ocean. Mudflow typically consists of a mixture of soil, rock, and/or water or air. The potential for debris flow occurs particularly in canyon bottoms, stream channels, and areas near the outlets of canyons or channels. Since the project site is not located near a canyon bottom or stream channels, no impacts associated with this issue are anticipated to occur. Oscillation in the surface of an enclosed body of water, such as a lake causes seiches. This oscillation is induced by earthquakes and can affect harbors, bays, lakes, rivers, and canals. While the project site is located approximately 4.1 miles northwest of the Salton Sea, the project site is generally flat with no nearby mountainous areas in the immediate vicinity. The project site is also at a higher elevation than the Salton Sea. No significant impacts resulting from tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows are anticipated to occur on the project site.



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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**17. Slopes**

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, Building and Safety – Grading Review; County Geologic Report No. 2313

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site is relatively flat and future grading proposed for the project will retain the flat nature of the project site. The proposed project will not substantially alter ground surface relief features. Therefore, there is no impact.
- b) Based on the project’s grading plan and site plan, no slopes with a slope ratio greater than two to one (2:1) (horizontal run: vertical rise) are proposed nor are there slopes that would be higher than 10 feet. Therefore, there is no impact.
- c) The project site is currently vacant and was formerly used for agricultural purposes. No subsurface disposal system is located on the project site. A comment letter provided by the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD) indicates that the site is underlain by existing U.S. Bureau of Reclamation facilities, agricultural drainage lines, and other private facilities. Coordination with the CVWD would be required to avoid any impacts to these subsurface facilities. Implementation of mitigation measures identified below would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation:

**GEO-2:** Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall coordinate with the Coachella Valley Water District and identify subsurface facilities that will need to be avoided and/or relocated. The necessary measures to avoid and/or relocate subsurface facilities on the project shall be included in the project’s grading plans and approved by the County of Riverside and Coachella Valley Water District.

This mitigation measure is consistent with COA 60.BSGrade.6, 60.BSGrade.17, and 60.Trans.4.

Monitoring: Monitoring provided by Riverside County Geologist and Riverside County Building and Safety Department.

**18. Soils**

a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan Figure S-6 "Engineering Geologic Materials Map", Project Application Materials, Building and Safety Grading review; County Geologic Report No. 2313

- a) Based on information contained within the Soil Survey of the Coachella Valley Area, California (USDA, 1928) the project site is underlain with Indio Series soils. Indio Series soils consist of very deep, well or moderately well drained soils formed in alluvium derived from mixed rock sources. The erosion hazards associated with Indio Series soils are none to slight. Development of the site would require the movement of on-site soils. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project proponent would be required to prepare and submit detailed grading plans for the project site. These plans must be prepared in conformance with applicable standards of the County's grading requirements.

Development of the site would involve more than one acre; therefore, the proposed project is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would also be required to address erosion and discharge impacts associated with the proposed on-site grading. A SWPPP is a written document that describes the construction operator's activities to comply with the requirements in the NPDES permit. Required elements of an SWPPP include (1) site description addressing the elements and characteristics specific to the project site; (2) descriptions of BMPs for erosion and sediment controls; (3) BMPs for construction waste handling and disposal; (4) implementation of approved local plans; and (5) proposed post-construction controls, including a description of local post-construction erosion and sediment control requirements. The SWPPP is intended to facilitate a process whereby the operator evaluates potential pollutant sources at the site and selects and implements BMPs designed to prevent or control the discharge of pollutants in stormwater runoff. These requirements are consistent with COA 10.BS GRADE.6.

The soils present on site have at most a slight erosion hazard potential, and the proposed project would be required to adhere to the County's grading requirements, obtain an NPDES permit, and prepare an SWPPP. Therefore, impacts associated with soil erosion hazards are less than significant.

- b) Expansive soils generally have a substantial amount of clay particles, which can give up water (shrink) or absorb water (swell). The change in the volume exerts stress on buildings and other loads placed on these soils. The extent or range of the shrink/swell is influenced by the amount and kind of clay present in the soil. The occurrence of these soils is often associated with geologic units having marginal stability. Expansive soils can be widely dispersed and they can occur in hillside areas as well as low-lying alluvial basins. Implementation of mitigation identified below would ensure a less than significant impact.



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

c) The project area is serviced by the CVWD which provides wastewater collection services in the general area. While no sewer connections are available in the immediate vicinity of the project site, the project would require the installation of off-site wastewater facilities to connect to CVWD sewer facilities. Therefore, no septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed as part of the project and no impact would occur.

Mitigation:

**GEO-1** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the County that the siting, design and construction of all structures and facilities within the project limits are in accordance with the regulations established in the California Building Code, as well as the recommendations identified in the project geotechnical investigation and the soils and foundation evaluations prepared for the project site.

This mitigation measure is consistent with COA 60.BSGrade.4

Monitoring: Monitoring provided by Riverside County Geologist and Riverside County Building and Safety Department.

**19. Erosion**

a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Flood Control District review, Project Application Materials; County Geologic Report No. 2313

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Soils on the project site consist of Indio Series soils. The erosion hazards associated with Indio Series soils are none to slight. Development of the site would require the movement of on-site soils. The site will be partly paved, partly landscaped, and built-upon. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project proponent would be required to prepare and submit detailed grading plans for the project site. These plans must be prepared in conformance with applicable standards of the County's grading requirements.

Development of the site would involve more than one acre; therefore, the proposed project is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would also be required to address erosion and discharge impacts associated with the proposed onsite grading. These requirements are consistent with COA 10.BSGrade.1.

The majority of the soils present on site have at most a slight erosion hazard potential, the proposed project would be required to adhere to the County's grading requirements, obtain an NPDES permit, and prepare an SWPPP. Therefore, impacts associated with soil erosion hazards are less than significant. The project will not have

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

an impact or change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river, stream, or the bed of a lake. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**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: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. 460, Sec. 14.2 & Ord. 484

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site lies within a high wind erosion susceptibility area. Construction of the proposed project would require the movement of on-site soils. The project would be required to implement dust and sand control measures in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 484 and all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations regulating wind erosion and fugitive dust (i.e., blowsand). Riverside County Ordinance No. 484 prohibits the wind erosion of substantial quantities of sandy soils in substantial quantities on a site to be blown onto a public road or roads or other public or private property. Necessary preventative/protection measures must be implemented and include, but are not limited to, wind-breaks, walls, fences, planting and maintaining vegetation, covering the land, applying water or other materials, or other effective method or combination of methods of holding the soil in place. Applicable SCAQMD rules include Rule 401 (Visible Emissions), Rule 402 (Nuisance), and Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and Rule 403.1 (Supplemental Fugitive Dust Control Requirements for Coachella Valley Sources). The rules enforced by SCAQMD are consistent with the provisions specifying the control of wind erosion as detailed in Riverside County Ordinance No. 484. These requirements are consistent with COAs 10.BSGrade.8, 10.Planning.22, 60.BSGrade.16, 60.Planning.8, and 80.Planning.4. Adherence to the SCAQMD rules identified above is a standard requirement for any construction activity occurring within the Basin. Adherence to Rule 403 can reduce fugitive dust emissions by 50 percent or more. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS** Would the project

**21. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

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

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



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

Source: Project application materials, Air Quality Impact Analysis (September 2009: Appendix F)

Findings of Fact:

As part of the Air Quality Impact Analysis prepared in September 2009, a global climate change (GCC) and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) analysis was prepared for the project. While the discussion of potential project-related air quality impacts above were based on the revisions made to the estimated average daily traffic in 2013, the analysis prepared in 2009 considers the previously higher number of average daily traffic expected at the time that study was prepared and yields a more conservative analysis due to an increased average daily traffic assumption. Therefore, the following discussion of greenhouse gas emissions are based on the 2009 Air Quality Impact Assessment and likely overstates project-related GHG impacts.

- a) Greenhouse gas emissions would be associated with the construction phase of the project through the use of heavy equipment and vehicle trips. There currently are no adopted thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions. Emissions of greenhouse gases during construction would be temporary. The total emissions during construction were estimated at 183 tons of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>). While construction of the project will lead to life-cycle emissions, environmental impacts of the production and disposal of materials are not generally analyzed in order to avoid speculation and to maintain a reasonable analytical approach towards assessing environmental impacts. For example, criteria pollutant emissions associated with off-site cement or drywall manufacture for a project are not considered; electricity demand associated with manufacture of appliances is not incorporated into the utilities section; and protected species impacts of timber harvesting of wood used to construct the project are not included in the biological resources discussion. These impacts are not evaluated because to do so would require highly speculative forecasting, which lead agencies are poorly situated to conduct and are not required to conduct under CEQA (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 15144, 15145).

Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project were estimated separately for increases in emissions due to area sources and vehicle use. Emissions associated with project operation include emissions from area sources such as landscaping and energy use. Operational emissions also include CO<sub>2</sub> from project-related traffic. Project-related operational CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were estimated at 19 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year from area sources and 9,475 tons per year from vehicles, for total operational emissions of 9,494 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year. It should be noted that vehicular GHG emissions are regulated through State and federal requirements for motor vehicle emissions rather than by individual projects. The project would comply with any State-mandated requirements aimed at the reduction of GHG emissions as well as any state or local requirements to reduce GHG emissions. This includes meeting the State 2010 Title 24 standards for energy efficiency.

Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the project would not generate greenhouse gases in amounts that would have a significant impact on the environment. Furthermore, as described below, the project is consistent with the current greenhouse gas reduction strategies. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

- b) As the GHG emissions reduction goals in AB 32 are scoped to manage total statewide GHG emissions of approximately 496.95 Million Metric Tons (MMT) of CO<sub>2</sub>e/year, the total GHG emissions of the proposed project are not likely to result in GHG emission levels that would substantially conflict with implementation of the GHG reduction goals under AB 32 or other

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

State regulations. The Climate Action Team and the ARB have developed several reports to achieve the Governor's GHG targets that rely on voluntary actions of California businesses, local governments and community groups, and State incentive and regulatory programs. These include the Climate Action Team's 2006 "Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature," ARB's 2007 "Expanded List of Early Action Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions in California," and ARB's "Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan: a Framework for Change."

These reports identify strategies to reduce California's emissions to the levels proposed in Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 and AB 32 that are applicable to the proposed project. The Proposed Scoping Plan is the most recent document, and the strategies included in the Scoping Plan that apply to the proposed project are described in Table C, which also summarizes the extent to which the project would comply with the strategies to help California reach the emission reduction targets. The strategies listed in Table C are either part of the project design or requirements under local or State regulations or ordinances. With implementation of these strategies/measures, the project's contribution to cumulative GHG emissions would be reduced.

**Table C: Project Compliance with Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies**

Strategy	Project Compliance
<b>Mandatory Code</b>	
<p><b>California Green Building Code (CALGreen).</b> The CALGreen Code prescribes a wide array of measures that would directly and indirectly result in reduction of GHG emissions from the Business-as-Usual Scenario (California Building Code). The mandatory measures that are applicable to the project include site selection, energy efficiency, water efficiency, materials conservation and resource efficiency, and environmental quality measures.</p>	<p><b>Compliant.</b> The proposed project would be required to adhere to the mandatory measures as required by the CALGreen Code.</p>
<b>Energy Efficiency Measures</b>	
<p><b>Energy Efficiency.</b> Maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards, and pursue additional efficiency efforts including new technologies, and new policy and implementation mechanisms. Pursue comparable investment in energy efficiency from all retail providers of electricity in California (including both investor-owned and publicly owned utilities).</p> <p><b>Renewables Portfolio Standard.</b> Achieve a 33 percent renewable energy mix statewide.</p> <p><b>Green Building Strategy.</b> Expand the use of green building practices to reduce the carbon footprint of California's new and existing inventory of buildings.</p>	<p><b>Compliant.</b> The proposed project would comply with the updated Title 24 standards, including the new 2013 California Building Code of Title 24, for building construction.</p>
<b>Water Conservation and Efficiency Measures</b>	
<p><b>Water Use Efficiency.</b> Continue efficiency programs and use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water. Approximately 19 percent of all electricity, 30 percent of all natural gas, and 88 million gallons of diesel are used to convey, treat, distribute and use water and wastewater. Increasing the efficiency of water transport and reducing water use would reduce GHG emissions.</p>	<p><b>Compliant.</b> The proposed project would be required to adhere to the mandatory measures as required by the CALGreen Code.</p>
<b>Solid Waste Reduction Measures</b>	



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

**Table C: Project Compliance with Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies**

Strategy	Project Compliance
<p><b>Increase Waste Diversion, Composting, and Commercial Recycling, and Move Toward Zero Waste.</b>            Increase waste diversion from landfills beyond the 50 percent mandate to provide for additional recovery of recyclable materials. Composting and commercial recycling could have substantial GHG reduction benefits. In the long term, zero-waste policies that would require manufacturers to design products to be fully recyclable may be necessary.</p>	<p><b>Compliant.</b>            The proposed project is conditioned to provide a recyclable collection area within the project site plan at a minimum of 50% of the total area required for trash/recycling enclosures. The provision of a recyclables collection area would encourage an increase in waste diversion and additional recovery of recyclable materials.</p>
<b>Transportation and Motor Vehicle Measures</b>	
<p><b>Vehicle Climate Change Standards.</b>            AB 1493 (Pavley) required the State to develop and adopt regulations that achieve the maximum feasible and cost-effective reduction of GHG emissions from passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks. Regulations were adopted by the ARB in September 2004.</p> <p><b>Light-Duty Vehicle Efficiency Measures.</b>            Implement additional measures that could reduce light-duty GHG emissions. For example, measures to ensure that tires are properly inflated can both reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel efficiency.</p> <p><b>Adopt Heavy- and Medium-Duty Fuel and Engine Efficiency Measures.</b>            Regulations to require retrofits to improve the fuel efficiency of heavy-duty trucks that could include devices that reduce aerodynamic drag and rolling resistance. This measure could also include hybridization of and increased engine efficiency of vehicles.</p> <p><b>Low Carbon Fuel Standard.</b>            ARB identified this measure as a Discrete Early Action Measure. This measure would reduce the carbon intensity of California's transportation fuels by at least 10 percent by 2020.</p>	<p><b>Compliant.</b>            The proposed project does not involve the manufacture of vehicles. However, vehicles that are purchased and used within the project site would comply with any vehicle and fuel standards that the ARB adopted at the time of manufacture.</p>
<p><b>Regional Transportation-Related Greenhouse Gas Targets.</b>            Develop regional GHG emissions reduction targets for passenger vehicles. Local governments will play a significant role in the regional planning process to reach passenger vehicle GHG emissions reduction targets. Local governments have the ability to directly influence both the siting and design of new residential and commercial developments in a way that reduces GHGs associated with vehicle travel.</p>	<p><b>Compliant.</b>            The proposed project would implement and encourage non-vehicular modes of transportation, including bicycle racks. Additionally, the project would be able to be serviced by existing alternative transportation (bus) routes.</p>
<p><b>Measures to Reduce High Global Warming Potential Gases.</b>            ARB has identified Discrete Early Action measures to reduce GHG emissions from the refrigerants used in car air conditioners, semiconductor manufacturing, and consumer products. ARB has also identified potential reduction opportunities for future commercial and industrial refrigeration, changing the refrigerants used in auto air-conditioning systems, and ensuring that existing car air-conditioning systems do not leak.</p>	<p><b>Compliant.</b>            New products used or serviced on the project site would comply with future ARB rules and regulations.</p>

Source: LSA Associates, Inc. (June 2013).

AB = Assembly Bill

ARB = California Air Resources Board

GHG = greenhouse gas

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

The proposed project is consistent with the goals in the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy of combining transportation and land use elements in order to achieve emissions reduction targets. The proposed project includes a land use growth pattern that accommodates the region's future employment needs. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable plans policies or ordinances related to greenhouse gas emissions and impact are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment APN 727-100-024-3 (February 2007: Appendix D)

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed project envisions the construction of a travel center/truck stop to include auto/truck fueling, auto/truck wash, 24-hour retail sale of gasoline, food, beverages, beer/wine (Type 20 – Off Sale), and grocery items. Three fast food drive-thru restaurants and two sit down restaurant are also proposed. Potentially hazardous materials such as petroleum products, pesticides, fertilizer, and other household hazardous products such as solvents and cleaning products may be stored and sold in conjunction with on-site retail sales. Additionally, the gas station would entail the storage, dispensing, and use of gasoline and other petroleum products, automobile batteries, lubricants, and other automotive fluids.

Exposure to hazardous materials during the construction and operation of the proposed on-site uses could result from (1) the improper handling or use of hazardous substances; (2) transportation accident; or (3) inadvertent release resulting from an unforeseen event (e.g.,



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

fire, flood, or earthquake). The severity of any such exposure is dependent upon the type, amount, and characteristic of the hazardous material involved; the timing, location, and nature of the event; and the sensitivity of the individual or environment affected.

During construction, the project would utilize construction equipment requiring diesel or other petroleum-based fuel. However, equipment fuel is not expected to be stored on-site and construction activities would not involve the use or storage of gases, paints, solvents, or other hazardous materials or generation.

The transport and delivery of fuel to gasoline stations is regulated by the Federal Department of Transportation. In the County, the Riverside County Community Health Agency, Department of Environmental Health is the local agency that has been certified by the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) to implement and ensure compliance with six State environmental and emergency programs. These programs include: Hazardous Materials Business Plan/Emergency Response Plan, Hazardous Waste/Tiered Permitting, Underground Storage Tanks, Aboveground Storage Tanks, California Accidental Release Program, and the Uniform Fire Code Hazardous Materials Management Plan and Hazardous Material Inventory Statements. The Riverside County Community Health Agency, Department of Environmental Health, as the local agency charged with implementing these programs, will provide permitting, inspections, and enforcement with the required regulations (COA's 90.En Health.1,2,3, and 4). Hazardous wastes produced on-site are subject to requirements associated with accumulation time limits, proper storage locations and containers, and proper labeling. Additionally, for removal of hazardous waste from the site, hazardous waste generators are required to use a certified hazardous waste transportation company, which must ship hazardous waste to a permitted facility for treatment, storage, recycling, or disposal.

