Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs.1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
New Units (100% of market value is subject to tax)				
Number of acres developed during phase	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Maximum Density permitted (units/acre)	8	8	8	8
Number of new units during this phase[1]	24	24	24	24
Market Value per unit	$98,490	$98,490	$98,490	$98,490
Amount Subject to Property Transfer Tax for all new units sold	$2,363,760	$2,363,760	$2,363,760	$2,363,760
Existing Units(80% of market value is subject to tax)				
Number of units constructed in 1st year of this phase	5	5	5	5
Number of existing units changing ownership in 1st year of this phase	Ø	1	4	6
Number of units constructed in 2nd year of this phase	5	5	5	5
Number of existing units changing ownership in 2nd year of this phase	Ø	2	4	7
Number of units constructed in 3rd year of this phase	5	5	5	5
Number of existing units changing ownership in 3rd year of this phase	Ø	2	5	7
Number of units constructed in 4th year of this phase	5	5	5	5
Number of existing units changing ownership in 4th year of this phase	1	3	5	8
Number of units constructed in 5th year of this phase	5	5	5	5
Number of existing units changing ownership in 5th year of this phase	1	3	6	8
Total number of units constructed during this phase	25	25	25	25
Total number of existing units changing ownership during this phase	2	11	24	36
Market Value per unit	$98,490	$98,490	$98,490	$98,490
Unencumbered Value per unit (80% of market value)	$78,792	$78,792	$78,792	$78,792
Amount subject to Property Transfer Tax for all existing units changing ownership during this phase	$157,584	$866,712	$1,891,008	$2,836,512

1= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

New Units & Existing Units Combined				
Total amount subject to Property Transfer Tax (includes all new units sold & all existing units changing ownership)	$2,521,344	$3,230,472	$4,254,768	$5,200,272
Property Transfer Tax Rate	0.11%	0.11%	0.11%	0.11%
Total Property Transfer Tax Collected at Phase Buildout	$2,773	$3,554	$4,680	$5,720
Percent of Property Transfer Tax allocated to City	50%	50%	50%	50%
Total Property Transfer Tax Allocated to City at Phase Buildout	$1,387	$1,777	$2,340	$2,860
Percent of Property Transfer Tax allocated to Riverside County	50%	50%	50%	50%
Total Property Transfer Tax Allocated to Riverside Co. at phase buildout	$1,387	$1,777	$2,340	$2,860

Land Use Designation: High Density, Specific Plan (0-14 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs.1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
New Units (100% of market value is subject to tax)				
Number of acres developed during phase	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75
Maximum Density permitted (units/acre)	14	14	14	14
Number of new units during this phase[1]	123	123	123	123
Market Value per unit	$98,490	$98,490	$98,490	$98,490
Amount Subject to Property Transfer Tax for all new units sold	$12,114,220	$12,114,220	$12,114,220	$12,114,220
Existing Units(80% of market value is subject to tax)				
Number of units constructed in 1st year of this phase	25	25	25	25
Number of existing units changing ownership in 1st year of this phase	Ø	1	2	3
Number of units constructed in 2nd year of this phase	25	25	25	25
Number of existing units changing ownership in 2nd year of this phase	Ø	1	2	3
Number of units constructed in 3rd year of this phase	25	25	25	25
Number of existing units changing ownership in 3rd year of this phase	Ø	1	2	3
Number of units constructed in 4th year of this phase	25	25	25	25
Number of existing units changing ownership in 4th year of this phase	0	1	3	4
Number of units constructed in 5th year of this phase	17	17	17	17
Number of existing units changing ownership in 5th year of this phase	1	2	3	4
Total number of units constructed during this phase	117	117	117	117
Total number of existing units changing ownership during this phase	1	6	12	17
Market Value per unit	$98,490	$98,490	$98,490	$98,490
Unencumbered Value per unit (80% of market value)	$78,792	$78,792	$78,792	$78,792
Amount subject to Property Transfer Tax for all existing units changing ownership during this phase	$78,792	$472,750	$945,500	$1,339,458

1= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

New Units & Existing Units Combined				
Total amount subject to Property Transfer Tax (includes all new units sold & all existing units changing ownership)	$12,193,012	$12,586,970	$13,059,720	$13,453,678
Property Transfer Tax Rate	0.11%	0.11%	0.11%	0.11%
Total Property Transfer Tax Collected at Phase Buildout	$13,412	$13,846	$14,366	$14,799
Percent of Property Transfer Tax allocated to City	50%	50%	50%	50%
Total Property Transfer Tax Allocated to City at phase buildout	$6,706	$6,923	$7,183	$7,400
Percent of Property Transfer Tax allocated to Riverside County	50%	50%	50%	50%
Total Property Transfer Tax Allocated to Riverside Co. at phase buildout	$6,706	$6,923	$7,183	$7,400

Property Transfer Tax from Industrial Development				
	Buildout Phase			
Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (LI) ***Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 89 acres*** ***Potential Square Feet at Buildout:1,318,124***	**Phase I (Yrs.1-5)**	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
New Units (100% of market value is subject to tax)				
Number of acres developed during phase	22.25	22.25	22.25	22.25
Number of square feet constructed at phase buildout[1]	329,531	329,531	329,531	329,531
Average value per square foot	$60.00	$60.00	$60.00	$60.00
Amount Subject to Property Transfer Tax for all new development	$19,771,860	$19,771,860	$19,771,860	$19,771,860
Existing Units(80% of market value is subject to tax)				
Number of square feet developed in 1st year of this phase	65,906	65,906	65,906	65,906
Number of square feet changing ownership in 1st year of this phase	Ø	1,977	5,272	8,568
Number of square feet developed in 2nd year of this phase	65,906	65,906	65,906	65,906
Number of square feet changing ownership in 2nd year of this phase	Ø	2,636	5,932	9,227
Number of square feet developed in 3rd year of this phase	65,906	65,906	65,906	65,906
Number of square feet changing ownership in 3rd year of this phase	Ø	3,295	6,591	9,886
Number of square feet developed in 4th year of this phase	65,906	65,906	65,906	65,906
Number of square feet changing ownership in 4th year of this phase	659	3,954	7,250	10,545
Number of square feet developed in 5th year of this phase	65,907	65,907	65,907	65,907
Number of square feet changing ownership in 5th year of this phase	1318	4,613	7,909	11,204
Total number of square feet developed during this phase	329,531	329,531	329,531	329,531
Total number of square feet changing ownership during this phase	1977	16,475	32,954	49,430
Average value per square foot	$60.00	$60.00	$60.00	$60.00
Unencumbered Value per unit (80% of market value)	48	48	48	48
Amount subject to Property Transfer Tax for all existing units changing ownership during this phase	94,896	790,800	1,581,792	2,372,640

1= Assumes 34% building coverage

New Units & Existing Units Combined				
Total amount subject to Property Transfer Tax (includes all new units sold & all existing units changing ownership)	$19,866,756	$20,562,660	$21,353,652	$22,144,500
Property Transfer Tax Rate	0.11%	0.11%	0.11%	0.11%
Total Property Transfer Tax Collected at Phase Buildout	$21,853	$22,619	$23,489	$24,359
Percent of Property Transfer Tax allocated to City	50%	50%	50%	50%
Total Property Transfer Tax Allocated to City at Phase Buildout	$10,927	$11,310	$11,745	$12,180
Percent of Property Transfer Tax allocated to Riverside County	50%	50%	50%	50%
Total Property Transfer Tax Allocated to Riverside Co. at phase buildout	$10,927	$11,310	$11,745	$12,180

Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (I-L) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 28 acres* *Potential Square Feet at Buildout: 414,692*	Buildout Phase Phase I (Yrs.1-5)	Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)	Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)	Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)
New Units (100% of market value is subject to tax)				
Number of acres developed during phase	7	7	7	7
Number of square feet constructed at phase buildout[1]	103,673	103,673	103,673	103,673
Average value per square foot	$60.00	$60.00	$60.00	$60.00
Amount Subject to Property Transfer Tax for all new units sold	$6,220,380	$6,220,380	$6,220,380	$6,220,380
Existing Units(80% of market value is subject to tax)				
Number of square feet developed in 1st year of this phase	20,734	20,734	20,734	20,734
Number of square feet changing ownership in 1st year of this phase	Ø	622	1,659	2,696
Number of square feet developed in 2nd year of this phase	20,735	20,735	20,735	20,735
Number of square feet changing ownership in 2nd year of this phase	Ø	829	1,866	2,903
Number of square feet developed in 3rd year of this phase	20,735	20,735	20,735	20,735
Number of square feet changing ownership in 3rd year of this phase	Ø	1,037	2,073	3,110
Number of square feet developed in 4th year of this phase	20,735	20,735	20,735	20,735
Number of square feet changing ownership in 4th year of this phase	207	1,451	2,281	3,318
Number of square feet developed in 5th year of this phase	20,735	20,735	20,735	20,735
Number of square feet changing ownership in 5th year of this phase	415	1,451	2,488	3,525
Total number of square feet developed during this phase	103,674	103,674	103,674	103,674
Total number of square feet changing ownership during this phase	622	5,390	10,367	15,552
Average value per square foot	$60.00	$60.00	$60.00	$60.00
Unencumbered Value per unit (80% of market value)	48	48	48	48
Amount subject to Property Transfer Tax for all existing units changing ownership during	29,856	258,720	497,616	746,496

1= Assumes 34% building coverage

New Units & Existing Units Combined				
Total amount subject to Property Transfer Tax (includes all new units sold & all existing units changing ownership)	$6,250,236	$6,479,100	$6,717,996	$6,966,876
Property Transfer Tax Rate	0.11%	0.11%	0.11%	0.11%
Total Property Transfer Tax Collected at Phase Buildout	$6,875	$7,127	$7,390	$7,664
Percent of Property Transfer Tax allocated to City	50%	50%	50%	50%
Total Property Transfer Tax Allocated to City at Phase Buildout	$3,438	$3,564	$3,695	$3,832
Percent of Property Transfer Tax allocated to Riverside County	50%	50%	50%	50%
Total Property Transfer Tax Allocated to Riverside Co. at phase buildout	$3,438	$3,564	$3,695	$3,832

CITY Property Transfer Tax Revenue Summary Table				
	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	Phase II (Yrs 6-10)	Phase III (Yrs 11-15)	Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)
Total tax revenue from residential development	$172,301	$236,855	$292,053	$355,544
Total tax revenue from industrial development	$14,365	$14,874	$15,440	$16,012
Total property transfer tax revenue from all development	$186,666	$251,729	$307,493	$371,556

RIVERSIDE COUNTY Property Transfer Tax Revenue Summary Table				
	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	Phase II (Yrs 6-10)	Phase III (Yrs 11-15)	Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)
Total tax revenue from residential development	$172,301	$236,855	$292,053	$355,544
Total tax revenue from industrial development	$14,364	$14,873	$15,440	$16,012
Total property transfer tax revenue from all development	$186,665	$251,728	$307,493	$371,556

Public Safety Tax Revenue from Residential Development

Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 936 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	234	234	234	234
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	18	18	18	18
Number of total potential units constructed at buildout	18	36	54	72
Safety Tax Rate (per unit)	$120.87	$120.87	$120.87	$120.87
Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands	**$2,176**	**$4,351**	**$6,527**	**$8,703**
Balance of vacant units at phase buildout	54.00	36.00	18.00	0.00
Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre)	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57
Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands	**$463**	**$309**	**$154**	**$0**
Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout	**$2,639**	**$4,660**	**$6,681**	**$8,703**

1= Assumes 75% of total number o funits possible at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 233 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 16*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase*	58.25	58.25	58.25	58.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)*	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	4	4	4	4
Number of total potential units constructed at buildout	4	8	12	16
Safety Tax Rate (per unit)	$120.87	$120.87	$120.87	$120.87
Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands	**$483**	**$967**	**$1,450**	**$1,934**
Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout	12.00	8.00	4.00	0.00
Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre)	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57
Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands	**$103**	**$69**	**$34**	**$0**
Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout	**$586**	**$1,036**	**$1,484**	**$1,934**

1= Assumes 75% of total number o funits possible at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 465 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 68*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase*	116.25	116.25	116.25	116.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)*	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	17	17	17	17
Number of total potential units constructed at buildout	17	34	51	68
Safety Tax Rate (per unit)	$120.87	$120.87	$120.87	$120.87
Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands	**$2,055**	**$4,110**	**$6,164**	**$8,219**
Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout	51.00	34.00	17.00	0.00
Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre)	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57
Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands	**$437**	**$291**	**$146**	**$0**
Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout	**$2,492**	**$4,401**	**$6,310**	**$8,219**

1= Assumes 75% of total number of units possible at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 259 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 972*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	64.75	64.75	64.75	64.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5	5	5	5
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	243	243	243	243
Number of total potential units constructed at buildout	243	486	729	972
Safety Tax Rate (per unit)	$120.87	$120.87	$120.87	$120.87
Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands	**$29,372**	**$58,743**	**$88,115**	**$117,487**
Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout	729.00	486.00	243.00	0.00
Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre)	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57
Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands	**$6,248**	**$4,165**	**$2,083**	**$0**
Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout	**$35,620**	**$62,908**	**$90,198**	**$117,487**

1= Assumes 75% of total number of units possible at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Low Density, Specific Plan (0-5 du/ac) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	291.75	291.75	291.75	291.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5	5	5	5
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	1094	1094	1094	1094
Number of total potential units constructed at buildout	1094	2,188	3,282	4,376
Safety Tax Rate (per unit)	$120.87	$120.87	$120.87	$120.87
Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands	**$132,233**	**$264,466**	**$396,699**	**$528,932**
Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout	3,282.00	2,188.00	1,094.00	0.00
Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre)	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57
Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands	**$28,127**	**$18,751**	**$9,376**	**$0**
Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout	**$160,360**	**$283,217**	**$406,075**	**$528,932**