As with any commercial operation, any on-site activity involving hazardous substances must adhere to applicable local, State, and Federal safety standards, ordinances, or regulations. Businesses engaged in the use, sale, storage, or transport of hazardous substances are monitored by various local (e.g., Riverside County Fire Department) and State (e.g., Department of Toxic Substance Control) entities. Compliance with applicable regulations will ensure impacts associated with the use, transport, storage, and sale of hazardous materials will be less than significant.

- b) Due to the on-site presence of hazardous materials associated with commercial retail sales and fuel sales as described above, the potential for an accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment is present at the proposed project site. Due to the size of containers such products would be sold in, any hazardous material spill associated with the household hazardous products sold in the retail store such as solvents, cleaning products, fertilizer, or related substances is likely to be small and easily contained. Because of the volume of materials involved in the transport and dispensing of petroleum products, any hazardous material release at the proposed gas station could be larger than that at any of the proposed retail uses. As earlier stated, any hazardous materials on-site will be handled in accordance with all applicable State and Federal laws, including containment, reporting, and remediation requirements in the event of a spill or accidental release. The handling of hazardous materials in accordance with all applicable local, State, and Federal standards, ordinances, and regulations will reduce the impacts associated with environmental and health hazards related to an accidental release of hazardous materials to a less than significant level.

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

- c) The proposed project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. The project is required to be reviewed by the County's emergency services departments (e.g., fire department, sheriff's department, etc.) for adherence to County requirements as they relate to emergency response and site access. The developers of the proposed project will be required to design, construct, and maintain structures, roadways, and facilities to comply with applicable local, regional, and/or State requirements related to emergency access and evacuation plans. Construction activities which may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic will be required (upon consultation and in coordination with the County and emergency service providers) to implement adequate and appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. Adherence to applicable emergency access/evacuation measures will ensure that emergency access is maintained and that no impairment of emergency response or evacuation plans occurs. Impacts related to this issue are, therefore, less than significant.
- d) There are no existing or proposed schools within one quarter mile of the project site. The nearest school to the proposed project site is Saul Martinez Elementary School located approximately 1.9 miles to the east. Therefore, no impact related to the emission or handling of hazardous substances within one quarter mile of a school will occur.
- e) The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**23. Airports**

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," GIS database

- a) The nearest airport to the project site is Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport located approximately 5 miles northeast. The project site is not located within an Airport Influence Area and the project will not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan. Therefore, there is no impact.



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

b) As previously noted, the project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airport and will not require review by the Airport Land Use Commission. Therefore, there is no impact.

c) The project is not located within an airport land use plan and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Therefore, there is no impact.

d) The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**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: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility," GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located in a high fire area. No risk of wildfire is expected to occur at the project site. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**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?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Preliminary Drainage Report for CUP 3623 dated September 2009, Revised Drainage Report for CUP 3623 dated November 2009, Drainage Report for Thermal Service Station, LP dated July 2012, Revised Drainage Study for Thermal Service Station, LP dated February 2013, Coachella Valley Water District letters dated September 5, 2012 and October 17, 2011.

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The grading and construction phases of the project site would require temporary disturbance of surface soils and removal of vegetative cover which could potentially result in erosion and sedimentation on site. Erosion and sedimentation are major visible water quality impacts attributable to construction activities. Any stockpiles and excavated areas on the project site would be susceptible to high rates of erosion from wind and rain and, if not managed properly, could result in increased sedimentation in local drainage ways.

Short-term stormwater pollutant discharges from the project site would be mitigated through compliance with the applicable NPDES permitting process, resulting in a less than significant impact. Permittees must verify compliance with permit requirements by monitoring their effluent, maintaining records, and filing periodic reports. An NPDES permit would generally specify an acceptable level of a pollutant or pollutant parameter in a discharge (for example, a certain level of bacteria). The permittee may choose which technologies to use to achieve that level.

Development of the project site is in excess of one acre; therefore, the proposed project is required to obtain coverage under an NPDES General Construction permit. The implementation of NPDES permits ensures that a state's mandatory standards for clean water and the federal minimums are met. Coverage with the permit would prevent sedimentation and soil erosion through implementation of a SWPPP and periodic inspections by RWQCB staff. As previously identified, a SWPPP is a written document that describes the construction operator's activities to comply with the requirements in the NPDES permit. Required elements of a SWPPP include (1) site description addressing the elements and characteristics specific to the project site; (2) descriptions of BMPs for erosion and sediment controls; (3) BMPs for construction waste handling and disposal; (4) implementation of approved local plans; and (5) proposed post-construction controls, including a description of local post-construction erosion and sediment control requirements. The SWPPP is intended to facilitate a process whereby the operator evaluates potential pollutant sources at the site and selects and implements



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

BMPs designed to prevent or control the discharge of pollutants in stormwater runoff. These requirements are consistent with COA 10.BSGrade.6.

During the construction period, the proposed project would use a series of BMPs to reduce erosion and sedimentation. These measures may include the use of gravel bags, silt fences, hay bales, check dams, hydroseed, and soil binders. The construction contractor would be required to operate and maintain these controls throughout the duration of onsite construction activities. In addition, the construction contractor would be required to maintain an inspection log and have the log on site to be reviewed by the County and representatives of the RWQCB.

- c) Water service would be provided by the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD). The proposed project would not interfere with groundwater recharge as the project site is not identified as a groundwater recharge area by the County. Development of the project site would increase the amount of impervious surfaces that could facilitate percolation on site as the site is currently vacant and undeveloped. The proposed project will 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 (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). Therefore, there is less than significant impact.
- d) Development of the project site would result in an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces in the form of roadways, parking lots, and buildings. Conditions resulting from this change could include increased runoff volumes and velocity; reduced infiltration; increased flow frequency, duration, and peak; shorter time to reach peak flow; and degradation in water quality. The project site currently has a low runoff coefficient, meaning that runoff during storms represents a relatively small portion of the total rainfall. The majority of the precipitation, particularly in smaller storms, infiltrates into the subsurface. The development of the project site with impervious surfaces (such as roadways, parking lots, and buildings) would result in a condition in which nearly all rainfall becomes runoff. Because the development of the proposed project would introduce a greater percentage of impervious surfaces, the post-development flow volumes that would be generated on site are anticipated to be substantially higher than the pre-development flows.

Projects in this area are required to retain 100-percent of the incremental increase of the runoff generated during a 100-year storm event. The project proposes one basin for retention of storm water. As detailed in the project's drainage report (January 2013), the proposed retention basin would be sized at approximately 355 feet long, and 141 feet wide, with a depth of 1.25 feet and is designed to hold a volume of approximately 1.44 acre-feet or approximately 62,708 cubic feet of storm water. As determined in the project's drainage report, the incremental increase of the runoff generated during a 100-year storm event is 34,793 cubic feet of storm water. The proposed retention basin is adequately sized to retain 100-percent of the incremental increase of the runoff and would require review and approval by the Riverside County Transportation Department prior to site development. Approvals of drainage features/improvements are made through the plan check process. As part of this process, all project-related drainage features would be required to meet County standards. The installation of project-related storm drain systems would occur on-site would be designed, installed, and maintained per the County of Riverside standards. As a means to ensure that the proposed retention basin maintains its functionality and effectiveness, the project applicant shall

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

maintain and clean the basin a minimum of twice per year and this requirement shall be shown on the title sheet of improvement plans for the project. These requirements are consistent with COA 10.TRANS. The project provides for adequate drainage facilities and/or appropriate easements. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

- e) The project site is located within Zone D as mapped on Federal Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) in effect at this time by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Zone D is defined as areas with possible but undetermined flood hazards as no flood hazard analysis has been conducted. No residential component is proposed as part of the project. Figure S-9 of the County General Plan shows that the project site and immediate vicinity are not within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain. The proposed project will not 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. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- f) As previously identified, the project site is not within an area identified as within the 100-year or 500-year flood zone. Development of the project site would not result in the placement of structures within a flood zone. No impact would occur.
- g) The proposed project is not anticipated to substantially degrade water quality with implementation of the project-specific Water Quality Management Plan (COA's 10.Trans.17, 60.Trans.11, 80.Trans.21, and 90.Trans.29). The proposed project would incorporate water quality design features such as structural BMPs (e.g., vegetated swales and clarifiers) and non-structural BMPs (e.g., educational programs) that would meet County water quality requirements. The proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality with implementation of mitigation measures identified below. Impacts are less than significant.
- h) The site has existing drainage infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed project does not include the construction of new or retrofitted storm water Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands). Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation:

**HYD-1** Prior to the first issuance of a grading permit by the County, the project proponent shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the Colorado River Regional Water Quality Control Board to be covered under the State National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit for discharge of stormwater associated with demolition and construction activities (COA 60.BSGrade.1).

**HYD-2** Prior to the first issuance of a grading permit by the County, the project applicant shall submit to and receive approval from the County of Riverside a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) (COA 60.BSGrade.1). The SWPPP shall include a surface water control plan and erosion control plan citing specific measures to control onsite and off-site erosion during the entire grading and construction period (60.BSGrade.1). In addition, the SWPPP shall emphasize structural and nonstructural best management practices (BMPs) to control sediment and non-visible discharges from the site. Some of the BMPs to be implemented may include (but shall not be limited to) the following:



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

- Sediment discharges from the site may be controlled by the following: sandbags, silt fences, straw wattles and temporary debris basins (if deemed necessary), and other discharge control devices. The construction and condition of the BMPs would be periodically inspected during construction, and repairs would be made when necessary as required by the SWPPP.
- All materials that have the potential to contribute non-visible pollutants to stormwater must not be placed in drainage ways and must be contained, elevated, and placed in temporary storage containment areas.
- All loose piles of soil, silt, clay, sand, debris, and other earthen material shall be protected in a reasonable manner to eliminate any discharge from the site. Stockpiles would be surrounded by silt fences and covered with plastic tarps.
- The SWPPP would include inspection forms for routine monitoring of the site during the construction phase to ensure NPDES compliance.
- Additional BMPs and erosion control measures would be documented in the SWPPP and utilized if necessary.
- The SWPPP would be kept on site for the entire duration of project construction and will also be available to the local RWQCB for inspection at any time.

In the event that it is not feasible to implement the above BMPs, the County of Riverside shall make a determination that other BMPs would provide equivalent or superior treatment either on site or off site.

**HYD-3**

The Construction Contractor shall be responsible for performing and documenting the application of BMPs identified in the SWPPP. Weekly inspections shall be performed on sediment control measures called for in the SWPPP. Monthly reports shall be maintained by the Contractor and available for County inspection. In addition, the Contractor would also be required to maintain an inspection log and have the log on site available for review by the County of Riverside and the representatives of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Monitoring: Monitoring will be provided by Riverside County Transportation Department, Riverside County Department of Building and Safety, and the Coachella Valley Water District.

**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?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones," Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," GIS database; Preliminary Drainage Report for CUP 3623 dated September 2009, Revised Drainage Report for CUP 3623 dated November 2009, Drainage Report for Thermal Service Station, LP dated July 2012, Revised Drainage Study for Thermal Service Station, LP dated February 2013, Coachella Valley Water District letters dated September 5, 2012 and October 17, 2011.

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern for the area. The project will not alter the course of a stream or river as it will be discharging directly into man-made flood control facilities. The project would be required to comply with the applicable NPDES permitting process and would also include the implementation of a SWPPP. These requirements are included as conditions of approval (COA 10.BS Grade.6). As previously identified, projects in this area are required to retain 100-percent of the incremental increase of the runoff generated during a 100-year storm event. The project proposes one basin for retention of storm water. The proposed retention basin would be sized at approximately 355 feet long, and 141 feet wide, with a depth of 1.25 feet and is designed to hold a volume of approximately 1.44 acre-feet or approximately 62,708 cubic feet of storm water. As determined in the project's drainage report, the incremental increase of the runoff generated during a 100-year storm event is 34,793 cubic feet of storm water. The proposed retention basin is adequately sized to retain 100-percent of the incremental increase of the runoff and would require review and approval by the Riverside County Transportation Department prior to site development. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
- b) It is not anticipated that offsite flows will be substantially affected by implementation of the proposed project due to existing and proposed drainage improvements. As previously identified, development of the project site would result in an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces in the form of roadways, parking lots, and buildings. Conditions resulting from this change could include increased runoff volumes and velocity; reduced infiltration; increased flow frequency, duration, and peak; shorter time to reach peak flow; and degradation in water quality. Because the development of the proposed project would introduce a greater percentage of impervious surfaces, the post-development flow volumes that would be generated on site are anticipated to be substantially higher than the pre-development flows.

Projects in this area are required to retain 100-percent of the incremental increase of the runoff generated during a 100-year storm event. As depicted on the site plan, the project proposes one basin for retention of storm water in the northern portion of the project site north of the proposed truck/trailer parking area. Approvals of drainage features/improvements are made through the plan check process. As part of this process, all project-related drainage features would be required to meet County standards. The installation of project-related storm drain



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

systems would occur on-site and would be designed, installed, and maintained per the County of Riverside standards. The proposed retention basin is adequately sized to retain 100-percent of the incremental increase of the runoff and would require review and approval by the Riverside County Transportation Department prior to site development. The project provides for adequate drainage facilities and/or appropriate easements. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

- c) The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam due to existing drainage improvements. In addition, the project site is not located in an area susceptible to the impacts of the failure of a levee or dam. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
- d) The proposed project is not expected to change the amount of surface water in any body of water. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: GIS database, Project Application Materials, County of Riverside General Plan

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project would result in an alteration of the present land use of the area since the subject land is currently vacant and implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of a new travel center/truck stop to include fueling facilities, auto and truck washes, and commercial retail uses. However, the project is consistent with the existing underlying land use designation as the land is designated as Commercial Tourist (CT) in the County's General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant. No placement of incompatible land uses would occur. See also discussion under Sections I and II, herein, as it relates to project land use, zoning, and general plan consistency.
- b) The project is not located within any City's Sphere of Influence (SOI). The project was presented to the Mecca Community Council in January 2013 for informational purposes. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to affect any land uses in other jurisdictions. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>28. Planning</b>				
a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project proposes a Change of Zone from Light Agriculture (A-1-5) to Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) and the project would be consistent with the site's proposed zone. No active agricultural activity is currently occurring on the project site. The project is surrounded by properties which are zoned Agriculture (A-1-5; A-1-10) and Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S); however, no active agricultural activity currently exists on adjacent properties surrounding the project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the placement of incompatible uses proximate to each other. Impacts are less than significant.

c-d) Please refer Checklist Response 27 a) above. Impacts are less than significant.

e) The project is consistent with the land use designations and policies of the General Plan. In addition, the project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community as no residential uses are located in the vicinity of the project site. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required

<b>MINERAL RESOURCES</b> Would the project				
<b>29. Mineral Resource</b>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area"

- a) The project area has not been used for mining and no known mineral resources are known to occur within the project site. The County General Plan identifies the project site as an area unstudied for mineral resources. Because no mining activities are currently occurring and no known mineral resources have been identified on the project site, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.
- b) As noted above, the project site has not been used for mineral resources; therefore, the project will not 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. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.
- c) There are no existing surface mines surrounding the project site; therefore, the project will be compatible with the surrounding uses and will not be located adjacent to a State classified, designated area, or existing surface mine. Therefore, there is no impact.
- d) The project site is not located adjacent or near an abandoned quarry mine; therefore, the project will not expose people or property to hazards from quarry mines. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are 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**

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

NA  A  B  C  D

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

NA  A  B  C  D

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map

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

**Findings of Fact:**

a) As previously identified, the nearest airport to the project site is Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport located approximately 5 miles northeast. The project site is not located within an Airport Influence Area and the project will not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that would expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels. No impacts would occur.

b) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airport and would not expose people residing on the project site or area to excessive noise levels. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring measures are required.

**31. Railroad Noise**

NA  A  B  C  D

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", GIS database, On-site Inspection

**Findings of Fact:** The proposed project is not located in the immediate vicinity of any railroads. The nearest railroad to the project site is an existing Southern Pacific Railroad located approximately 1.0 mile to the east. At this distance, railroad noise from this location is not expected to affect the proposed project site. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring measures are required.

**32. Highway Noise**

NA  A  B  C  D

**Source:** On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, General Plan Noise Element; Department of Environmental Health, Office of Industrial Hygiene's transmittal dated September 20, 2012

**Findings of Fact:** The General Plan establishes 70 decibels as the upper limit of "normally acceptable" noise levels for commercial land uses. The proposed project is located adjacent to State Highway 86. State Highway 86 is a four-lane highway and the 70 decibel noise contour projected for a four-lane Major Highway in the County's General Plan is located approximately 91 feet from the center of the right-of-way. The project site plan depicts structures on the site with the nearest structure located approximately 350 feet away. At this distance, the structures proposed for the project site would not be exposed to highway noise levels exceeding the normally acceptable noise level of 70 decibels. Also, the Department of Environmental Health's, Office of Industrial Hygiene's transmittal dated September 20, 2012 indicates no noise study shall be required based on submitted diagrams, surrounding zoning, and distance to sensitive receivers. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.



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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**33. Other Noise**

NA  A  B  C  D

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database

Findings of Fact: No additional noise sources have been identified near the project site that would contribute a significant amount of noise to the project. Therefore, there will be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**34. Noise Effects on or by the Project**

a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Table N-1 ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure"); Riverside County General Plan EIR; Project Application Materials; Department of Environmental Health, Office of Industrial Hygiene's transmittal dated September 20, 2012

Findings of Fact:

- a) Potential permanent noise impacts associated with the operations of the proposed project are a result of project-generated vehicular traffic on the project vicinity roadways and from potential roadway noise impacts onto the proposed uses. Some particular uses could also result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels such as a mining use, or an intense industrial use (e.g., sheet metal fabrication, etc.); however, the proposed project does not include the development of high noise-generating uses.