1= Assumes 75% of total number of units possible at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	8	8	8	8
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	24	24	24	24
Number of total potential units constructed at buildout	24	48	72	96
Safety Tax Rate (per unit)	$67.60	$67.60	$67.60	$67.60
Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands	**$1,622**	**$3,245**	**$4,867**	**$6,490**
Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout	72.00	48.00	24.00	0.00
Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre)	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57
Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands	**$617**	**$411**	**$206**	**$0**
Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout	**$2,239**	**$3,656**	**$5,073**	**$6,490**

1= Assumes 75% of total number of units possible at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: High Density, Specific Plan (0-14 du/ac) ***Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres*** ***No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492***	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	14	14	14	14
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	123	123	123	123
Number of total potential units constructed at buildout	123	246	369	492
Safety Tax Rate (per unit)	$38.72	$38.72	$38.72	$38.72
Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands	**$4,763**	**$9,525**	**$14,288**	**$19,050**
Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout	369.00	246.00	123.00	0.00
Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre)	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57	$8.57
Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands	**$3,162**	**$2,108**	**$1,054**	**$0**
Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout	**$7,925**	**$11,633**	**$15,342**	**$19,050**

1= Assumes 75% of total number of units possible at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (I-L) ***Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 28 acres*** ***Potential Square Feet at Buildout: 414,692***	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of developable acres	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00
Total number of acres constructed at phase buildout [1]	2.38	4.76	7.14	9.52
Safety Tax Rate (per developed acre)	$521.91	$521.91	$521.91	$521.91
Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands	$1,242	$2,484	$3,726	$4,969
Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout	21.00	14.00	7.00	0.00
Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre)	$2.36	$2.36	$2.36	$2.36
Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands	$50	$33	$17	$0
Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout	**$1,292**	**$2,517**	**$3,743**	**$4,969**

1= Assumes 34% building coverage

Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (LI) ***Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 89 acres*** ***Potential Square Feet at Buildout:1,318,124***	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of developable acres	22.25	22.25	22.25	22.25
Total number of acres constructed at phase buildout [1]	7.57	15.13	22.70	30.26
Safety Tax Rate (per developed acre)	$521.91	$521.91	$521.91	$521.91
Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands	$3,948	$7,897	$11,845	$15,793
Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout	66.75	44.50	22.25	0.00
Safety Tax Rate (per acre)	$2.36	$2.36	$2.36	$2.36
Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands	$158	$105	$53	$0
Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout	**$4,106**	**$8,002**	**$11,898**	$15,793

1= Assume 34% building coverage

Public Safety Tax Revenue Summary Table
(Desert Hot Springs Only)

	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Total tax revenue from residential development	$211,861	$371,511	$531,163	$690,815
Total tax revenue from industrial development	$5,398	$10,519	$15,641	$20,762
Total Public Safety tax revenue from all development	**$217,259**	**$382,030**	**$546,804**	**$711,577**

TUMF Revenue
from Residential Development

Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac) ***Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 936 acres*** ***No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72***	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	234	234	234	234
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	18	18	18	18
TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit)	$1,837	$1,837	$1,837	$1,837
TUMF fee collected	$33,074	$33,074	$33,074	$33,074

1= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) ***Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 233 acres*** ***No. of Potential Buildout Units: 16***	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	58.25	58.25	58.25	58.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	4	4	4	4
TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit)	$1,837	$1,837	$1,837	$1,837
TUMF fee collected	$7,350	$7,350	$7,350	$7,350

1= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) ***Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 465 acres*** ***No. of Potential Buildout Units: 68***	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	116.25	116.25	116.25	116.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	17	17	17	17
TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit)	$1,837	$1,837	$1,837	$1,837
TUMF fee collected	$31,236	$31,236	$31,236	$31,236

1= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 259 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 972*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	64.75	64.75	64.75	64.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5	5	5	5
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	243	243	243	243
TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit)	$1,837	$1,837	$1,837	$1,837
TUMF fee collected	$446,498	$446,498	$446,498	$446,498

1= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Low Density, Specific Plan (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	291.75	291.75	291.75	291.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5	5	5	5
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	1,094	1,094	1,094	1,094
TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit)	$1,837	$1,837	$1,837	$1,837
TUMF fee collected	$2,010,159	$2,010,159	$2,010,159	$2,010,159

1= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) ***Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres*** ***No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96***	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	4	4	4	4
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	8	8	8	8
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	24	24	24	24
TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit)	$1,837	$1,837	$1,837	$1,837
TUMF fee collected	$44,099	$44,099	$44,099	$44,099

1= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: High Density, Specific Plan (0-14 du/ac) ***Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres*** ***No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492***	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	14	14	14	14
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase [1]	123	123	123	123
TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit)	$1,277	$1,277	$1,277	$1,277
TUMF fee collected	$157,046	$157,046	$157,046	$157,046

1= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

TUMF Revenue
from Industrial Development

Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (LI) ***Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 89 acres*** ***Potential Square Feet at Buildout:1,318,124***	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	22.25	22.25	22.25	22.25
Total square feet constructed at phase buildout[1]	329,531	329,531	329,531	329,531
TUMF fee rate (per 1,000 square feet)	$1,031.56	$1,031.56	$1,031.56	$1,031.56
TUMF fee collected	$339,931	$339,931	$339,931	$339,931

1= Assumes 34% building coverage

Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (I-L) ***Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 28 acres*** ***Potential Square Feet at Buildout: 414,692***	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs. 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs. 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs. 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during phase	7	7	7	7
Total square feet constructed at phase buildout	103,673	103,673	103,673	103,673
TUMF fee rate (per 1,000 square feet)	$1,032	$1,032	$1,032	$1,032
TUMF fee collected	$106,945	$106,945	$106,945	$106,945

1= Assumes 34% building coverage

TUMF Revenue Summary Table				
	Buildout Phase			
	(Yrs 1-5)	(Yrs 6-10)	(Yrs 11-15)	(Yrs 16-20)
Total TUMF revenue from residential development	$2,729,462	$2,729,462	$2,729,462	$2,729,462
Total TUMF revenue from industrial development	$446,876	$446,876	$446,876	$446,876
Total TUMF revenue from all development	**$3,176,339**	**$3,176,339**	**$3,176,339**	**$3,176,339**

Sales Tax & Measure A Revenue from Single-Family Residential Development				
Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)	**Buildout Phase**			
Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936	**Phase I**	**Phase II**	**Phase III**	**Phase IV**
No.of Potential Buildout Units: 72	**(Yrs 1-5)**	**(Yrs 6-10)**	**(Yrs 11-15)**	**(Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	234.00	234.00	234.00	234.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	18	18	18	18
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	18	36	54	72
Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout				
Median housing value	$207,000	$207,000	$207,000	$207,000
Historic average mortgage lending rate	5.02%	5.02%	5.02%	5.02%
Average interest paid annually	$10,391	$10,391	$10,391	$10,391
Interest paid on 30-yr. mortgage	$311,742	$311,742	$311,742	$311,742
Total value of dwelling unit (median value + interest over 30 years)	$518,742	$518,742	$518,742	$518,742
Average monthly mortgage payment	$1,441	$1,441	$1,441	$1,441
Average monthly household income (assumes monthly mortgage payment is 30% of monthly income)	$4,803	$4,803	$4,803	$4,803
Average annual household income	$57,638	$57,638	$57,638	$57,638
Average annual expendable income per household (assumes expendable income is 19% of net household income)	$10,951	$10,951	$10,951	$10,951
Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout	$197,122	$394,244	$591,366	$788,488
Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City				
Percent expendable income to be spent within City	70%	70%	70%	70%
Percent expendable income to be spent outside City	30%	30%	30%	30%
Amount spent within City annually	$137,985	$275,971	$413,956	$551,941
Amount spent outside City annually	$59,137	$118,273	$177,410	$236,546
Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues				
City's sales tax rate	1%	1%	1%	1%
Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout	$1,380	$2,760	$4,140	$5,519
Calculation of Measure A Revenues				
Measure A tax rate	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%
Annual Measure A revenue collected in City at phase buildout	$690	$1,380	$2,070	$2,760
Percent allocated to Coachella Valley	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%
Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley	$166	$331	$497	$662
Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program	35%	35%	35%	35%
Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program	$58	$116	$174	$232
Percent allocated to this jurisdiction	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction	$1.74	$3.48	$5.22	$6.95

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 16*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	58.25	58.25	58.25	58.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	4	4	4	4
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	4	8	12	16
Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout				
Median housing value	$207,000	$207,000	$207,000	$207,000
Historic average mortgage lending rate	5.02%	5.02%	5.02%	5.02%
Average interest paid annually	$10,391	$10,391	$10,391	$10,391
Interest paid on 30-yr. mortgage	$311,742	$311,742	$311,742	$311,742
Total value of dwelling unit (median value + interest over 30 years)	$518,742	$518,742	$518,742	$518,742
Average monthly mortgage payment	$1,441	$1,441	$1,441	$1,441
Average monthly household income (assumes monthly mortgage payment is 30% of monthly income)	$4,803	$4,803	$4,803	$4,803
Average annual household income	$57,638	$57,638	$57,638	$57,638
Average annual expendable income per household (assumes expendable income is 19% of net household income)	$10,951	$10,951	$10,951	$10,951
Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout	$43,805	$87,610	$131,415	$175,220
Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City				
Percent expendable income to be spent within City	70%	70%	70%	70%
Percent expendable income to be spent outside City	30%	30%	30%	30%
Amount spent within City annually	$30,663	$61,327	$91,990	$122,654
Amount spent outside City annually	$13,141	$26,283	$39,424	$52,566
Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues				
City's sales tax rate	1%	1%	1%	1%
Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout	$307	$613	$920	$1,227
Calculation of Measure A Revenues				
Measure A tax rate	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%
Annual Measure A revenue collected in City at phase buildout	$153	$307	$460	$613
Percent allocated to Coachella Valley	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%
Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley	$37	$74	$110	$147
Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program	35%	35%	35%	35%
Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program	$13	$26	$39	$52
*Percent allocated to this jurisdiction	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction	$0.39	$0.77	$1.16	$1.55

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 68*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	116.25	116.25	116.25	116.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	17	17	17	17
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	17	34	51	68
Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout				
Median housing value	$207,000	$207,000	$207,000	$207,000
Historic average mortgage lending rate	5.02%	5.02%	5.02%	5.02%
Average interest paid annually	$10,391	$10,391	$10,391	$10,391
Interest paid on 30-yr. mortgage	$311,742	$311,742	$311,742	$311,742
Total value of dwelling unit (median value + interest over 30 years)	$518,742	$518,742	$518,742	$518,742
Average monthly mortgage payment	$1,441	$1,441	$1,441	$1,441
Average monthly household income (assumes monthly mortgage payment is 30% of monthly income)	$4,803	$4,803	$4,803	$4,803
Average annual household income	$57,638	$57,638	$57,638	$57,638
Average annual expendable income per household (assumes expendable income is 19% of net household income)	$10,951	$10,951	$10,951	$10,951
Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout	$186,171	$372,341	$558,512	$744,683
Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City				
Percent expendable income to be spent within City	70%	70%	70%	70%
Percent expendable income to be spent outside City	30%	30%	30%	30%
Amount spent within City annually	$130,320	$260,639	$390,959	$521,278
Amount spent outside City annually	$55,851	$111,702	$167,554	$223,405
Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues				
City's sales tax rate	1%	1%	1%	1%
Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout	$1,303	$2,606	$3,910	$5,213
Calculation of Measure A Revenues				
Measure A tax rate	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%
Annual Measure A Revenue Collected in City at phase buildout	$652	$1,303	$1,955	$2,606
Percent allocated to Coachella Valley	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%
Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley	$156	$313	$469	$626
Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program	35%	35%	35%	35%
Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program	$55	$109	$164	$219
Percent allocated to this jurisdiction	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction	$1.64	$3.28	$4.93	$6.57

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 972*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	64.75	64.75	64.75	64.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5	5	5	5
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	243	243	243	243
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	243	486	729	972
Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout				
Median housing value	$207,000	$207,000	$207,000	$207,000
Historic average mortgage lending rate	5.02%	5.02%	5.02%	5.02%
Average interest paid annually	$10,391	$10,391	$10,391	$10,391
Interest paid on 30-yr. mortgage	$311,742	$311,742	$311,742	$311,742
Total value of dwelling unit (median value + interest over 30 years)	$518,742	$518,742	$518,742	$518,742
Average monthly mortgage payment	$1,441	$1,441	$1,441	$1,441
Average monthly household income (assumes monthly mortgage payment is 30% of monthly income)	$4,803	$4,803	$4,803	$4,803
Average annual household income	$57,638	$57,638	$57,638	$57,638
Average annual expendable income per household (assumes expendable income is 19% of net household income)	$10,951	$10,951	$10,951	$10,951
Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout	$2,661,146	$5,322,293	$7,983,439	$10,644,586
Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City				
Percent expendable income to be spent within City	70%	70%	70%	70%
Percent expendable income to be spent outside City	30%	30%	30%	30%
Amount spent within City annually	$1,862,803	$3,725,605	$5,588,408	$7,451,210
Amount spent outside City annually	$798,344	$1,596,688	$2,395,032	$3,193,376
Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues				
City's sales tax rate	1%	1%	1%	1%
Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout	$18,628	$37,256	$55,884	$74,512
Calculation of Measure A Revenues				
Measure A tax rate	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%
Annual Measure A Revenue Collected in City at phase buildout	$9,314	$18,628	$27,942	$37,256
Percent allocated to Coachella Valley	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%
Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley	$2,235	$4,471	$6,706	$8,941
Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program	35%	35%	35%	35%
Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program	$782	$1,565	$2,347	$3,130
*Percent allocated to this jurisdiction	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction	$23.47	$46.94	$70.41	$93.89