Increased traffic noise levels expected to occur from traffic generated by the proposed project would not result in noise levels substantially increasing above the existing ambient noise condition of the project area. The anticipated number of increased trips associated with the addition of development proposed for the project site is 2,759 trips. It takes a doubling of traffic

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

volumes to result in a perceptible noise increase (3 decibels). As noted in the County's General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the average daily trips along State Highway 86 in Coachella just north of the project site is estimated at 35,200 trips. The level of traffic increase in the project vicinity (2,759 trips) would not be result in perceptible change in the existing noise environment. As such, impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

- b) The proposed project may create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project during construction. As described in County Noise Ordinance No. 847, construction noise is exempted from the provisions of the ordinance so long as construction does not occur within one-quarter mile of an inhabited dwelling. There are no residences located within one mile of the project site. Further, construction noise impacts are temporary in nature and would cease upon completion of construction. Also, the Department of Environmental Health, Office of Industrial Hygiene's transmittal dated September 20, 2012 indicates no noise study shall be required based on submitted diagrams, surrounding zoning, and distance to sensitive receivers. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the County Noise Ordinance No. 847, and impacts are considered less than significant.
- c) The proposed project will not expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance (County Noise Ordinance No. 847), or applicable standards of other agencies. County Noise Ordinance No. 847 identifies sound level standards based on land use designations. These sound level standards identify noise levels so as not to disturb adjacent occupied properties. For commercial uses, the established sound level standard between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. is 65 maximum decibels (instantaneous) and the standard between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. is 55 maximum decibels (instantaneous). There are no occupied properties adjacent to the project site. There is an existing commercial development (travel center) west of State Highway 86; however, noise from the proposed project site would not be discernible over the noise emitted from State Highway 86. Therefore, impacts are expected to be less than significant.
- d) Vibration refers to groundborne noise and perceptible motion. Groundborne vibration is almost exclusively a concern inside buildings and is rarely perceived as a problem outdoors, where the motion may be discernable, but without the effects associated with the shaking of a building, there is less adverse reaction. The construction of the proposed project would not require the use of equipment such as jackhammers and pile drivers, which are known to generate substantial construction vibration levels. The primary sources of vibration during construction would be from a large bulldozer.

Groundborne vibration during construction activity would be temporary and cease upon completion of construction. For these reasons, temporary impacts from project-related groundborne vibration during construction would be less than significant.

Other sources of groundbourne vibration include large trucks traveling on unmaintained roadways or from steel-wheeled trains. Generally, roadways in the project vicinity are well-maintained and large trucks travelling in the project vicinity would not occur frequently. Additionally the proposed project is not located adjacent to railroad tracks with steel-wheeled trains. Impacts are considered less than significant.



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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

**POPULATION AND HOUSING** Would the project

**35. Housing**

a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element; Riverside County General Plan EIR

Findings of Fact:

- a) As previously identified, the proposed project site is currently vacant land and contains no structures on-site. As no displacement of an existing residential use would occur within the project limits, development of the proposed project would not displace existing housing. No impact related to this issue would occur.
- b) The project proposes the development of a travel center/truck stop to include auto/truck fueling, auto/truck wash, 24-hour retail sale of gasoline, food, beverages, beer/wine (Type 20 – Off Sale), and grocery items. Three fast food drive-thru restaurants and two sit down restaurant are also proposed. Development of uses associated with a travel center/truck stop as described above would not create a demand for additional housing due to the nature of the project. Utilizing the employment generation factor identified in the County's General Plan EIR of one employee for every 500 net square feet of commercial tourist land area, the proposed project is anticipated to generate 229 jobs. This level of employment generation is expected to be filled by local residents already residing in the region. Therefore, implementation of the project is not expected to create a demand for additional housing and impacts would be less than significant.
- c) Please refer to Checklist Response 35 a). No impact would occur.

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

- d) The project is not located within or near a County Redevelopment Project Area. No impact would occur.
- e) As previously identified, the project is anticipated to generate employment for up to 229 persons. No residential uses are proposed as part of the project. This level of employment generation is expected to be filled by local residents already residing in the region and no significant population increase is expected to occur. The project is not expected to cumulatively exceed local and regional population projections. Less than significant impacts would occur.
- f) Refer to Checklist Response 35 b). The project would not induce substantial population growth in the area. While the project is expected to generate up to 229 employment positions, these positions are anticipated to be filled by residents already residing in the local region. Less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are 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: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact:

In the event of a fire on the project site, fire services would be provided by the Riverside County Fire Department. The nearest station to the project site that would provide services to the project site is the Mecca Station, located at 91350 Avenue 66 in Mecca, approximately 1.3 mile to the east. There is another fire station nearby in Thermal at 86911 Avenue 58 approximately 5.0 miles to the northwest. The proposed project site is located in a semi-developed area with existing similar uses to the east and residential uses to the east across State Highway 111. The project site is already within the service area of the Riverside County Fire Department. Additionally, the project is required to comply with Riverside County's Development Impact Fee as established by Riverside County Ordinance No. 659.6. The development of the proposed uses at the project site would not substantially increase fire response demand to levels requiring the provision of additional or expanded facilities. A less than significant impact would occur.

The project provides adequate fire access along Avenue 66 and would be conditioned to include fire protection improvements such as minimum required fire flow of 3,000 gallons per minute (GPM) for a three-hour duration at 20 pounds per square inch (PSI) residual operating pressure, installation of super fire hydrants on-site, tank permits, water certification, water system plans, provision of fire lanes, installation of a complete fire sprinkler system, installation of a fire alarm system, installation of portable fire extinguishers, and a hood duct extinguishing system over cooking equipment (COA's



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

10.Fire.1; 10.Fire.2, 10.Fire.3; 10.Fire.4; 80.Fire.2, 80.Fire.3; 90.Fire.1; 90.Fire.2; 90.Fire.3; 90.Fire.4; and 90.Fire.5).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**37. Sheriff Services**

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element; Riverside County Sheriff's Department transmittal dated October 19, 2011

Findings of Fact:

The Riverside County Sheriff's Department (RCSD) provides law enforcement and crime prevention services to the project site. The nearest station to the project site that would provide services to the project site is the Thermal Sheriff's Station, located at 86625 Airport Boulevard in Thermal, approximately 6.0 miles to the northwest. The proposed project site is located in a semi-developed area with existing similar uses to the east and residential uses to the east across State Highway 111. The project site is already within the service area of the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. Additionally, the project is required to comply with Riverside County's Development Impact Fee as established by Riverside County Ordinance No. 659.6. The development of the proposed uses at the project site would not substantially increase police response demand to levels requiring the provision of additional or expanded facilities. Additionally, the County Sheriff's transmittal letter of October 19, 2011 recommends security measures such as exterior lighting, surveillance, and an alarm system (COA 10.Planning.45). Less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**38. Schools**

Source: GIS database

Findings of Fact:

The Coachella Valley Unified School District provides public education services in the project area. The project is not expected to impact school facilities or require the construction of new school facilities as the project would not result in a substantial increase in population. As previously identified, the project is anticipated to generate employment for up to 229 persons. No residential uses are proposed as part of the project. This level of employment generation is expected to be filled by local residents already residing in the region and no significant population increase is expected to occur. The applicant of this project would be conditioned to pay the school impact fees as set by state law. Fees are required to be paid prior to issuance of any future building permits. Therefore, with payment of school fees impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**39. Libraries**

Source: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

As previously identified, the project is anticipated to generate employment for up to 229 persons. No residential uses are proposed as part of the project. This level of employment generation is expected to be filled by local residents already residing in the region and no significant population increase is expected to occur. The proposed project will not create an incremental demand for library services. The project will not require the provision of new or altered library facilities. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**40. Health Services**

Source: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

As previously identified, the project is anticipated to generate employment for up to 229 persons. No residential uses are proposed as part of the project. This level of employment generation is expected to be filled by local residents already residing in the region and no significant population increase is expected to occur. The proposed project will not create an incremental demand for health services. The project will not require the provision of new or altered healthcare facilities. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**RECREATION**

**41. Parks and Recreation**

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

b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational



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

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: GIS database, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications), Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees), Parks & Open Space Department Review

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed project does not involve the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. As previously identified, the project is anticipated to generate employment for up to 229 persons. No residential uses are proposed as part of the project. This level of employment generation is expected to be filled by local residents already residing in the region and no significant population increase is expected to occur. The proposed project will not create an incremental demand for recreational services. The project will not require the provision of new or altered recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.
- b) Please refer to Checklist Response 41 a) above. Impacts are less than significant.
- c) The project site is located within the Mecca Community Service Area (CSA). CSAs are an alternative method of providing governmental services by the County within unincorporated areas to provide extended services such as sheriff protection, fire protection, local park maintenance services, water and sewer services, ambulance services, streetlight energy services, landscape services and street sweeping. Specifically, the Mecca CSA focuses on the provision of streetlight services. The project would be required to pay fees to maintain services identified for the Mecca CSA. The project is not subject to Quimby fees as no residential use is proposed. Thus, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**42. Recreational Trails**

Source: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact: The General Plan conceptually identifies both a Class I Bike Path and a Class III Bike Path along Avenue 66 (Class I) and along State Highway 86 (Class III). While conceptual bikes paths are identified in the project vicinity, there are no trails identified on adjacent roadways. As such, no impact to recreational trails would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

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

**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 General Plan, Traffic Study for the Thermal Project (July 3, 2013: Appendix E), Riverside County Ordinance 348, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 8 transmittal dated November 3, 2011, SunLine Transit Agency transmittal dated October 31, 2011.