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376*	**Buildout Phase** **Phase I (Yrs 1-5)**	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	291.75	291.75	291.75	291.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	1,094	1,094	1,094	1,094
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	1,094	2,188	3,282	4,376
Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout				
Median housing value	$207,000	$207,000	$207,000	$207,000
Historic average mortgage lending rate	5.02%	5.02%	5.02%	5.02%
Average interest paid annually	$10,391	$10,391	$10,391	$10,391
Interest paid on 30-yr. mortgage	$311,742	$311,742	$311,742	$311,742
Total value of dwelling unit (median value + interest over 30 years)	$518,742	$518,742	$518,742	$518,742
Average monthly mortgage payment	$1,441	$1,441	$1,441	$1,441
Average monthly household income (assumes monthly mortgage payment is 30% of monthly income)	$4,803	$4,803	$4,803	$4,803
Average annual household income	$57,638	$57,638	$57,638	$57,638
Average annual expendable income per household (assumes expendable income is 19% of net household income)	$10,951	$10,951	$10,951	$10,951
Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout	$11,980,635	$23,961,269	$35,941,904	$47,922,539
Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City				
Percent expendable income to be spent within City	70%	70%	70%	70%
Percent expendable income to be spent outside City	30%	30%	30%	30%
Amount spent within City annually	$8,386,444	$16,772,889	$25,159,333	$33,545,777
Amount spent outside City annually	$3,594,190	$7,188,381	$10,782,571	$14,376,762
Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues				
City's sales tax rate	1%	1%	1%	1%
Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout	$83,864	$167,729	$251,593	$335,458
Calculation of Measure A Revenues				
Measure A Tax Rate	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%
Annual Measure A Revenue Collected in City at Phase Buildout	$41,932	$83,864	$125,797	$167,729
Percent allocated to Coachella Valley	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%
Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley	$10,064	$20,127	$30,191	$40,255
Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program	35%	35%	35%	35%
Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program	$3,522	$7,045	$10,567	$14,089
Percent allocated to this jurisdiction	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction	$105.67	$211.34	$317.01	$422.68

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 96*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	8	8	8	8
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	24	24	24	24
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	24	48	72	96
Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout				
Median housing value	$98,490	$98,490	$98,490	$98,490
Historic average mortgage lending rate	5.02%	5.02%	5.02%	5.02%
Average interest paid annually	$4,944	$4,944	$4,944	$4,944
Interest paid on 30-yr. mortgage	$148,326	$148,326	$148,326	$148,326
Total value of dwelling unit (median value + interest over 30 years)	$246,816	$246,816	$246,816	$246,816
Average monthly mortgage payment	$686	$686	$686	$686
Average monthly household income (assumes monthly mortgage payment is 30% of monthly income)	$2,285	$2,285	$2,285	$2,285
Average annual household income	$27,424	$27,424	$27,424	$27,424
Average annual expendable income per household	$5,211	$5,211	$5,211	$5,211
Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout	$125,053	$250,107	$375,160	$500,214
Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City				
Percent expendable income to be spent within City	70%	70%	70%	70%
Percent expendable income to be spent outside City	30%	30%	30%	30%
Amount spent within City annually	$87,537	$175,075	$262,612	$350,150
Amount spent outside City annually	$37,516	$75,032	$112,548	$150,064
Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues				
City's sales tax rate	1%	1%	1%	1%
Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout	$875	$1,751	$2,626	$3,501
Calculation of Measure A Revenues				
Measure A Tax Rate	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%
Annual Measure A Revenue Collected in City at Phase Buildout	$438	$875	$1,313	$1,751
Percent allocated to Coachella Valley	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%
Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley	$105	$210	$315	$420
Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program	35%	35%	35%	35%
Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program	$37	$74	$110	$147
Percent allocated to this jurisdiction	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction	$1.10	$2.21	$3.31	$4.41

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492*	**Buildout Phase** **Phase I (Yrs 1-5)**	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	14	14	14	14
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	123	123	123	123
Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout	123	246	369	492
Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout				
Average monthly apartment rental rate	$768	$768	$768	$768
Average monthly household income (assumes monthly rental payment is 30% of monthly income)	$2,560	$2,560	$2,560	$2,560
Average annual household income	$30,720	$30,720	$30,720	$30,720
Average annual expendable income per household (assumes expendable income is 19% of net household income)	$5,837	$5,837	$5,837	$5,837
Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout	$717,926	$1,435,853	$2,153,779	$2,871,706
Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City				
Percent expendable income to be spent within City	70%	70%	70%	70%
Percent expendable income to be spent outside City	30%	30%	30%	30%
Amount spent within City annually	$502,548	$1,005,097	$1,507,645	$2,010,194
Amount spent outside City annually	$215,378	$430,756	$646,134	$861,512
Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues				
City's sales tax rate	1%	1%	1%	1%
Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout	$5,025	$10,051	$15,076	$20,102
Calculation of Measure A Revenues				
Measure A Tax Rate	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%
Annual Measure A Revenue Collected in City at Phase Buildout	$2,513	$5,025	$7,538	$10,051
Percent allocated to Coachella Valley	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%
Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley	$603	$1,206	$1,809	$2,412
Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program	35%	35%	35%	35%
Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program	$211	$422	$633	$844
Percent allocated to this jurisdiction	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction	$6.33	$12.66	$19.00	$25.33

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Summary Table

	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Total sales tax revenue from single-family residential development	$106,358	$212,715	$319,073	$425,430
Total sales tax revenue from multi-family residential development	$5,025	$10,051	$15,076	$20,102
Total sales tax revenue from all development	**$111,383**	**$222,766**	**$334,149**	**$445,532**

Measure A Revenue

	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Total Measure A revenue from single-family resid. development	$134	$268	$402	$536
Total Measure A revenue from multi-family resid. development	$6	$13	$19	$25
Total Measure A revenue from all development	**$140**	**$281**	**$421**	**$561**

Utility Tax Revenue (Desert Hot Springs only)				
Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)	**Buildout Phase**			
Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936	**Phase I**	**Phase II**	**Phase III**	**Phase IV**
No.of Potential Buildout Units: 72	**(Yrs 1-5)**	**(Yrs 6-10)**	**(Yrs 11-15)**	**(Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	234.00	234.00	234.00	234.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[a]	18	18	18	18
Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout	18	36	54	72
Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue				
City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10)	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180
Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF)	9,223	9,223	9,223	9,223
Annual utility tax per dwelling unit	$274	$274	$274	$274
Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout	$4,936.06	$9,872	$14,808	$19,744
Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac)	**Buildout Phase**			
Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233	**Phase I**	**Phase II**	**Phase III**	**Phase IV**
No.of Potential Buildout Units: 16	**(Yrs 1-5)**	**(Yrs 6-10)**	**(Yrs 11-15)**	**(Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	58.25	58.25	58.25	58.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[a]	4	4	4	4
Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout	4	8	12	16
Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue				
City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10)	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180
Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF)	9,223	9,223	9,223	9,223
Annual utility tax per dwelling unit	$274	$274	$274	$274
Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout	$1,097	$2,194	$3,291	$4,388

Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 68*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	116.25	116.25	116.25	116.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[a]	17	17	17	17
Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout	17	34	51	68
Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue				
City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10)	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180
Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF)	9,223	9,223	9,223	9,223
Annual utility tax per dwelling unit	$274	$274	$274	$274
Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout	$4,662	$9,324	$13,985	$18,647

Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 972*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	64.75	64.75	64.75	64.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[a]	243	243	243	243
Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout	243	486	729	972
Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue				
City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10)	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180
Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF)	9,223	9,223	9,223	9,223
Annual utility tax per dwelling unit	$274	$274	$274	$274
Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout	$66,637	$133,274	$199,910	$266,547

Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	291.75	291.75	291.75	291.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5	5	5	5
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[a]	1,094	1,094	1,094	1,094
Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout	1,094	2,188	3,282	4,376
Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue				
City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10)	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180
Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF)	9,223	9,223	9,223	9,223
Annual utility tax per dwelling unit	$274	$274	$274	$274
Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout	$300,003	$600,005	$900,008	$1,200,010

Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 96*	**Buildout Phase**			
	(Yrs 1-5)	**(Yrs 6-10)**	**(Yrs 11-15)**	**(Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	8	8	8	8
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[a]	24	24	24	24
Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout	24	48	72	96
Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue				
City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10)	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180
Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF)	9,223	9,223	9,223	9,223
Annual utility tax per dwelling unit	$274	$274	$274	$274
Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout	$6,581	$13,163	$19,744	$26,326

Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	14	14	14	14
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[a]	123	123	123	123
Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout	123	246	369	492
Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue				
City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10)	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180	$2,529,180
Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF)	9,223	9,223	9,223	9,223
Annual utility tax per dwelling unit	$274	$274	$274	$274
Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout	$33,730	$67,459	$101,189	$134,919

Utility Tax Revenue (Desert Hot Springs only)

	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Total Utility Tax Revenue from all development	**$417,645**	**$835,290**	**$1,252,936**	**$1,670,581**

Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue				
Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)	**Buildout Phase**			
Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936	**Phase I**	**Phase II**	**Phase III**	**Phase IV**
No.of Potential Buildout Units: 72	**(Yrs 1-5)**	**(Yrs 6-10)**	**(Yrs 11-15)**	**(Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	234.00	234.00	234.00	234.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[2]	18	18	18	18
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	18	36	54	72
Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue				
Average No. of Persons Per Household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential Population at Phase Buildout	52	104	156	207
Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue[1]	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94
Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout	$152	$305	$457	$610

[1] = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office

[2] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 16*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	58.25	58.25	58.25	58.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[2]	4	4	4	4
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	4	8	12	16
Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue				
Average No. of Persons Per Household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential Population at Phase Buildout	12	23	35	46
Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue[1]	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94
Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout	$34	$68	$102	$135

[1] = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office

[2] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 68*	**Buildout Phase** **Phase I (Yrs 1-5)**	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	116.25	116.25	116.25	116.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[2]	17	17	17	17
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	17	34	51	68
Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue				
Average No. of Persons Per Household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential Population at Phase Buildout	49	98	147	196
Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue[1]	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94
Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout	$144	$288	$432	$576

[1] = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office
[2] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 972*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	64.75	64.75	64.75	64.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[2]	243	243	243	243
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	243	486	729	972
Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue				
Average No. of Persons Per Household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential Population at Phase Buildout	700	1,400	2,100	2,799
Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue[1]	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94
Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout	$2,058	$4,115	$6,173	$8,230

[1] = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office
[2] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	291.75	291.75	291.75	291.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[2]	1,094	1,094	1,094	1,094
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	1,094	2,188	3,282	4,376
Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue				
Average No. of Persons Per Household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential Population at Phase Buildout	3,151	6,301	9,452	12,603
Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue[1]	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94
Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout	$9,263	$18,526	$27,789	$37,052

[1] = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office

[2] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 96*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[2]	24	24	24	24
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	24	48	72	96
Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue				
Average No. of Persons Per Household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential Population at Phase Buildout	69	138	207	276
Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue[1]	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94
Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout	$203	$406	$610	$813

[1] = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office
[2] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[2]	123	123	123	123
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	123	246	369	492
Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue				
Average No. of Persons Per Household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential Population at Phase Buildout	354	708	1,063	1,417
Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue[1]	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94	$2.94
Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout	$1,041	$2,083	$3,124	$4,166

[1] = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office
[2] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Total Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue from all development	$12,896	$25,791	$38,687	$51,582

Highway Users Gas Tax Revenue				
Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)	**Buildout Phase**			
Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936	**Phase I**	**Phase II**	**Phase III**	**Phase IV**
No.of Potential Buildout Units: 72	**(Yrs 1-5)**	**(Yrs 6-10)**	**(Yrs 11-15)**	**(Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	234.00	234.00	234.00	234.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	18	18	18	18
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	18	36	54	72
Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue				
Average no. persons per household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential population at phase buildout	52	104	156	207
Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue[2]	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15
Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout	$837	$1,674	$2,512	$3,349

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

[2] = data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office

Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 16*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	58.25	58.25	58.25	58.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	4	4	4	4
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	4	8	12	16
Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue				
Average no. persons per household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential population at phase buildout	12	23	35	46
Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue[2]	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15
Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout	$186	$372	$558	$744

"1 = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

2 = data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office"

Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 68*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	116.25	116.25	116.25	116.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	17	17	17	17
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	17	34	51	68
Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue				
Average no. persons per household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential population at phase buildout	49	98	147	196
Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue[2]	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15
Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout	$791	$1,581	$2,372	$3,163

"1 = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

2 = data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office"

Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 972*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	64.75	64.75	64.75	64.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	243	243	243	243
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	243	486	729	972
Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue				
Average no. persons per household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential population at phase buildout	700	1,400	2,100	2,799
Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue[2]	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15
Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout	$11,302	$22,605	$33,907	$45,210

"1 = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

2 = data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office"

Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	291.75	291.75	291.75	291.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	1,094	1,094	1,094	1,094
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	1,094	2,188	3,282	4,376
Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue				
Average no. persons per household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential population at phase buildout	3,151	6,301	9,452	12,603
Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue[2]	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15
Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout	$50,884	$101,768	$152,652	$203,537

"1 = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

2 = data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office"

Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 96*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	24	24	24	24
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	24	48	72	96
Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue				
Average no. persons per household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential population at phase buildout	69	138	207	276
Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue[2]	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15
Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout	$1,116	$2,233	$3,349	$4,465

"1 = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

2 = data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office"

Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	123	123	123	123
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	123	246	369	492
Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue				
Average no. persons per household	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Potential population at phase buildout	354	708	1,063	1,417
Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue[2]	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15	$16.15
Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout	$5,721	$11,442	$17,163	$22,884

"1 = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density 2 = data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office"

Highway User Gas Tax Revenue				
	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	Phase II (Yrs 6-10)	Phase III (Yrs 11-15)	Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)
Total Gas Tax Revenue from all development	$70,838	$141,676	$212,513	$283,351

CSA 152 Revenue
from Single-Family Residential Development

Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 72*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	234.00	234.00	234.00	234.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	18	18	18	18
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	18	36	54	72
Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue				
BAU Value per dwelling unit	1	1	1	1
City's BAU Rate	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$28.08	$56.16	$84.24	$112.32