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project's traffic study assumed that the project would be developed in three phases. Phase I (completed in year 2014) consists of the development of a 1,080 square foot fast food restaurant (without drive-thru), a gas station with 16 standard fueling stations and 6 truck fueling stations, and a 5,665 square foot convenience store and car wash. Phase II (completed in year 2016) consists of a 984 square foot fast food restaurant (with drive-thru) and a 1,300 square foot fast food restaurant (without drive-thru). Phase III (completed in year



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

2020) consists of a 1,040 square foot fast food restaurant (with drive-thru) and a 1,530 square foot fast food restaurant (without drive-thru). Build-Out of the project (Phases 1 through 3) would generate a total of 6,828 average daily trips (ADT) with 597 trips occurring during the a.m. peak hour and 562 trips occurring during the p.m. peak hour. A pass-by reduction of 15 percent was applied to the ADT as well as a 48-52 percent reduction for diverted link trips to account for existing trips (non-project related) on the existing roadways. The traffic study prepared for the proposed project concluded the project would generate a net total of 2,759 average daily trips (ADT).

The Traffic Study utilizes the Level of Service (LOS) standards to measure potential impacts of the proposed project. LOS is a professional industry standard by which the operating conditions of a given intersection or roadway segment are measured. LOS is defined on a scale of A to F, where LOS A represents the best operating conditions and LOS F represents the worst operating conditions. The County of Riverside has established a minimum LOS C on all county-maintained roads and conventional highways. As an exception, LOS D may be allowed in Community Development areas, only at intersections of any combination of Secondary Highways, Major Highways, Arterials, Urban Arterials, Expressways, conventional state highways or freeway ramp intersections. LOS E may be allowed in designated community centers to the extent that it would support transit-oriented development and walkable communities. Please refer to the Traffic Study provided in Appendix E for a detailed description of the methodology employed to conduct the traffic analysis and evaluate potential impacts. For the purposes of this analysis, an LOS value of E or F at an intersection will be used to characterize a significant traffic impact under CEQA.

The Traffic Study prepared for the proposed project analyzes six (6) local intersections and are identified below in Table C. The Traffic Study considers the following scenarios in the analysis of project-related traffic impacts:

- Existing (2013) Conditions;
- Opening Year (2014) Conditions;
- Opening Year (2014) Conditions Plus Project;
- Phases I and II (2016) Conditions;
- Phases I and II (2016) Conditions Plus Project;
- Build-Out Phases I, II, and III (2020) Conditions;
- Build-Out Phases I, II, and III (2020) Conditions Plus Project;

Cumulative project conditions (i.e., ambient growth plus traffic associated with approved and pending project in the vicinity of the proposed project) were also analyzed for each of the scenarios summarized above, with the exception of the Existing (2013) Conditions scenario. The Traffic Study considers the following scenarios in the analysis of project-related traffic impacts:

- Opening Year (2014) Plus Cumulative Plus Project Conditions;
- Phases I and II (2016) Plus Cumulative Plus Project Conditions; and,
- Build-Out Phases I, II, and III (2020) Plus Cumulative Plus Project Conditions.

Please refer to the Traffic Study provided in Appendix E for a detailed description of the analysis scenarios.

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

Avenue 66 forms the southern boundary of the project site, and runs through the project area in an east-west direction. It is a state highway (State Route 195 [SR-195]) and carries the bulk of non-freeway traffic east-west through this area while State Highway 86 (SH-86), located adjacent to the east of the project site, carries the bulk of freeway traffic through the area in a north-south direction. Buchanan Street forms the project's western boundary. There are three driveways proposed along Buchanan Street that would provide access to the project site as well as a single access point off of Avenue 66.

Table C shows the existing year (2013) and opening year (2014) both without and with the proposed project. As shown in Table C, in the existing condition (2013), all study area intersections are operating at satisfactory LOS (LOS D or above). Similarly, in the opening year (2014) condition without project and with the project, all study area intersections are operating at satisfactory LOS (LOS D or above). Therefore, no impacts during the project's opening year 2014 scenario would occur.

Table D shows the existing year (2013) and Phases I and II (2016) both without and with the proposed project. As shown in Table D, in the existing condition (2013), all study area intersections are operating at satisfactory LOS (LOS D or above). Similarly, in the Phases I and II (2016) condition without project and with the project, all study area intersections are operating at satisfactory LOS (LOS D or above). Therefore, no impacts during the project's Phase I and II 2016 scenario would occur.

Table E shows the existing year (2013) and Project Build-Out Phases I, II, and III (2020) both without and with the proposed project. As shown in Table E, in the existing condition (2013), all study area intersections are operating at satisfactory LOS (LOS D or above). Similarly, in the Project Build-Out Phases I, II, and III (2020) condition without project, all study area intersections are operating at satisfactory LOS (LOS D or above). However, in the Project Build-Out Phases I, II, and III (2020) condition with the project, the Avenue 66/Buchanan Street study area intersection would operate at deficient LOS (LOS F). This is a significant impact and mitigation is required. With mitigation identified below, the intersection of Avenue 66/Buchanan Street would operate at LOS C in the a.m. peak hour and LOS B in the p.m. peak hour and the impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.



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

**Table C: Existing 2013, Opening Year 2014, and Opening Year 2014 Plus Project LOS Summary**

Intersection	Control	Existing 2013						Opening 2014						Opening 2014 Plus Project					
		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		LOS		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		LOS		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		LOS	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/West Pierce Street Intersection Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound	AWSC	8.2	A	8.8	A	8.2	A	8.9	A	8.3	A	8.3	A	8.0	A	8.0	A		
		8.2	A	8.1	A	7.9	A	8.5	A	8.0	A	8.0	A	7.4	A				
		8.5	A	9.5	A	8.6	A	9.5	A	8.7	A	8.7	A	9.3	A				
		7.8	A	8.1	A	7.7	A	8.2	A	7.8	A	7.8	A	7.9	A				
		7.9	A	8.2	A	7.9	A	8.3	A	7.9	A	7.9	A	7.9	A				
2. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/East Pierce Street Southbound	OWSC	9.8	A	9.5	A	10.0	B	9.4	A	9.9	A	9.6	A						
3. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/Buchanan Street Northbound Southbound	OWSC	0.0	A	9.3	A	0.0	A	9.4	A	0.0	A	9.4	A	0.0	A	9.4	A		
		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	21.1	C	17.8	C		
4. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/SH-86 Intersection	Signal	6.6	A	7.2	A	8.8	A	7.3	A	11.1	B	10.0	A						
5. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/Lincoln Street Northbound	OWSC	10.8	B	11.6	B	10.2	B	11.2	B	10.3	B	11.5	B						
6. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/SH-111-Grapefruit Boulevard Eastbound	OWSC	13.0	B	16.2	C	11.8	B	15.3	C	8.7	A	15.3	C						

Source: Table 10, Darnell and Associates  
**Bold** = exceeds Level of Service (LOS) standard  
 AWSC = all-way stop control

-- = V/C is undefined at two-way stop controls  
 OWSC = one-way stop control

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

**Table D: Existing 2013, Phases I and II 2016, and Phases I and II 2016 Plus Project LOS Summary**

Intersection	Control	Existing 2013						Phases I and II 2016						Phases I and II 2016 Plus Project					
		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour			
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS		
1. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/West Pierce Street Intersection Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound	AWSC	8.2	A	8.8	A	8.3	A	9.0	A	8.4	A	9.1	A	8.4	A	9.1	A		
		8.2	A	8.1	A	7.9	A	8.6	A	8.0	A	8.7	A	8.0	A	8.7	A		
		8.5	A	9.5	A	8.7	A	9.6	A	8.9	A	9.8	A	8.9	A	9.8	A		
		7.8	A	8.1	A	7.8	A	8.3	A	7.9	A	8.4	A	7.9	A	8.4	A		
		7.9	A	8.2	A	7.9	A	8.3	A	8.3	A	8.0	A	8.4	A	8.0	A	8.4	A
2. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/East Pierce Street Southbound	OWSC	9.8	A	9.5	A	10.1	B	9.5	A	10.3	B	9.6	A	10.3	B	9.6	A		
		0.0	A	9.3	A	0.0	A	9.4	A	0.0	A	9.3	A	0.0	A	9.3	A		
3. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/Buchanan Street Northbound Southbound	OWSC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	26.3	D	19.0	C	26.3	D	19.0	C		
		6.6	A	7.2	A	8.2	A	8.3	A	12.6	B	13.1	B	12.6	B	13.1	B		
4. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/SH-86 Intersection	Signal	6.6	A	7.2	A	8.2	A	8.3	A	12.6	B	13.1	B	12.6	B	13.1	B		
5. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/Lincoln Street Northbound	OWSC	10.8	B	11.6	B	10.3	B	11.6	B	10.4	B	11.8	B	10.4	B	11.8	B		
		13.0	B	16.2	C	12.1	B	16.1	C	12.7	A	16.5	C	12.7	A	16.5	C		
6. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/SH-111-Grapefruit Boulevard Eastbound	OWSC	13.0	B	16.2	C	12.1	B	16.1	C	12.7	A	16.5	C	12.7	A	16.5	C		

Source: Table 11, Darnell and Associates  
**Bold** = exceeds Level of Service (LOS) standard  
 AWSC = all-way stop control  
 -- = V/C is undefined at two-way stop controls  
 OWSC = one-way stop control