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 16*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	58.25	58.25	58.25	58.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	4	4	4	4
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	4	8	12	16
Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue				
BAU Value per dwelling unit	1	1	1	1
City's BAU Rate	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$6.24	$12.48	$18.72	$24.96

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 68*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	116.25	116.25	116.25	116.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	17	17	17	17
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	17	34	51	68
Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue				
BAU Value per dwelling unit	1	1	1	1
City's BAU Rate	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$26.52	$53.04	$79.56	$106.08

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 972*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	64.75	64.75	64.75	64.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	243	243	243	243
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	243	486	729	972
Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue				
BAU Value per dwelling unit	1	1	1	1
City's BAU Rate	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$379.08	$758.16	$1,137.24	$1,516.32

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	291.75	291.75	291.75	291.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	1,094	1,094	1,094	1,094
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	1,094	2,188	3,282	4,376
Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue				
BAU Value per dwelling unit	1	1	1	1
City's BAU Rate	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$1,706.64	$3,413.28	$5,119.92	$6,826.56

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 96*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	24	24	24	24
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	24	48	72	96
Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue				
BAU Value per dwelling unit	1	1	1	1
City's BAU Rate	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$37.44	$74.88	$112.32	$149.76

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	123	123	123	123
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	123	246	369	492
Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue				
BAU Value per dwelling unit	1	1	1	1
City's BAU Rate	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$191.88	$383.76	$575.64	$767.52

[1] = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

CSA 152 Revenue from Industrial Development				
Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (I-L)	**Buildout Phase**			
Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 28acres	**Phase I**	**Phase II**	**Phase III**	**Phase IV**
Potential Square Feet at Buildout: 414,692	**(Yrs 1-5)**	**(Yrs 6-10)**	**(Yrs 11-15)**	**(Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00
Percentage of acres developed (percent lot coverage)	75%	75%	75%	75%
Number of acres developed at phase buildout	5.25	10.50	15.75	21.00
Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue				
BAU Value per developed acre	12	12	12	12
City's BAU Rate	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$98	$197	$295	$393

Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (LI)	**Buildout Phase**			
Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 89	**Phase I**	**Phase II**	**Phase III**	**Phase IV**
Potential Square Feet at Buildout: 1,318,124	**(Yrs 1-5)**	**(Yrs 6-10)**	**(Yrs 11-15)**	**(Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	22.25	22.25	22.25	22.25
Percentage of acres developed (percent lot coverage)	75%	75%	75%	75%
Number of acres developed at phase buildout	16.69	33.38	50.06	66.75
Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue				
BAU Value per developed acre	12	12	12	12
City's BAU Rate	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56	$1.56
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$312	$625	$937	$1,250

CSA 152 Revenue				
	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	Phase II (Yrs 6-10)	Phase III (Yrs 11-15)	Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)
Total CSA 152 Revenue from Residential Development	$2,376	$4,752	$7,128	$9,504
Total CSA 152 Revenue from Industrial Development	$411	$821	$1,232	$1,643
Total CSA 152 Revenue from all Development	**$2,787**	**$5,573**	**$8,360**	**$11,146**

CFD 2010-01
from Single-Family Residential Development

Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 936 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
*Number of acres developed during this phase	234.00	234.00	234.00	234.00
*Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase[1]	18	18	18	18
Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout	18	36	54	72
Number of total parcels existing at phase buildout[2]	18	36	54	72
Calculation of CFD Revenue				
BU Value per dwelling unit	1	1	1	1
City's BU Rate	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$7,200.00	$14,400.00	$21,600.00	$28,800.00

Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 16*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during this phase	58.25	58.25	58.25	58.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase[1]	4	4	4	4
Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout	4	8	12	16
Number of total parcels existing at phase buildout[2]	4	8	12	16
Calculation of CFD Revenue				
BU Value per dwelling unit	1	1	1	1
City's BU Rate	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$1,600.00	$3,200.00	$4,800.00	$6,400.00

[2] Assumes each future dwelling unit will occupy its own parcel.

Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 68*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during this phase	116.25	116.25	116.25	116.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase[1]	17	17	17	17
Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout	17	34	51	68
Number of total parcels existing at phase buildout[2]	17	34	51	68
Calculation of CFD Revenue				
BU Value per dwelling unit	1	1	1	1
City's BU Rate	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$6,800.00	$13,600.00	$20,400.00	$27,200.00

[2] Assumes each future dwelling unit will occupy its own parcel.

Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 972*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during this phase	64.75	64.75	64.75	64.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5	5	5	5
Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase[1]	243	243	243	243
Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout	243	486	729	972
Number of total parcels existing at phase buildout[2]	243	486	729	972
Calculation of CFD Revenue				
BU Value per dwelling unit	1	1	1	1
City's BU Rate	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$97,200.00	$194,400.00	$291,600.00	$388,800.00

[2] Assumes each future dwelling unit will occupy its own parcel.

Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during this phase	291.75	291.75	291.75	291.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5	5	5	5
Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase[1]	1,094	1,094	1,094	1,094
Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout	1,094	2,188	3,282	4,376
Number of total parcels existing at phase buildout[2]	1,094	2,188	3,282	4,376
Calculation of CFD Revenue				
BU Value per dwelling unit	1	1	1	1
City's BU Rate	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$437,600.00	$875,200.00	$1,312,800.00	$1,750,400.00

[2] Assumes each future dwelling unit will occupy its own parcel.

Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 96*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during this phase	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	8	8	8	8
Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase[1]	24	24	24	24
Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout	24	48	72	96
Number of total parcels existing at phase buildout[2]	24	48	72	96
Calculation of CFD Revenue				
BU Value per dwelling unit	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60
City's BU Rate	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$424.60	$448.60	$472.60	$496.60

[2] Assumes each future dwelling unit will occupy its own parcel.

Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during this phase	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	14	14	14	14
Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase[1]	123	123	123	123
Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout	123	246	369	492
	123	246	369	492
Calculation of CFD Revenue				
BU Value per dwelling unit	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60
City's BU Rate	$20.00	$20.00	$20.00	$20.00
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$143.60	$266.60	$389.60	$512.60

Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (I-L) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 38.48 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units:569,904*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during this phase	9.62	9.62	9.62	9.62
Calculation of CFD Revenue				
BU Value per Acre	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
City's BU Rate	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$7,696.00	$7,696.00	$7,696.00	$7,696.00

Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (LI) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 161.61 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 2,393,360*	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Number of acres developed during this phase	40.40	40.40	40.40	40.40
Calculation of CFD Revenue				
BU Value per Acre	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
City's BU Rate	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00	$400.00
Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout	$32,322.00	$32,322.00	$32,322.00	$32,322.00

[1] Assumes existing parcels will not be subdivided when developed.

Lighting & Landscaping District Revenue	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Total CFD Revenue from Single-Family Resid. Development	$550,400	$1,100,800	$1,651,200	$2,201,600
Total CFD Revenue from Multi-Family Resid. Development	$568	$715	$862	$1,009
Total CFD Revenue from Industrial Development	$40,018	$40,018	$40,018	$40,018
Total Annual CFD Revenue from all development	**$590,986**	**$1,141,533**	**$1,692,080**	**$2,242,627**

Costs of General Government				
Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)	**Buildout Phase**			
Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936	**Phase I**	**Phase II**	**Phase III**	**Phase IV**
No.of Potential Buildout Units: 72	**(Yrs 1-5)**	**(Yrs 6-10)**	**(Yrs 11-15)**	**(Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	234.00	234	234	234
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	18	18	18	18
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	18	36	54	72
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	52	104	156	207
Calculating Annual Costs of General Government				
General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66
Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout	$7,966	$15,931	$23,897	$31,862

Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 16*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	58.25	58.25	58.25	58.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	4	4	4	4
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	4	8	12	16
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	12	23	35	46
Calculating Annual Costs of General Government				
General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66
Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout	$1,770	$3,540	$5,310	$7,081

Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 68*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	116.25	116.25	116.25	116.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	17	17	17	17
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	17	34	51	68
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	49	98	147	196
Calculating Annual Costs of General Government				
General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66
Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout	$7,523	$15,046	$22,569	$30,092

Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 972*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	64.75	64.75	64.75	64.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5	5	5	5
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	243	243	243	243
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	243	486	729	972
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	700	1,400	2,100	2,799
Calculating Annual Costs of General Government				
General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66
Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout	$107,536	$215,071	$322,607	$430,142

Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	291.75	291.75	291.75	291.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5	5	5	5
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	1,094	1,094	1,094	1,094
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	1,094	2,188	3,282	4,376
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	3,151	6,301	9,452	12,603
Calculating Annual Costs of General Government				
General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66
Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout	$484,131	$968,263	$1,452,394	$1,936,526

Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 96*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	8	8	8	8
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	24	24	24	24
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	24	48	72	96
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	69.12	138.24	207.36	276.48
Calculating Annual Costs of General Government				
General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66
Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout	$10,621	$21,242	$31,862	$42,483

Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	14	14	14	14
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	123	123	123	123
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	123	246	369	492
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	354	708	1,063	1,417
Calculating Annual Costs of General Government				
General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709	$4,119,709
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66	$153.66
Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout	$54,432	$108,863	$163,295	$217,726

Costs of General Government				
	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	Phase II (Yrs 6-10)	Phase III (Yrs 11-15)	Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)
Annual Costs of General Gov. for all development	$673,978	$1,347,957	$2,021,935	$2,695,913

Costs of Public Safety				
Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)	**Buildout Phase**			
Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936	**Phase I**	**Phase II**	**Phase III**	**Phase IV**
No.of Potential Buildout Units: 72	**(Yrs 1-5)**	**(Yrs 6-10)**	**(Yrs 11-15)**	**(Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	234.00	234	234	234
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	18	18	18	18
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	18	36	54	72
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	52	104	156	207
Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety				
Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07
Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout	$18,511	$37,021	$55,532	$74,042

Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 16*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	58.25	58.25	58.25	58.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	4	4	4	4
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	4	8	12	16
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	12	23	35	46
Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety				
Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07
Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout	$4,113	$8,227	$12,340	$16,454

Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 68*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	116.25	116.25	116.25	116.25
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	17	17	17	17
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	17	34	51	68
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	49	98	147	196
Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety				
Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07
Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout	$17,482	$34,964	$52,447	$69,929

Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 972*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	64.75	64.75	64.75	64.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5	5	5	5
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	243	243	243	243
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	243	486	729	972
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	700	1,400	2,100	2,799
Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety				
Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07
Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout	$249,893	$499,786	$749,680	$999,573

Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	291.75	291.75	291.75	291.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	5	5	5	5
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	1,094	1,094	1,094	1,094
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	1,094	2,188	3,282	4,376
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	3,151	6,301	9,452	12,603
Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety				
Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07
Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout	$1,125,034	$2,250,067	$3,375,101	$4,500,134

Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) *Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres* *No.of Potential Buildout Units: 96*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	8	8	8	8
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	24	24	24	24
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	24	48	72	96
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	69	138	207	276
Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety				
Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07
Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout	$24,681	$49,362	$74,042	$98,723

Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) *Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres* *No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492*	**Buildout Phase**			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Land Use Buildout Data				
Number of acres developed during phase	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75
Maximum density permitted (units/acre)	14	14	14	14
Maximum potential units constructed during this phase[1]	123	123	123	123
Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout	123	246	369	492
Average number of persons per household (year 2010)	2.880	2.880	2.880	2.880
Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout	354	708	1,063	1,417
Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety				
Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455	$9,573,455
Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010)	26,811	26,811	26,811	26,811
Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07	$357.07
Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout	$126,489	$252,978	$379,467	$505,957

Costs of Public Safety				
	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
Annual Costs of Public Safety for all development	**$1,566,203**	**$3,132,406**	**$4,698,609**	**$6,264,812**

Costs of Roadway Maintenance				
	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	Phase II (Yrs 6-10)	Phase III (Yrs 11-15)	Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)
Roadway Data				
Total land area in jurisdiction (square miles)	29	29	29	29
Number of paved road miles in jurisdiction (year 2011)	135	135	135	135
Number of road miles per square mile of land area	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Total Area designated for conservation (square miles)[1]	10.10	10.10	10.10	10.10
Total no. of potential road miles in conservation area	46.5	46.5	46.5	46.5
No. of potential road miles in conservation area at phase buildout	11.6	23.3	34.9	46.5
Calculation of Annual Roadway Maintenance Costs				
Total Annual Roadway Maintenance Expenditures	$88,777	$88,777	$88,777	$88,777
Number of paved road miles in jurisdiction	135	135	135	135
Annual Cost of Roadway Maintenance Per Road Mile	$658	$658	$658	$658
Annual Cost of Roadway Maintenance at Phase Buildout	**$7,651**	**$15,301**	**$22,952**	**$30,602**

Total Potential Costs/Revenues Associated with Development of Conservation Lands
Summary Table - City of Desert Hot Springs

	Buildout Phase			
	Phase I (Yrs 1-5)	**Phase II (Yrs 6-10)**	**Phase III (Yrs 11-15)**	**Phase IV (Yrs 16-20)**
ANNUAL REVENUES				
General Fund:				
Property Tax	$540,002	$1,080,004	$1,620,005	$2,160,006
Property Transfer Tax	$186,666	$251,729	$307,493	$371,556
Local Sales Tax	$111,383	$222,766	$334,149	$445,532
Transient Occupancy Tax	$0	$0	$0	$0
Utility Tax	$417,645	$835,290	$1,252,936	$1,670,581
Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue	$12,896	$25,791	$38,687	$51,582
Restricted Funds:				
TUMF Fees	$3,176,339	$3,176,339	$3,176,339	$3,176,339
Highway Users Gas Tax	$70,838	$141,676	$212,513	$283,351
Measure A	$140	$281	$421	$561
CSA 152 (NPDES)	$2,787	$5,573	$8,360	$11,146
Community Facilities District	$590,986	$1,141,533	$1,692,080	$2,242,627
Public Safety Tax	$217,259	$382,030	$546,804	$711,577
ANNUAL COSTS				
General Fund:				
General Government Costs	$673,978	$1,347,957	$2,021,935	$2,695,913
Restricted Funds:				
Public Safety Costs	$1,566,203	$3,132,406	$4,698,609	$6,264,812
Roadway Maintenance Costs	$7,651	$15,301	$22,952	$30,602
TUMF Allocation to CVAG	$3,176,339	$3,176,339	$3,176,339	$3,176,339
SUMMARY OF REVENUES/COSTS:				
Revenues:				
Total Annual General Fund Revenues	$1,268,592	$2,415,581	$3,553,269	$4,699,257
Total Annual Restricted Fund Revenues	$4,058,348	$4,847,431	$5,636,517	$6,425,601
Revenue Subtotal	$5,326,940	$7,263,012	$9,189,786	$11,124,858
Historic Average Interest Rate on 90-Day Treasury Bills	5.03%	5.03%	5.03%	5.03%
Anticipated Interest Earned on Revenues	$267,945	$365,330	$462,246	$559,580
Total Annual Revenues at Phase Buildout	$5,594,885	$7,628,342	$9,652,032	$11,684,438
Costs:				
Total Annual General Fund Costs	$673,978	$1,347,957	$2,021,935	$2,695,913
Total Annual Restricted Fund Costs	$4,750,192	$6,324,046	$7,897,900	$9,471,753
Total Annual Costs at Phase Buildout	$5,424,171	$7,672,002	$9,919,834	$12,167,666
Annual Cashflow at Phase Buildout	**$170,715**	**-$43,661**	**-$267,802**	**-$483,228**

EXHIBIT - B

FINAL

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/STATEMENT

(SCH No. 2000061079)

for the

MAJOR AMENDMENT TO THE COACHELLA VALLEY MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN

and Associated

NATURAL COMMUNITY CONSERVATION PLAN

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Prepared For

Coachella Valley Conservation Commission
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Prepared By

DUDEK
3685 Main Street, Suite 250
Riverside, California 92501

MARCH 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page No.**

TABLE

APPENDIX

PREFACE

This document contains the comments received on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR)/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Major Amendment to the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and the responses to those comments.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Introduction

The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR)/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the proposed Major Amendment to the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan (MSHCP) project was circulated for public review from September 6, 2013, through October 21, 2013. Comments received during, or shortly after the close of, the public circulation period include letters. Copies of all the written comments are included in this document.

Format of Responses to Comments

All the written comments received during, or shortly after the close of, the public review period are included in this document. Substantive environmental issues raised within each comment letter are numbered along the right-hand margin of each letter or comment in the transcript. The responses to the comments in each comment letter are referenced by the index numbers in the margins of the letters.

The format of the responses to comments is based on a unique letter and number code for each comment. The number at the end of the code refers to a specific comment within the individual letter. Therefore, each individual comment has a unique code assignment. For example, S-1-1 is the first substantive comment in letter S-1. "S" represents a comment letter from a state agency, "1" refers to the first letter from a state agency, and the second "1" refers to the first comment in that letter. The alphabetic codes used in this appendix are:

- "F" for federal agencies
- "R" for regional, county, and city agencies
- "TG" for Tribal Governments
- "IP" for interested parties
- "P" for comments from the public.

Index of Comments Received

Table 1 lists the agencies, organizations, and persons who commented on the Draft SEIR/SEIS during, or shortly after the close of, the public comment period. The individual comment letters are listed within each category (agencies, interested parties, etc.) by the date they were received. The comment letters are provided in this document in Appendix A.

Table 1
Summary of Comments Received on the Draft SEIR/SEIS During, or Shortly After the Close of, the Public Circulation Period Ending October 21, 2013

	Federal Agencies
F-1	United States Environmental Protection Agency
	Regional, County and Local Agencies
R-1	Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
	Tribal Governments
TG-1	Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians
TG-2	Native American Heritage Commission
	Interested Parties
IP-1	Desert Valleys Builders Association
IP-2	Sierra Club and Center for Biological Diversity
	Members of the Public
P-1	Dr. Mohammed A. Athar

Comments and Responses

The comments received on the Draft SEIR/SEIS during, or shortly after the close of, the public comment period and the responses to those comments are provided in the following sections. The responses to the comments are provided following the last page of each coded letter in each category (e.g., each tribal government comment letter is followed by the responses to the comments in the letters; interested parties' comment letters are followed by the responses to those comments).

Federal Agency Comments and Responses

Comment Letter F-1

Comment F-1-1

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP or Plan) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

The EPA reviewed the Draft EIS for the MSHCP and provided comments to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) on March 7, 2005. We rated the DEIS as Environmental Concerns – Insufficient Information (EC-2) and requested additional information on impacts to waters of the U.S., consultation with Tribal governments, environmental justice issues, conformity with air quality standards, and impacts to cultural resources and migratory birds. The EPA reviewed the Final EIS and provided comments to the FWS on May 15, 2006.

Response F-1-1

Comment acknowledged. Comment relates the history of the EPA's consideration of the SEIR/SEIS and no specific response is necessary.

Comment F-1-2

Based on our review of the DSEIS, we have rated the Preferred Alternative and the document as LO-1, Lack of Objections – Adequate (see the enclosed "Summary of EPA Rating Definitions"). The Preferred Alternative would result in the issuance of a Major Amendment to the approved Coachella Valley MSHCP to include the City of Desert Hot Springs and Mission Springs Water District as Permittees of the Plan. Since the City of Desert Hot Springs was previously a Permittee, and was, therefore, included in the analyses prepared for the Draft and Final EISs, and the limited Covered Activities proposed for the Mission Springs Water District have been adequately addressed in the DSEIS, we have no objections to this action.

Response F-1-2

This comment relates to the review of the Draft SEIR/SEIS and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) rating of LO-1 (Lack of Objections – Adequate). The commenter's statement that they have no objections to the action is noted.

This comment also provides a brief summary of the addition of the City of Desert Hot Springs (DHS) and Mission Springs Water District (MSWD) as Local Permittees to the CVMSHCP and is not related to the adequacy of the SEIR/SEIS analysis. No specific response is necessary.

Comment F-1-3

We recommend that the Final SEIS include a section devoted to climate change. This section should contain not only a description of anticipated climate change impacts to Covered Species—and the habitats on which they depend—over the MSHCP permit term, but also the efforts that would be taken to minimize or mitigate these impacts. The EPA believes that the long duration of the permit term (75 years), and the extreme warming anticipated to occur in the planning area, warrants the inclusion of a climate change mitigation and adaptation plan in the MSHCP.

Response F-1-3

This comment makes the recommendation to include a section in the Final SEIR/SEIS devoted to climate change. An overview of climate change science and a general discussion of conservation planning for species and vegetation types in relation to climate change is presented in Appendix I of the CVMSHCP (2007), Section 3.0, Conservation Planning, Subsection 3.2.2.3, Key Concepts, Climate Change (page A1-28 to A1-30). This discussion concludes with the following: "So, by including geographically distinct sites, the multiple sites criterion will include the range of conditions a given species inhabits today. As the climate changes in the future, there is a possibility that the habitat at one or more sites will become unsuitable for a target species. But preserving multiple sites in this manner will increase the likelihood that some refugia for each of the species will be maintained if climatic conditions change over time." To provide an updated analysis of the effects of climate change on Covered Species and habitat communities in relation

to the Covered Activities and Conservation Objectives of the Plan, a Climate Change section has been added to the Final SEIR/SEIS. Please refer to Section 4.1.4, Final SEIR/SEIS.

Comment F-1-4

We appreciate the opportunity to review this DSEIS, and are available to discuss our comments. When the FSEIS is released, please send one CD copy to this office (specify Mail Code CED-2). If you have any questions, please contact me at 415-972-3521, or contact Jason Gerdes, the lead reviewer for this project. Mr. Gerdes can be reached at 415-947-4221 or gerdes.jason@epa.gov.

Response F-1-4

Comment acknowledged; comment is not related to the adequacy of the SEIR/SEIS. As requested, the Coachella Valley Conservation Commission (CVCC) will send a copy of the Final SEIS/SEIR on CD to the EPA, Region IX office located in San Francisco, California.

Regional, County, and City Agency Comments and Responses

Comment Letter R-1

Comment R-1-1

Thank you for providing the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) with a copy of the Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Major Amendment, whereby the City of Desert Hot Springs and Mission Springs Water District would be added to the list of participating Permittees of the Plan, and the Plan area boundaries would be amended to include areas within the City of Desert Hot Springs. This proposal will have no effect on airports or the

Response R-1-1

Comment acknowledged. The comment is not related to the adequacy of the SEIR/SEIS analysis and no specific response is necessary.

Comment R-1-2

within the City of Desert Hot Springs. This proposal will have no effect on airports or the safety of air navigation, and there are no Airport Influence Areas within the City of Desert Hot Springs. Therefore, we have no objections to, or comments regarding, this proposal.

Response R-1-2

This commenter states that the proposed Major Amendment will have no effect on airports or the safety of air navigation, and that there are no Airport Influence Areas within DHS. This commenter's lack of objection to the CVMSHCP Major Amendment is noted.

Tribal Government Comments and Responses

Comment Letter TG-1

Comment TG-1-1

The Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians appreciates your observance of Tribal Cultural Resources and their preservation in your project. The information provided to us on said

Response TG-1-1

Comment acknowledged. The comment is not related to the adequacy of the SEIR/SEIS and no specific response is necessary.

Comment TG-1-2

Resources and their preservation in your project. The information provided to us on said project(s) has been assessed through our Cultural Resource Department, where it was concluded that although it is outside the existing reservation, the project area does fall within the bounds of our Tribal Traditional Use Areas. At this time the Soboba Band

Response TG-1-2

Comment acknowledged. The CVMSHCP Major Amendment Draft SEIR/SEIS does not present supplemental information regarding cultural resources. As stated in Section 1.6 of the Draft SEIR/SEIS (page 1-11), "Based on the analysis contained in the Initial Study Checklist and comments received, it was determined that the SEIR/SEIS should focus on biological resources, land use, socioeconomic and fiscal impacts, and traffic and circulation." Cultural resources are addressed and analyzed in the approved 2007 Recirculated EIR/EIS in the following sections: Section 3.9, Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns; Section 4.9.2, Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns; Section 5.4, Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns for the Proposed Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains Trails Plan; Section 9.9, Cumulative Impacts to Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns; Section 10.5, Cultural Consultants/Trails Plan; and Appendix F, Cultural Resources Background Report.

Comment TG-1-3

within the bounds of our Tribal Traditional Use Areas. At this time the Soboba Band does not have any specific concerns regarding this project, but wishes to defer to the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians.

Response TG-1-3

This comment refers to no specific concerns with the CVMSHCP Major Amendment and states that this tribal government will defer to the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians

Comment Letter TG-2

Comment TG-2-1

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has reviewed the above referenced project. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA 42 U S C 4321-43351) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S C 470 et seq) and 36 CFR Part 800 14(b) require consultation with culturally affiliated Native American tribes to determine if the proposed project may have an adverse impact on cultural resources. To adequately comply with this provision and mitigate project-related impacts on archaeological resources, the Commission notes the following

Contact has been made to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for

- A list of appropriate and culturally affiliated Native American Contacts for consultation concerning the project site has been provided and is attached to this letter
- A Sacred Lands File search did identify Native American traditional cultural places or properties.
  Note that lack of additional surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence once ground-breaking activity begins. If that occurs, the NAHC suggests that inadvertent discoveries of human remains comply with California Health & Safety Code 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and coordinate with the NAHC. Federal NAGPRA will apply. A Native American elder may be the only source of cultural data.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me

Sincerely,

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

cc Mr. Tom Kirk
Coachella Valley Conserv. Comm.
73-710 Fred Waring Dr. Suite 200
Palm Desert CA 92260

Native American Contacts
Riverside County
September 16, 2013

Cabazon Band of Mission Indians
Doug Welmas, Chairperson
84-245 Indio Springs Parkway Cahuilla
Indio , CA [redacted]
(760) 342-2593
(760) 347-7880 Fax

Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians
Shane Chapparosa, Chairman
P.O. Box 189 Cahuilla
Warner , CA 92086
(760) 782-0711
(760) 782-2701 - FAX

Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
Joseph Hamilton, Chairman
P.O. Box 391670 Cahuilla
Anza , CA 92539
admin@ramonatribe.com
(951) 763-4105
(951) 763-4325 Fax

Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians
Mary Resvaloso, Chairperson
PO Box 1160 Cahuilla
Thermal , CA 92274
mresvaloso@torresmartinez.
(760) 397-0300
(760) 397-8146 Fax

Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians
Darrell Mike, Chairperson
46-200 Harrison Place Chemehuevi
Coachella , CA 92236
lthomas@29palmsbomi-nsn.gov
760-863-2444

760-863-2449 - Fax

Joseph R. Benitez (Mike)
P.O. Box 1829 Chemehuevi
Indio , CA 92201
(760) 347-0488
(760) 408-4089 - cell

Colorado River Indian Tribe
Wayne Patch, Sr. ,Chairman
26600 Mojave Road Mojave
Parker , AZ 85344 Chemehuevi
crit.museum@yahoo.com
(928) 669-9211-Tribal Office
(928) 669-9970 ext 21
(928) 669-1925 Fax

Fort Yuma Quechan Indian Nation
Keeny Escalanti, Sr., President
PO Box 1899 Quechan
Yuma , AZ 85366
qitpres@quechantribe.com
(760) 572-0213
(760) 572-2102 FAX

Native American Contacts
Riverside County
September 16, 2013

AhaMaKav Cultural Society, Fort Mojave Indian
Linda Otero, Director
P.O. Box 5990 Mojave
Mohave Valley AZ 86440
(928) 768-4475
LindaOtero@fortmojave.com
(928) 768-7996 Fax