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

**Table E: Existing 2013, Phases I, II, III 2020, and Phases I, II, III 2020 Plus Project LOS Summary**

Intersection	Control	Existing 2013						Phases I,II, III 2020						Phases I, II, III 2020 Plus Project					
		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour			
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS		
1. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/West Pierce Street Intersection Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound	AWSC	8.2	A	8.8	A	8.4	A	9.3	A	8.6	A			8.6	A	9.4	A		
		8.2	A	8.1	A	8.1	A	8.8	A	8.2	A			8.2	A	9.0	A		
		8.5	A	9.5	A	8.9	A	10.0	A	9.1	A			9.1	A	10.2	A		
		7.8	A	8.1	A	7.9	A	8.5	A	8.0	A			8.0	A	8.6	A		
		7.9	A	8.2	A	8.0	A	8.4	A	8.4	A			8.0	A	8.5	A		
2. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/East Pierce Street Southbound	OWSC	9.8	A	9.5	A	10.3	B	9.7	A	10.5	B			10.5	B	25.1	D		
		0.0	A	9.3	A	0.0	A	9.5	A	0.0	A			0.0	A	0.0	A		
3. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/Buchanan Street Northbound Southbound	OWSC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	55.2	F			55.2	F	25.1	D		
		6.6	A	7.2	A	9.1	A	9.2	A	15.4	B			15.4	B	15.8	B		
4. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/SH-86 Intersection	Signal	10.8	B	11.6	B	10.5	B	12.0	B	10.7	B			10.7	B	12.2	B		
		13.0	B	16.2	C	12.7	B	18.1	C	13.1	B			13.1	B	18.9	C		
5. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/Lincoln Street Northbound	OWSC																		
6. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/SH-111-Grapefruit Boulevard Eastbound	OWSC																		

Source: Table 12, Darnell and Associates  
**Bold** = exceeds Level of Service (LOS) standard  
 AWSC = all-way stop control  
 -- = V/C is undefined at two-way stop controls  
 OWSC = one-way stop control

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

Table F shows the existing year (2013) and opening year (2014) with traffic associated with cumulative projects and the proposed project. As shown in Table F, in the existing condition (2013), all study area intersections are operating at satisfactory LOS (LOS D or above). Similarly, in the opening year (2014) condition with cumulative projects and with the project, all study area intersections are operating at satisfactory LOS (LOS D or above). Therefore, no impacts during the project's opening year 2014 cumulative scenario would occur.

Table G shows the existing year (2013) and Phases I and II (2016) with traffic associated with cumulative projects and the proposed project. As shown in Table G, in the existing condition (2013), all study area intersections are operating at satisfactory LOS (LOS D or above). However, in the Phases I and II (2016) condition with cumulative projects and with the project, all study area intersections are operating at satisfactory LOS (LOS D or above) with the exception of Avenue 66/SH-111-Grapefruit Boulevard (LOS E) during the PM peak hour. This is a significant impact and mitigation is required. With mitigation identified below, the intersection of Avenue 66/ SH-111-Grapefruit Boulevard would operate at a satisfactory LOS (LOS B) and the impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Table H shows the existing year (2013) and Project Build-Out Phases I, II, and III (2020) with traffic associated with cumulative projects and the proposed project. As shown in Table H, in the existing condition (2013), all study area intersections are operating at satisfactory LOS (LOS D or above). However, in the Project Build-Out Phases I, II, and III (2020) condition with cumulative projects and with the project, all study area intersections are operating at satisfactory LOS (LOS D or above) with the exception of Avenue 66/Buchanan Street (LOS F) during the AM and PM peak hour and Avenue 66/SH-111-Grapefruit Boulevard (LOS E) during the PM peak hour. This is a significant impact and mitigation is required. With mitigation identified below, the intersections of Avenue 66/Buchanan Street and Avenue 66/ SH-111-Grapefruit Boulevard would operate at a satisfactory LOS (LOS C or above for Avenue 66/Buchanan Street and for Avenue 66/SH-111-Grapefruit Boulevard during both the AM and PM peak hours) and the impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The County determines the timing of necessary roadway improvements and ensures that construction and needed improvements occurs prior to or concurrent with the time at which the identified roadway segment or intersection level of service is forecast to fail to achieve at performance levels established by the County. In this way, improvements are typically constructed before the LOS degrades beyond the County's performance standards to ensure the significant impacts are avoided. As a result of its continual monitoring of the local circulation system, the County ensures that roadway improvements are constructed prior to the time the level of service deteriorates below the County's established performance criteria.

The County is in the process of establishing a Road and Bridge Benefit District (RBBB) for the South Valley Parkway area, which includes the project site. The intent of the RBBB is to mitigate cumulative traffic impacts. The South Valley Parkway RBBB is currently in the planning stage, and the County is coordinating the preparation of a nexus study and refinements to the scope of improvements to be funded under the RBBB. These additional studies will provide the basis for establishing the RBBB fee structure. The project would be responsible for contributing its fair share toward the funding of the future improvements via payment of the County's Development Impact Fees and other fees (e.g., Coachella Valley Association of Governments [CVAG] Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees [TUMF], and

---

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

---

South Valley Parkway RBBB fees) used to fund roadway and roadway-related improvements, resulting in a less than significant cumulative impact. These requirements are conditions of approval (COA 10.Trans.7, COA 80.Trans.3, COA 80.Trans.14).



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

**Table F: Existing 2013 and Opening Year 2014 Plus Cumulative Plus Project LOS Summary**

Intersection	Control	Existing 2013			Opening 2014 Plus Cumulative Plus Project				
		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS		
1. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/West Pierce Street Intersection Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound	AWSC	8.2	A	8.8	A	9.5	A	8.7	A
		8.2	A	8.1	A	9.0	A	8.3	A
		8.5	A	9.5	A	10.3	A	9.2	A
		7.8	A	8.1	A	8.4	A	8.2	A
		7.9	A	8.2	A	8.5	A	8.1	A
2. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/East Pierce Street Southbound	OWSC	9.8	A	9.5	A	10.6	B	10.6	B
		0.0	A	9.3	A	21.0	C	18.7	C
3. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/Buchanan Street Northbound Southbound	OWSC	--	--	--	--	0.0	A	13.8	C
		6.6	A	7.2	A	11.4	B	10.7	B
4. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/SH-86 Intersection	Signal	6.6	A	7.2	A	11.4	B	10.7	B
		10.8	B	11.6	B	10.8	B	12.7	B
5. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/Lincoln Street Northbound	OWSC	13.0	B	16.2	C	16.5	C	31.6	D
		13.0	B	16.2	C	16.5	C	31.6	D
6. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/SH-111-Grapefruit Boulevard Eastbound	OWSC	13.0	B	16.2	C	16.5	C	31.6	D
		13.0	B	16.2	C	16.5	C	31.6	D

Source: Table 14, Darnell and Associates  
**Bold** = exceeds Level of Service (LOS) standard  
 AWSC = all-way stop control

-- = V/C is undefined at two-way stop controls  
 OWSC = one-way stop control

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

**Table G: Existing 2013 and Phases I and II 2016 Plus Cumulative Plus Project LOS Summary**

Intersection	Control	Existing 2013						Phases I and II 2016 Plus Cumulative Plus Project					
		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		LOS		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		LOS	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/West Pierce Street Intersection Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound	AWSC	8.2	A	8.8	A	8.7	A	9.9	A				A
		8.2	A	8.1	A	8.3	A	9.4	A				A
		8.5	A	9.5	A	9.2	A	10.8	B				B
		7.8	A	8.1	A	8.1	A	8.8	A				A
2. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/East Pierce Street Southbound	OWSC	7.9	A	8.2	A	8.1	A	8.6	A				A
		9.8	A	9.5	A	10.7	B	10.7	B				B
3. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/Buchanan Street Northbound Southbound	OWSC	0.0	A	9.3	A	0.0	A	9.6	A				A
		--	--	--	--	32.1	D	18.6	C				C
		6.6	A	7.2	A	12.4	B	12.4	B				B
4. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/SH-86 Intersection	Signal	10.8	B	11.6	B	21.1	C	13.0	B				B
		13.0	B	16.2	C	17.1	C	35.9	E				E
5. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/Lincoln Street Northbound	OWSC												
6. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/SH-111-Grapefruit Boulevard Eastbound	OWSC												

Source: Table 15, Darnell and Associates  
**Bold** = exceeds Level of Service (LOS) standard  
 AWSC = all-way stop control

-- = V/C is undefined at two-way stop controls  
 OWSC = one-way stop control

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

**Table H: Existing 2013 and Phases I, II, III 2020 Plus Cumulative Plus Project LOS Summary**

Intersection	Control	Existing 2013						Phases I, II, III 2020 Plus Cumulative Plus Project					
		AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/West Pierce Street Intersection Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound	AWSC	8.2	A	8.8	A	8.9	A	10.3	A				B
		8.2	A	8.1	A	8.4	A	9.7	A				A
		8.5	A	9.5	A	9.5	A	11.4	A				B
		7.8	A	8.1	A	8.2	A	9.1	A				A
		7.9	A	8.2	A	8.2	A	8.8	A				A
2. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/East Pierce Street Southbound	OWSC	9.8	A	9.5	A	11.0	B	10.9	B				B
3. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/Buchanan Street Northbound Southbound	OWSC	0.0	A	9.3	A	60.4	F	36.9	F				E
		--	--	--	--	76.6	F	42.9	F				E
4. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/SH-86 Intersection	Signal	6.6	A	7.2	A	13.6	B	15.2	B				B
5. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/Lincoln Street Northbound	OWSC	10.8	B	11.6	B	11.2	B	13.5	B				B
6. Avenue 66 (SR-195)/SH-111-Grapefruit Boulevard Eastbound	OWSC	13.0	B	16.2	C	18.5	C	47.6	C				E