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
Daniel McCarthy, M.S.., Director-CRM Dept.
26569 Community Center. Drive Serrano
Highland . CA 92346
(909) 864-8933, Ext 3248
dmccarthy@sanmanuel-nsn.gov
(909) 862-5152 Fax

Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians
John Marcus, Chairman
P.O. Box 391820 Cahuilla
Anza . CA 92539
(951) 659-2700
(951) 659-2228 Fax

Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians
Matthew Krystal, Cultural Resources Manager
P.O. Box 1160 Cahuilla
Thermal . CA 92274
mkrystal@tmdci-nsn.gov
760) 397-0300,
(760) 409-2967 - cell
(760) 397-8146 Fax

Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
Mary Ann Green, Chairperson
P.O. Box 846 Cahuilla
Coachella . CA 92236
(760) 398-4722
760-369-7161 - FAX

Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
Jeff Grubbe, Chairperson
5401 Dinah Shore Drive Cahuilla
Palm Springs. CA 92262
jtmgpc@aguacaliente-nsn.gov
(760) 325-3400
(760) 325-0593 Fax

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
William Madrigal, Jr.,Cultural Resources Manager
12700 Pumarra Road Cahuilla
Banning . CA 92220 Serrano
(951) 201-1866 - cell
wmadrigal@morongo-nsn.gov
(951) 572-6004 Fax

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Robert Martin, Chairperson
12700 Pumarra Road Cahuilla
Banning . CA 92220 Serrano
(951) 849-8807
(951) 755-5200
(951) 922-8146 Fax

Native American Contacts
Riverside County
September 16, 2013

Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians THPO
Patricia Garcia, Tribal Historic Perservation Officer
5401 Dinah Shore Drive Cahuilla
Palm Springs, CA 92264
ptuck@aguacaliente-nsn.gov
(760) 699-6907

(760) 699-6924- Fax

Ah-Mut-Pipa Foundation
Preston J. Arrow-weed
P.O. Box 160 Quechan
Bard , CA 92222 Kumeyaay
ahmut@earthlink.net
(928) 388-9456

Cahuilla Band of Indians
Luther Salgado, Chairperson
PO Box 391760 Cahuilla
Anza , CA 92539
Chairman@cahuilla.net
760-763-5549
760-763-2631 - Tribal EPA

Ernest H. Siva
Morongo Band of Mission Indians Tribal Elder
9570 Mias Canyon Road Serrano
Banning , CA 92220 Cahuilla
siva@dishmail.net
(951) 849-4676

Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians
Anthony Madrigal, Jr, THPO Officer
46-200 Harrison Place Chemehuevi
Coachella , CA 92236
amadrigal@29palmsbomi-nsn.gov
760-863-2444
760-625-7672-cell
760-863-2449 - Fax

Response TG-2-1

This commenter's information regarding a list of culturally affiliated Native American Contacts and information on a Sacred Lands File search is noted. The CVMSHCP Major Amendment Draft SEIR/SEIS does not present supplemental information regarding cultural resources. As stated in Section 1.6 of the Draft SEIR/SEIS (page 1-11), "Based on the analysis contained in the Initial Study Checklist and comments received, it was determined that the SEIR/SEIS should focus on biological resources, land use, socioeconomic and fiscal impacts, and traffic and circulation." Similar to the 2007 recirculated EIR/EIS, this SEIR/SEIS does not analyze the potential impacts of Covered Activities on cultural resources, nor does it supplant other requirements that Covered Activities might be subject to regarding environmental analysis, including cultural resource surveys, through their environmental review and approval process. Any required mitigation would be determined through that process. Therefore, while Covered Activities would be provided Take Authorization with approval of the proposed Major Amendment, they would remain subject to existing applicable regulations for the assessment of potential impacts to cultural and other environmental resources under CEQA/NEPA review. As such, potential impacts to cultural resources due to implementation of the proposed Major Amendment would have a less than significant effect on cultural resources and Native American concerns. Additionally, Cultural resources are discussed in the approved 2007 Recirculated EIR/EIS in the following sections: Section 3.9, Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns, which includes a section on documentation of cultural resources; Section 4.9.2, Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns; Section 5.4, Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns for the Proposed Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains Trails Plan; Section 9.9, Cumulative Impacts to Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns; Section 10.5, Cultural Consultants/Trails Plan; and Appendix F, Cultural Resources Background Report.

Interested Parties Comments and Responses

Comment Letter IP-1

Comment IP-1-1

> **The Desert Valleys Builders Association would like the Commission and those reviewing the *draft Supplemental EIR/EIS* regarding the *Major Amendment to the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan* to know that we fully support the intent and implementation of the CVMSHCP and the Major Amendment.**

Response IP-1-1

This commenter's support of the CVMSHCP Major Amendment is appreciated.

Comment Letter IP-2

Comment IP-2-1

> Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above document. These comments are submitted on behalf of the Sierra Club and the Center for Biological Diversity. The Sierra Club is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to the conservation and preservation of the nation's natural resources. The Sierra Club represents members who reside in San Bernardino, Imperial and Riverside Counties. The Sierra Club and its members utilize the natural, scenic and biological resources of the Coachella Valley through their corporate and individual activities including scientific research, planning, education, and recreation. The Center for Biological Diversity ("Center") is a non-profit environmental organization dedicated to the protection of native species and their habitats through science, policy, and environmental law. The Center has over 48,000 members throughout California and the western United States, including in Imperial and Riverside Counties.
>
> The Sierra Club and the Center have a keen interest in ensuring that the sensitive biological resources within the proposed Major Amendment area that both groups have fought to protect through the years are adequately preserved and protected. We believe that having the DHS of Desert Hot Springs ("DHS") and the Mission Springs Water District ("MSWD")participate in the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Natural Community Conservation Plan ("CVMSHCP") has the potential to ensure the preservation and protection of these resources. However, the CVMSHCP must contain the appropriate conservation measures for all resources within the proposed Major Amendment ("Proposed MA") area, and the SEIR/SEIS must address all impacts of the proposed MA over time. Accordingly, these comments address relevant issues in the proposed MA to the CVMSHCP and the draft SEIR/SEIS.

Response IP-2-1

Comment acknowledged. The comment generally discusses the adequacy of the SEIR/SEIS analysis as an introduction to more specific-comments to follow in the letter, and no specific response is necessary as those comments are addressed in more detail below.

Comment IP-2-2

> **The purpose of the MSHCP is to obtain Take Authorization (Take Permits) pursuant to FESA and the NCCP Act for Covered Activities in the Coachella Valley while balancing environmental protection with regional economic objectives and simplifying compliance with the State and Federal Endangered Species Acts and other applicable laws and regulations. (Proposed MA, page 1-2) "Covered activities" generally means "development", including the construction of homes and businesses, but can also include water facilities including:**
>
> > **"[N]ew projects approved pursuant to ... water ...management plans...**
> >
> > ***Public facility construction, operations, and maintenance and safety activities by the Permittees for existing and future facilities, including both on and off site activities.* Such facilities include, but are not limited to... water development, production, storage, treatment, and transmission facilities; sewage treatment and transmission facilities; reclaimed water storage and transmission facilities[.]" (Proposed MA, page 7-1, emphasis in original)**

Response IP-2-2

As stated in Section 4.1 (page 4.1-13) of the Draft SEIR/SEIS, groundwater withdrawal is not a Covered Activity. "Covered Activities for MSWD would not include groundwater extraction and therefore, no direct impacts to sensitive species or associated Habitats related to such activity would occur as a result of the Major Amendment." The quoted text from Section 7.1 refers to Covered Activities including water development and production. Water development and production involves the installation of wells, reservoirs, underground pipelines and other structures. The ground disturbance associated with development of these facilities is a Covered Activity; the amount of ground disturbance resulting from the proposed Covered Activities listed for MSWD in Table 2-2 of the Draft SEIR/SEIS (page 2-8) was analyzed and described in Section 4.1.4. However, groundwater withdrawal is not a Covered Activity and Take of Covered Species that may result from the operations of groundwater wells is not authorized under this Major Amendment. In order to clarify, language has been added to CVMSHCP Section 7.1 (Covered Activities Outside Conservation Areas, page 7-1) to identify that groundwater withdrawal is not a Covered Activity as follows, "Public facility construction, operations (not including groundwater withdrawal), and maintenance and safety activities by the Permittees for existing and future facilities, including both on and off site activities."

It should also be noted that this Major Amendment does not provide project-level approval of the Covered Activities. Rather, the action analyzed in this SEIR/SEIS is the amendment of the existing CVMSHCP to include Desert Hot Springs and MSWD as Permittees to the Plan and authorize additional Take under the existing permit associated with Desert Hot Springs and MSWD Covered Activities. The approval of the Major Amendment is not a commitment of the

CVCC, CVAG, or the Permittees to a definite course of action regarding proposed Covered Activities or the groundwater withdrawal that the commenter is concerned about, which may or may not be proposed by MSWD in various unknown variations. At the time a Covered Activity is proposed, an analysis of the impacts of all of the aspects of that project (construction ground disturbance, as well as operational impacts, such as those from groundwater pumping) will be conducted pursuant to CEQA. During the CEQA/NEPA review process, the project must demonstrate consistency with the CVMSHCP in order for Take coverage under the Plan to be allocated for the Covered Activity. If the CEQA/NEPA analysis determines Take of a federal or state listed species would occur from the non-covered portions of that project (e.g., from groundwater withdrawal), a separate Take authorization would be required and additional mitigation proposed to offset that Take. Therefore, the issues raised in this comment will be addressed when there is an actual project proposal to be analyzed.

Notwithstanding the fact that mitigation for groundwater impacts is not required at the present time by CEQA, there are various features of the Major Amendment that will contribute to the overall goals and objectives of the CVMSHCP. For instance, as a Permittee, MSWD will be required to minimize and mitigate impacts of Covered Activities to the maximum extent practicable. As noted in the Final SEIR/SEIS (page 1-2), MSWD will be responsible to ensure that the Conservation Goals and Objectives of the Plan are met. They will also sign the Implementing Agreement and by so doing agree to all the obligations of a Permittee, including ensuring compliance with the required Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures as outlined in Section 4.4 of the CVMSHCP, committing to the conservation measures for the acres they own in the Conservation Areas, abiding by the terms and conditions of the permits, and completing the obligations described in Section 6.6.1 of the CVMSHCP.

Comment IP-2-3

> It therefore appears that the Plan includes "operations" and "production" of water facilities such as wells. However, according to the SEIR/SEIS, the covered activities specifically do not include groundwater withdrawal, even though groundwater withdrawal could be considered part of "operations" and/or "production" of water, and even though groundwater withdrawal is linked to the health of mesquite hummocks, one of the natural communities protected under the CVMSHCP. (SEIR/SEIS, page 4.1-15) This is an ambiguity within the Proposed MA language that should be resolved.

Response IP-2-3

As stated on page 4.1-13 of the Draft SEIR/SEIS, groundwater withdrawal is not a Covered Activity. However, indirect impacts from groundwater withdrawal related to proposed operations and production of water facilities or activities such as water development, production, storage, treatment, and transmission facilities within Conservation Areas, including mesquite hummocks

Conservation Areas could occur. As discussed in Response IP-2-2, while groundwater withdrawal is not included as a Covered Activity, the CVMSHCP does require protection, conservation, and management of 348 acres of the mesquite hummocks natural community. To ensure protection of the mesquite hummock natural community and associated Covered Species within Conservation Areas, Covered Activities for all Permittees, including MSWD, will be reviewed during the Joint Project Review (JPR) process as described in the CVMSHCP Major Amendment, Section 6.6.1.1. As stated in the Major Amendment Implementing Agreement, Section 7.5, Review of Development Proposals in Conservation Areas (page 18), "As set forth in Section 4.3 of the MSHCP, Development in Conservation Areas will be limited to uses that are compatible with the Conservation Objectives for the specific Conservation Area. Discretionary Projects in Conservation Areas, other than second units on parcels with an existing residence, shall be required to assess the project's ability to meet the Conservation Objectives in the Conservation Area. Additionally, the Permittees will participate in the Joint Project Review Process set forth in Section 6.6.1.1 of the MSHCP." Furthermore, as outlined in Response IP-2-2, any specific projects that either individually or cumulatively impact groundwater resources and thus, indirectly, mesquite hummocks, would be subject to additional mitigation requirements under CEQA/NEPA and the state and federal ESAs (to the extent that groundwater withdrawal results in impacts meeting the definition of Take).

Moreover, long-term management of groundwater in this area is being implemented through a cooperative effort among the three water agencies with jurisdiction in the Mission Creek subbasin, Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD), Desert Water Agency (DWA), and MSWD The January 2013 *Mission Creek and Garnet Hill Subbasins Water Management Plan: Final Report* ("Water Management Plan") was developed as a result of a settlement agreement among these three water agencies. The Water Management Plan is available at: http://www.cvwd.org/news/publicinfo/2013_07_10_MissionCreekGarnetHillWMP-FinalReport-Sections.pdf. MSWD and CVWD both operate production wells within the Mission Creek subbasin in the vicinity of the mesquite hummocks. Figure 2-1 of the Water Management Plan (page 2-3) shows the boundaries for MSWD and CVWD; some of the mesquite hummock areas occur within the MSWD boundary; the remaining mesquite hummocks occur within the CVWD boundary.

To meet the goals of the Water Management Plan, an objective to eliminate long-term groundwater overdraft will be implemented by maintaining 2009 groundwater levels to the extent practicable based on water supply availability by 2015. (see Water Management Plan, page ES-9, Section on Water Management Objectives). One of the primary ways to accomplish stabilization of the groundwater is through recharge, as is being done at the facility constructed in 2002, located northwest of the mesquite hummock areas. According to the Water Management Plan, "groundwater levels in the subbasin have increased since 2003 as a result of artificial recharge activities (including normal and advanced deliveries) coupled with reduced pumping."

Water levels in a MSWD well located 0.5 miles south of the recharge facility have increased as much as 250 feet since 2004 and MSWD wells further south of the recharge facility show increases of 20 to 50 feet (see page 4-19, Water Management Plan). As shown in Figure 4-2, on page 4-13 of the Water Management Plan, an increase in groundwater storage in the Mission Creek subbasin has occurred between 2005 and 2010, demonstrating that natural and artificial recharge, and other factors such as reduced pumping, benefit groundwater levels, including groundwater levels near mesquite hummocks. The Water Management Plan (page ES-6, Section on Water Resources: Mission Creek Subbasin) indicates that, "Water level declines in wells farthest from the recharge facility began to stabilize around 2008 due to normal and advanced recharge water deliveries coupled with reduced pumping and are beginning to show slight increases." Both 2010 and 2011 were years of above average advanced delivery of water to the Mission Creek subbasin. Through the Water Management Plan, MSWD, in cooperation with CVWD and DWA, has adopted an objective to manage the Mission Creek and Garnet Hill subbasins to eliminate long-term overdraft (Water Management Plan, see page 6-1, Section on Water Management Objectives).

In addition, CVCC is responsible for implementing measures to monitor and manage groundwater levels as part of the monitoring and management of the mesquite hummock natural community. Although groundwater withdrawal is not a Covered Activity, protection of the mesquite hummock natural community and associated species is required under the CVMSHCP and all Permittees are responsible for contributing to that effort. Section 8.4.1 of the Plan addresses the management of aeolian sand communities, including mesquite hummocks, and describes a management goal "to maintain or increase groundwater levels so that mesquite hummocks can be maintained in extent and can regenerate" (page 8-47 of the Final Recirculated Plan). Section 8 also calls for an evaluation of water requirements, the source of water to support mesquite restoration or enhancement, and the relationship with groundwater levels. It states that if natural and human-induced impacts on this resource are to be mitigated, the relationship between hydrologic conditions and the health and reproduction of the native mesquite hummocks needs to be quantified. Provisions to assist in this monitoring and management have been included in the MSWD obligations (Draft SEIR/SEIS, pages 4.1-14 through 4.1-17). At the present time, there are not adequate monitoring wells in the vicinity of the mesquite hummocks. The link between groundwater and mesquite health needs to be better understood, especially in sites such as Willow Hole where depth to groundwater varies widely in the fault area. In the Mojave and Sonoran deserts (including the Coachella Valley), rainfall may be insufficient to provide adequate surface soil moisture for mesquite to survive.[1,2] Mesquite hummocks are

[1] Mission Springs Water District (MSWD). 2004. *Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Mission Springs Water District.* 900 Zone Project. MSWD. February.
[2] Sosobee, R.E. and C. Wan. 1989. Plant Ecophysiology: A Case Study of Honey Mesquite. *In*: A. Wallace, E.D. MacArthur, M.R. Haferkamp (compilers). Proceedings – Symposium on Shrub Ecophysiology and Biotechnology; 1987 June 30-July 2. Logan, UT. USDA, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-256.

associated with shallow water tables,[3,4] and reductions in water availability can reduce the extent of these natural communities or cause compositional shifts from more mesic to more xeric species.[5,6,7] Other research indicates mesquite are flexible in their water use and can switch more readily between water sources than some species, depending on environmental conditions[8]. This points to the need for more research to understand the sources of water mesquite depend on. This is a research question to be addressed in monitoring the mesquite hummock natural community. A specific management objective to "maintain or increase groundwater levels so that mesquite hummocks can be maintained in extent and can regenerate," was included in Section 8.4.1.1 of the Management and Monitoring Program section of the Plan. Adaptive Management of the community would be triggered if monitoring indicates the necessity for management actions to ensure the health and persistence of mesquite hummocks in the Conservation Areas where this natural community exists. If natural and human-induced impacts on this resource are to be mitigated, the relationship between hydrologic conditions and the health and reproduction of the native mesquite hummocks should be further quantified. The monitoring wells provided by MSWD as one of their obligations through this Major Amendment will provide the necessary additional groundwater data needed to evaluate the health of the mesquite (plant characteristics) and its relationship to hydrologic/groundwater conditions.

Comment IP-2-4

> **Regardless, the covered activities that are included have the potential to indirectly impact groundwater, because such development will lead to a greater demand for groundwater withdrawal, and therefore groundwater withdrawal is a reasonably foreseeable consequence of development, and the proposed MA, and needs to be addressed within the proposed MA and the SEIR/SEIS.**

Response IP-2-4

This comment refers to the potential for indirect impacts to groundwater levels due to development that could lead to groundwater withdrawal and the need to address these impacts in the Major Amendment to the Plan and the Draft SEIR/SEIS. At the outset, it must be emphasized that the impacts from groundwater production are not impacts of the Major Amendment (see Response IP-2-2). Furthermore, the impacts mentioned in this comment are even more attenuated

[3] Jarrell, W.M. and R.A. Virginia. 1990. "Soil Cation Accumulation in Mesquite Woodland: Sustained Production and Long-term Estimates of Water Use and Nitrogen Fixation." *Journ. of Arid Environ.* 18:51-58.
[4] Nabhan, G.P. 2001. Mesquite as a Mirror - Mesquite as a Harbor. http://www.spmesquite.com/articles/mirror.html.
[5] Rood, S.B. and J.M. Mahoney. 1990. Collapse of Riparian Poplar Forests Downstream of From Dams in Western Prairies: Probable Causes and Prospects for Mitigation. *Envir. Mgmt.* 14:451-464.
[6] Stromberg, J.C. 1993. "Riparian Mesquite Forests: a Review of their Ecology, Threats and Recovery Potential." *Journ. of Arizona Nevada Academy of Sciences.* Vol. 27.
[7] Stromberg, J.C. and D.T. Patten. 1990. "Riparian Vegetation Instream Flow Requirements: A Case Study From a Diverted Stream in the Eastern Sierra Nevada, California." *Envir. Mgmt.* 14:185-194.
[8] http://www.tucson.ars.ag.gov/salsa/archive/publications/ams_preprints/snyder.PDF; http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1365-2435.2003.00739.x/pdf

from the Major Amendment, since the comment speculates that the operation of new MSWD facilities will spur new development, resulting in further demands for groundwater. Such impacts are likewise not impacts specifically of the Major Amendment, as described in Response IP-2-2. The argument that the availability of these facilities to pump groundwater will spur development and therefore more groundwater production is also circular and speculative. Lastly, it is not clear that future demand from development will be met specifically with increased groundwater production, as opposed to additional conservation or development of other water sources, and therefore this assumption is not supported and is speculative.

Notwithstanding the fact that such impacts are not properly addressed pursuant to CEQA at the present time, there are some measures and provisions associated with the CVMSHCP that would generally apply and are relevant. For instance, measures to monitor and manage groundwater levels and withdrawals are addressed in the Major Amendment to the Plan, the Implementing Agreement, and the Final SEIR/SEIS. Management and conservation of aeolian sand communities, which include mesquite hummock natural communities, is addressed in Section 8.4.1 of the Major Amendment to the Plan. Monitoring and adaptive management specific to mesquite hummocks is addressed in Section 8.4.1.2, where habitat enhancement and restoration activities to support mesquite communities and groundwater levels are addressed. Specific restoration to be conducted within the Willow Hole Conservation Area is also included in the MSWD obligations described in Section 6.6.1 of the CVMSHCP. The CVMSHCP also provides for protection of mesquite hummocks through a "no net loss" requirement (see Section 8.2.4.1) and conservation objectives that require protection of specific acreages of this natural community. USFWS Special Terms and Condition #27 states, "The CVCC shall ensure that the mesquite hummocks Natural Community will be subject to a "no net loss" requirement within Conservation Areas as described in Section 8.2.4.1 of the Plan. The CVCC shall ensure that all no net loss requirements are implemented within 10 years of impacts, including providing suitable or potential habitat for Covered Species if such habitat is affected or lost due to Covered Activities."

To address groundwater levels related to the health of mesquite hummocks, inclusion of MSWD as a Permittee will enhance our ability to monitor this natural community as described in Section 8.4.1.3.1 of the CVMSHCP on Landscape Level Monitoring. All of the information and data necessary to effectively manage and maintain the mesquite hummocks natural community are not currently available. MSWD will provide data on water levels in the Willow Hole Conservation Area, specifically for the "fault dunes" and associated mesquite hummocks west of Palm Drive. They will also provide technical expertise on the hydrology of the area that would otherwise have to be obtained by CVCC at an additional cost to the CVMSHCP. MSWD will also provide funds to be used to install water monitoring wells or other means of gathering data on groundwater levels related to mesquite hummocks that is critical to the analysis and not currently available.

Implementation of the Water Management Plan will complement the efforts under the CVMSHCP to insure maintenance of mesquite. Mesquite hummocks are identified as one of the environmental issues that need to be addressed to meet the objectives of the Water Management Plan (see Section 5, page 5-17); the Water Management Plan also identifies the need to construct monitoring wells near mesquite hummocks (page 7-23). It also recognizes the CVMSHCP and states in reference to CVWD, and MSWD once the Major Amendment is complete, that "Local permittees agree to conserve identified land within the CVMSHCP reserve system, fund an endowment for monitoring and mitigation programs and comply with other terms of the CVMSHCP." (page 5-17). As previously described, through the Water Management Plan, MSWD and other water agencies are addressing stabilization of the groundwater, which will benefit mesquite hummocks.

As described in the Water Management Plan, MSWD has a strong record of water conservation. MSWD promotes awareness of the need to protect the groundwater through its Groundwater Guardians education program. MSWD actively promotes water efficient landscaping through outreach and education to its customers. As described in the Water Management Plan, MSWD's 2010 per capita water use was below its projected target and is considerably lower than per capita water use outside the MSWD boundaries (see pages 5-15 and 5-16, Section on Demand Issues: Conservation).

The Monitoring Program includes a study to evaluate and manage water levels in the mesquite hummock communities as described in Section 8.4.1.3.2, Natural Community Level Monitoring, of the CVMSHCP. Therefore, the relationship between mesquite hummocks and groundwater will be evaluated on an ongoing basis through the CVMSHCP Monitoring Program. As stated in section 8.4.1.3.2 of the CVMSHCP Major Amendment (page 8-55), "The objectives of this research will include, (1) to monitor the plant characteristics and hydrologic conditions of mesquite hummocks in the Coachella Valley; (2) to determine the source(s) of water utilized by the mesquite; and (3) to relate vegetation health and reproduction to varying hydrologic conditions in the Coachella Valley. The study involves compiling existing vegetation and hydrologic data as GIS [geographic information system] layers, coordination with CVWD on ground-water level data they collect from existing wells, and monitoring plant characteristics and hydrologic conditions at the sites including Willow Hole, Thousand Palms, East Indio Hills, Indio Hills Palms, and Dos Palmas Conservation Areas. Additional support and information in the Willow Hole Conservation Area will be provided by MSWD. The water-level trends from these sites are compared to precipitation and pumping trends to help determine the natural and/or human-induced impacts on the groundwater system. The GIS will be updated on an annual basis with the data collected by other agencies during this study. These data will be used in conjunction with the hydrologic data to determine if there is a correlation between the health of the mesquite and the hydrologic properties at the site (depth to water and soil moisture).

Persistence of the mesquite trees will be monitored to determine if there is a relationship between water-table depth, soil moisture, and reproduction."

As stated in the Draft SEIR/SEIS, Section 4.1 (page 4.1-14), "the Monitoring and Adaptive Management Program will include the use of appropriate methods and technologies (which may change over time) to monitor groundwater levels in the Willow Hole, East Indio Hills, and Thousand Palms Conservation Areas where a substantial lowering of the water table could have a significant adverse impact on mesquite hummocks and associated Covered Species. Should monitoring detect a substantial lowering of the water table or a decline in mesquite health, the following actions will be taken by the CVCC: 1) evaluate the results of the monitoring, including in relation to proposed Covered Activities, 2) prepare a damage assessment report, 3) develop effective measures to ameliorate the direct and indirect effects of substantial lowering of the water table on mesquite hummocks and associated Covered Species, and 4) implement effective measures through Adaptive Management." The underlined text has been added to the Final SEIR/SEIS to provide clarification regarding the actions to be taken. The following clarification has been added to the SEIR/SEIS (pages 4.1-14 to 4.1-15) to ensure that direct and indirect impacts from groundwater withdrawal are addressed: "Furthermore, if Permittees propose Covered Activities within the Willow Hole Conservation Area, the impacts to the mesquite hummock Natural Community shall be addressed during the Joint Project Review process. MSWD, as a Permittee, will limit the installation of new wells within the fault zone associated with mesquite hummock natural communities, in the area east of Little Morongo Road and south of 18th Avenue, until the development and implementation of a mesquite restoration plan (described in Section 4.1, page 4.1-15) is completed."

As stated in the Draft SEIR/SEIS, Section 4.1 (page 4.1-14), in addition to the required avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures and land use adjacency guidelines, MSWD will also implement the following measures. Even though already included in the SEIR/SEIS, these obligations will be added to Section 6.6.1 of the Plan should the Major Amendment be adopted (see Errata to Plan). In response to the concerns of the commenter, measure 6 has been modified as noted below:

1. A contribution of $110,000 toward the Endowment Fund for the Monitoring Program, the Management Program, and Adaptive Management. This contribution will provide for the permanent monitoring and management of MSWD lands in the Conservation Areas in perpetuity as required by the CVMSHCP, including removal of invasive species and monitoring of mesquite hummocks. CVCC would also assume responsibility for the monitoring and management of those lands transferred by MSWD in perpetuity as a result of MSWD's contribution to the Endowment Fund. Prior to transfer of lands to CVCC, MSWD will cooperate with CVCC to enhance and manage the mesquite hummocks on land it owns in the Conservation Areas to mitigate and provide for the Conservation of impacts to this natural community from MSWD's operation and management activities in

the CVMSHCP Conservation Areas. The MSWD contribution to the CVCC Endowment Fund will also support management and monitoring of mesquite hummocks on other CVCC lands additional to those transferred to CVCC by MSWD.