Source: Table 16, Darnell and Associates  
**Bold** = exceeds Level of Service (LOS) standard  
 AWSC = all-way stop control

-- = V/C is undefined at two-way stop controls  
 OWSC = one-way stop control



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

- b) The Congestion Management Program utilizes a level of service standard of LOS E. The project intersection impact analyses discussed above as part of the discussion contained under Threshold a) is based on the more restrictive LOS D level of service standards from the local jurisdiction in which the intersection is located. Thus, the analysis presented above meets and exceeds the CMP level of service standard for intersection analyses resulting in a less than significant impact and no additional mitigation is required.
- c & d) The nearest airport to the project site is Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport located approximately 5 miles northeast. The proposed project is not located within an Airport Influence Area. The project will not change air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. Additionally, the nearest railroad to the project site is an existing Southern Pacific Railroad located approximately 1.0 mile to the east. The project would not affect rail traffic at this location. Additionally, there are no bodies of water immediately adjacent to the project site and no impacts to waterborne traffic would occur with implementation of the project. Therefore, there is no impact.
- e) The proposed project will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) nor would the project introduce incompatible uses such as farm equipment on roadways. All project-related improvements would be required to adhere to the County of Riverside roadway standards. Therefore, there is no impact.
- f) Potential impacts to road maintenance from project-related traffic would be offset by existing fee mechanisms established and required by the Riverside County Transportation Department. Therefore, impacts regarding the need for new or additional road maintenance are considered to be less than significant.
- g) It should be noted that project construction will occur for some time and during this time there may be diversions or delay of traffic along Avenue 66 and, as a result, a potential for traffic to divert onto Avenue 64. This potential impact would be mitigated by implementation of a plan to control traffic during temporary construction periods and is identified below.
- h) During project construction and roadway improvements, a detour or alternate route will be available for emergency access. Upon completion of project construction, there will be no impediment to emergency access and access to nearby uses. The project site would be developed in accordance with County ordinances, standard conditions of approval, and permits related to emergency access. Furthermore, mitigation has been identified to require the preparation and implementation of a traffic control plan during construction. Therefore, impacts are considered to be less than significant.
- i) SunLine Transit currently operates two bus routes along Avenue 66 in the project area; Routes 91 and 95. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in permanent modifications to Avenue 66 adjacent to the project site, although a new project access point will be created along Avenue 66. Landscaping and other improvements will be made to the project site, but these improvements will not have any long-term negative effect upon existing roadway usage by bicycles, buses, or other alternative transportation vehicles. The project will also provide bicycle racks as shown on the project's site plan. During construction hours, lane closures that could possibly include bike access and sidewalks may

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

occur. Typically, any closure of a sidewalk or a bike lane associated with the construction of the project would occur during the stated hours of construction and only for the portion of the project being constructed for that particular day. Therefore, a less than significant impact associated with this issue would occur.

**Mitigation:**

**TRA-1** Prior to the issuance of a building permit or any use allowed by the Conditional Use Permit, and prior to doing any work within the State highway right-of-way, clearance and/or an encroachment permit shall be obtained by the applicant from the District 08 Office of the State Department of Transportation in San Bernardino (COA 80.Trans.2)

**TRA-2** The developer shall fully construct traffic improvements at the following location, or as approved by the County Transportation Department.:

- Avenue 66/Buchanan Street – install an all-way stop control and construct a westbound right-turn lane on 66th Avenue.

The resulting geometrics of this intersection shall be as follows:

Northbound: One shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane – stop controlled;

Southbound: One left-turn lane, one shared through/right-turn lane – stop controlled;

Eastbound: One shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane; and,

Westbound: One shared left-turn/through lane, one right-turn lane.

All listed improvements are requirements for interim conditions only. Full right-of-way and roadway half sections adjacent to the property for the ultimate roadway cross-section per the County's Road Improvement Standards and Specifications shall be provided. Any off-site widening required to provide the listed geometrics shall be the responsibility of the landowner/developer (COA 80.Trans.17)

**TRA-3** The project is required to comply with Riverside County's Development Impact Fee as established by Riverside County Ordinance No. 659.6 (COA 90.Planning.34) and Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee Ordinance No. 673 (COA 80.Trans.3) to further address traffic impacts created by the project.

**Monitoring:** Monitoring will be provided by Riverside County Transportation Department.

**44. Bike Trails**

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan

**Findings of Fact:** The General Plan conceptually identifies both a Class I Bike Path and a Class III Bike Path along Avenue 66 (Class I) and along State Highway 86 (Class III). As previously noted, during construction hours, lane closures that could possibly include bike access and sidewalks may occur. Typically, any closure of a sidewalk or a bike lane associated with the construction of the project would occur during the stated hours of construction and only for the portion of the project being constructed for that particular day. Therefore, a less than significant impact associated with this issue would occur.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are 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, Coachella Valley Water District letters dated September 5, 2012 and October 17, 2011.

Findings of Fact:

- a) As part of the project design, the project will install an on-site water well, water pump, and water tank and necessary water pipes to provide the project with its domestic water demand in accordance with CVWD and En Health Department (COA 10.En Health.1). The location of these facilities will be located on the project site in the northeastern portion and would not result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities that may cause significant environmental effects. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b) Based on review by Health Department and water district, it is anticipated that the project will have sufficient water supplies available for existing and future development. As detailed above, the project will install an on-site water well, water pump, and water tank and necessary water pipes to provide the project with its domestic water demand. No new or expanded entitlements would be required for the project. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are 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; Coachella Valley Water District letters dated September 5, 2012 and October 17, 2011.



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

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Wastewater treatment services will be provided by CVWD and notice of availability of these services has been received (COA 10.En Health.1). No septic systems are proposed with implementation of the project. CVWD operates six wastewater treatment facilities and expansions and improvements are ongoing to meet the region's demands. The project will connect to an existing sewer line underlying Avenue 66. The project will not require the construction of new wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities to meet wastewater demand. The extension of the existing sewer line underlying Avenue 66 would occur within the existing roadway and no significant environmental effects are expected to occur with this planned extension. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are 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: Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Waste Management Department letter dated June 2, 2009, CalRecycle Solid Waste Information System database

Findings of Fact:

a) The project will not generate a substantial amount of construction demolition waste as no structures exist on the project site. Solid waste services will be provided by the Riverside County Waste Management Department. Solid waste generated by the proposed project is likely to be disposed of at the Mecca II landfill located at Box Canyon Road and Garfield Street in Mecca east of the project site. A secondary disposal site is the Oasis Sanitary landfill located at 84505 84th Avenue in Oasis located south of the project site. The Mecca II landfill's total capacity is approximately 372,480 cubic yards of which 34,786 cubic yards of disposal capacity remains. The Oasis Sanitary landfill's total capacity is approximately 1,097,152 cubic yards of which 149,597 cubic yards of disposal capacity remains. Based on a solid waste generation rate of 10.53 pounds per employee per day, the proposed project is anticipated to generate approximately 2,411.37 pounds per day (1.2 tons per day) or 880,150.05 pounds per year (440 tons per year). The proposed project will not require nor result in the construction of new landfill facilities, including the expansion of existing facilities as capacity exists at the receiving landfills. The project shall be required to submit Waste Recycling Plan (COA's 80.Planning.33 and 90.Planning.46) to the Riverside County Waste Management Department. Impacts are less than significant.

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

b) Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste generation, transport, and disposal are intended to assure adequate landfill capacity through mandatory reductions in solid waste quantities (e.g., through recycling and composting of green waste) and the safe and efficient transport of solid waste. The project would comply will all regulatory requirements regarding solid wastes and adherence to regulatory requirements would ensure a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

- a) Electricity services would be provided to the project site by Imperial Irrigation District. Since electrical service is present in the project vicinity, the provision of electrical services to the project site would not result in significant environmental effects and is considered to be less than significant.
- b) Natural gas services would be provided to the project site by Southern California Gas Company. Since natural gas service is present in the project vicinity, the provision of natural gas services to the project site would not result in significant environmental effects and is considered to be less than significant.
- c) Communications systems would be provided to the project site by Verizon. Since communications service is present in the project vicinity, the provision of communication services to the project site would not result in significant environmental effects and is considered to be less than significant.
- d) Please refer to Checklist Response 25 d). The project provides for adequate drainage facilities and/or appropriate easements. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.
- e) Please refer to Checklist Response 41 c). The project site is located within the Mecca Community Service Area (CSA). Specifically, the Mecca CSA focuses on the provision of

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

streetlight services. The project would be required to pay fees to maintain services identified for the Mecca CSA. Installation of street lights would be conducted simultaneously with proposed roadway improvements. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

f) Please refer to Checklist Response 43 f). Potential impacts to road maintenance from project-related traffic would be offset by existing fee mechanisms established and required by the Riverside County Transportation Department. Therefore, impacts regarding the need for new or additional road maintenance are considered to be less than significant.

g) No other governmental facilities are required for the proposed project. As such, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**49. Energy Conservation**

a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?

Source: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed project will not project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans as no adopted plan is in place. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are 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 detailed in the preceding responses, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or