2. With regard to the CVMSHCP requirements to maintain the mesquite hummock natural community, MSWD agrees to provide, as available: 1) data on water levels in the Willow Hole Conservation Area, the "fault dunes," and associated mesquite hummocks east and west of Palm Drive; 2) water samples for a study of stable isotopes in mesquite tissue for use by the CVCC Monitoring Program team; 3) historical photographs or aerial imagery of the mesquite hummock areas in the Willow Hole Conservation Area that would help document changes from current conditions; 4) technical expertise of MSWD staff, or consultants as appropriate, in coordination with the CVCC Monitoring Team. MSWD is willing to provide any and all relevant data they have available to CVCC; however, MSWD does not have facilities that will provide needed data near the mesquite hummocks habitat. Additional facilities will be required to collect data on groundwater levels near the hummocks habitat. MSWD will also provide funds to be used for water monitoring wells or other means of gathering data on groundwater levels related to mesquite hummocks. The determination of how to best accomplish this monitoring, including placement of wells, will be made in coordination with the CVCC staff, CVCC Monitoring Team, Wildlife Agencies, relevant Reserve Management committees, other relevant Permittees, and MSWD staff. These data and support from MSWD will enhance understanding of the hydrological regimes that support mesquite hummocks in the CVMSHCP area and provide baseline data for the ongoing monitoring of mesquite hummocks. The District will provide funds to support monitoring and analysis of groundwater levels in the amount of $120,000.

3. To improve the water available to mesquite hummocks, MSWD will provide funds to CVCC to be used for the removal of non-native tamarisk from the Willow Hole Conservation Area in the amount of $100,000 to cover the costs of tamarisk removal from approximately 30 acres of conservation lands. CVCC will ensure that removal of tamarisk occurs on lands controlled by CVCC or other public or private conservation lands.

4. MSWD will contribute $20,000 to the cost of a study being conducted by CVCC of the feasibility of mesquite restoration and development of a mesquite restoration plan. CVCC has initiated this study with creation of a constraints analysis detailing site conditions where current stands of mesquite are now absent (but were extant within the past century), declining, or are currently doing well (defined by leaf area, fruit production and other relevant variables). MSWD will contribute to the mesquite study plan that will detail the location, water requirements, and monitoring and management responsibilities, including funding, for this mesquite restoration effort. CVCC will provide the final study to the Wildlife Agencies for review and approval.

5. CVCC is responsible for evaluating the relationship between mesquite hummocks and groundwater through the Monitoring Program. MSWD will contribute to and participate in this research for the mesquite hummock areas within their district boundary. The objectives of this research will include: (1) to monitor the plant characteristics and hydrologic conditions of mesquite hummocks in the Coachella Valley; (2) to determine the source(s) of water utilized by the mesquite; and (3) to relate vegetation health and reproduction to varying hydrologic conditions in the Coachella Valley. The study will involve compiling existing vegetation and hydrologic data as GIS layers, coordination with MSWD on groundwater level data they collect from existing wells, and monitoring plant characteristics and hydrologic conditions at the sites including Willow Hole. The water-level trends from these sites can be compared to precipitation and pumping trends to help determine the natural and/or human-induced impacts on the groundwater system. The GIS will be updated on an annual basis with the data collected by other agencies during this study. These data will be used in conjunction with the hydrologic data to determine if there is a correlation between the health of the mesquite and the hydrologic properties at the site (depth to water and soil moisture). Persistence of the mesquite trees will be monitored to determine if there is a relationship between water-table depth, soil moisture, and reproduction.

6. If the study undertaken by the CVCC demonstrates the decline of mesquite hummock areas in the Willow Hole Conservation Area, MSWD will work with CVCC, the Wildlife Agencies, and other relevant Permittees to identify and implement a plan to enhance, restore, and maintain the mesquite hummocks natural community and to address changed circumstances, identified in the CVMSHCP, that affect this natural community as a part of their CVMSHCP implementation activities. As is required of all Permittees, MSWD commits to participate in additional measures that will result from the CVMSHCP Adaptive Management Plan analysis to the extent that measures are consistent with what is required of other Permittees. ~~reasonable, feasible, and within the resources of the District.~~ Further, MSWD confirms that the goals of the 2013 Water Management Plan prepared in cooperation with CVWD and Desert Water Agency are consistent with the objectives of the CVMSHCP to manage the groundwater resource in perpetuity for the benefit of mesquite hummocks and the species that depend on this natural community.

As stated in Section 4.1 of the Final SEIR/SEIS (page 4.1-14), a Water Management Plan has been prepared by MSWD, CVWD, and the DWA (Water Management Plan, 2013). At the request of MSWD, models were developed that include expected natural inflow and recharge and artificial recharge at the existing Mission Creek recharge ponds, as well as existing and anticipated future groundwater withdrawals. This Water Management Plan is focused on stabilizing the water levels in the Mission Creek subbasin. As a Permittee, MSWD will be responsible for providing data and technical expertise regarding the models and other information to help CVCC understand the ecology of mesquite hummocks related to

groundwater. CVCC will use this information to manage and monitor the groundwater levels in relation to the Conservation Areas with any proposed Covered Activities in these areas. These data will inform management activities and contribute to the Adaptive Management process to be used in the conservation of natural mesquite hummocks communities.

Comment IP-2-5

> Mesquite hummocks provide habitat for several species, including crissal thrasher, yellow bats and Coachella Valley round-tailed ground squirrels. According to the SEIR/SEIS, mesquite along the western extent of the mesquite hummocks between Mission Creek and Morongo wash appear to be dying. (SEIR/SEIS, page 4.1-13). This is "likely due to artificially lowered groundwater levels in the subbasin" (Proposed MA, page 10-46) The Willow Hole Conservation Area "contains the largest concentration of mesquite hummocks in the CVMSHCP Area" and the "[g]roundwater level north of the fault dunes plays an important role in maintaining the mesquite hummocks natural community in this Conservation Area" (Proposed MA, page 4-73). Even though a

Response IP-2-5

Comment acknowledged. The comment is not related to the adequacy of the SEIR/SEIS analysis and no specific response is necessary.

Comment IP-2-6

> community in this Conservation Area" (Proposed MA, page 4-73). Even though a decline in the health of the mesquite hummocks in the Willow Hole Conservation Area has been observed, the proposed MA provides no conservation objectives directly related to maintaining the groundwater levels for the mesquite hummocks in this Conservation Area. (Proposed MA, Pages 4-72 to 4-75) Neither does the proposed MA provide any specific "required measures" related to restoration of the mesquite, limiting groundwater withdrawal, limiting the proximity of new wells to the fault zone, or to preventing the lowering of groundwater levels north of the fault dunes in this Conservation Area[3]. (Proposed MA, Pages 4-77 to 4-82)

Response IP-2-6

The commenter states that the Major Amendment does not provide for specific required measures related to restoration of the mesquite, limiting groundwater withdrawal, limiting the proximity of new wells to the fault zone, or preventing the lowering of groundwater levels north of the fault dunes in the Willow Hole Conservation Area. As stated in Response IP-2-2 and elsewhere in this document, such measures are not required pursuant to the requirements of CEQA at the present time because those impacts are outside of the scope of the present project, which is the Major Amendment. Even though the Major Amendment does not cover

groundwater withdrawal, there are some measures that are detailed in the SEIR/SEIS and the CVMSHCP Major Amendment that address this activity indirectly. For instance, conservation measures directly related to maintaining groundwater levels for mesquite hummocks in the Willow Hole Conservation Area are outlined in the Final SEIR/SEIS, Section 4.1 (pages 4.1-15 to 4.1-16) as part of additional MSWD conservation obligations and will also be added to Section 6.6.1 of the Plan for consistency (see Errata to Plan). A Specific obligation related to restoration of the mesquite hummock Natural Community is obligation number 3, which states that MSWD will provide $100,000 for non-native tamarisk removal in the Willow Hole Conservation Area to improve water availability to mesquite hummocks. Non-native tamarisk uses significant quantities of water, which is therefore not available to mesquite or other native plants that are part of the mesquite hummocks natural community. This obligation states, "To improve the water available to mesquite hummocks, MSWD will provide funds to CVCC to be used for the removal of non-native tamarisk from the Willow Hole Conservation Area in the amount of $100,000 to cover the costs of tamarisk removal from approximately 30 acres of conservation lands. CVCC will ensure that removal of tamarisk occurs on lands controlled by CVCC or other public or private conservation lands."

The Draft SEIR/SEIS states that the hydrological regime that supports the mesquite hummocks in the Mission Creek subbasin is not well understood. As such, specific restoration measures for the mesquite in this area are not well understood and are currently being explored by CVCC and MSWD at this time. MSWD conservation obligation number 4 (page 4.1-15), which will be added to Section 6.6.1 of the Plan, specifically addresses mesquite restoration. Obligation number 4 requires that MSWD will also contribute $20,000 to the cost of a study being conducted by CVCC of the feasibility of mesquite restoration and development of a mesquite restoration plan. The draft mesquite restoration study and restoration plan was submitted on October 31, 2013. MSWD will contribute to and participate in CVCC's research evaluating the relationship between mesquite hummocks and groundwater for the mesquite hummock areas within their district boundary. To address the decline of mesquite hummock areas in the Willow Hole Conservation Area, MSWD will work with CVCC, the Wildlife Agencies, and other relevant Permittees to identify and implement a plan to enhance, restore, and maintain the mesquite hummocks natural community and to address changed circumstances, identified in the CVMSHCP, that affect this natural community as a part of their CVMSHCP implementation activities." The data and technical expertise to be provided by MSWD if they become a Permittee is essential to development and implementation of this plan.

Concerns regarding groundwater withdrawal and preventing lowering of groundwater levels in mesquite communities are addressed in the Draft SEIR/SEIS, as discussed in Response IP-2-4.

Additionally, to address concerns regarding direct and indirect impacts from groundwater withdrawal within the Willow Hole Conservation Area, the following clarification has been added to the SEIR/SEIS (pages 4.1-14 to 4.1-15, see Final SEIR/SEIS): "Furthermore, if Permittees propose Covered Activities within the Willow Hole Conservation Area, the impacts to the mesquite hummock Natural Community shall be addressed during the Joint Project Review process. MSWD, as a Permittee, will limit the installation of new wells within the fault zone associated with mesquite hummock natural communities, in the area east of Little Morongo Road and south of 18th Avenue, until the development and implementation of a mesquite restoration plan (described in Section 4.1, page 4.1-15) is completed."

Comment IP-2-7

> Instead, the proposed MA provides a "wait and see" approach to whether the lowering of the groundwater table will continue to contribute to the declining health of the mesquite hummocks, including the mesquite hummocks in the Willow Hole Conservation Area, which it may possibly treat as a "changed circumstance". Section 6.8.3.4 discusses lowering the water table as a changed circumstance only if there is "an increase in the depth to groundwater that significantly affects water availability to mesquite plants in the Willow Hole, East Indio Hills, or Thousand Palms Conservation Areas." If lowering of the groundwater table occurs, and if the mesquite plants are impacted, then Adaptive Management actions will be taken to "ameliorate the effects of substantial lowering of the water table" as a "Changed Circumstance". (Proposed MA, page 6-41 and page 9-236) These are ultimately subjective measures and provide no clarity or assurance to the public of what the trigger actually would be for a "Changed Circumstance" and additional review. This also seems to indicate that significant damage to mesquite hummocks in these Conservation Areas must occur first in order to demonstrate that a Changed Circumstance has occurred. Only once the damage has occurred, the Proposed MA promises to develop "feasible measures to ameliorate the effects". Whether there are, in fact, feasible measures is the subject of a study now underway, which is "in progress" but was "delayed". (2012 Year End Monitoring Report, Page 29) As of today, it is not clear if any measures to ameliorate the effects of groundwater lowering are, in fact, feasible and therefore proposing a process which allows these fragile and rare natural communities to be damage *before* any conservation measures are taken does not provide the needed protection required in the CVMSHCP under State or Federal law.

Response IP-2-7

This comment refers to the definition of Changed Circumstances as it relates to lowering of the water table and its impacts on mesquite communities. The definition provides a general threshold of a lowered water table that will be refined based on information obtained through monitoring by the CVCC Monitoring Program. Rather than allowing significant damage to occur to mesquite hummocks in the Conservation Areas, the intent of the Major Amendment Changed Circumstances for lowering of the water table is to provide early detection of lowered

groundwater levels through the Monitoring Program activities. As stated in the Major Amendment, Section 6.8.3.4, Preventive Measures (page 6-45), "This monitoring program increases the probability of early detection of a substantial lowering of the water table. Early detection improves the chances of successfully addressing any threat posed by a substantial lowering of the water table. Should monitoring detect such a substantial lowering, appropriate Adaptive Management actions will be taken." Please refer to Responses IP-2-3, IP-2-4 and IP-2-6, which address measures that ameliorate the effects of groundwater lowering to protect sensitive mesquite hummock communities, and also Response IP-2-2, which describes that groundwater impacts from groundwater withdrawal are not covered under the Major Amendment and that mitigation under CEQA is not required in this SEIR/SEIS.

That being said, the CVCC is not taking a wait and see approach but is actively investigating the status of the mesquite hummock Natural Community. The study of mesquite hummocks is currently in progress as part of the Monitoring Program. Through the Monitoring Program, a more accurate mapping of the distribution and extent of the mesquite has been completed. As part of the Major Amendment process, a review of the measures that could be taken to restore and enhance mesquite hummocks was completed. During this process, the need to remove non-native tamarisk was identified as an important restoration action. The need for additional data was also identified as critical to our ability to identify measures and establish triggers that can be used to monitor the health and sustainability of this natural community. The obligations of MSWD to provide data and funding for monitoring wells located in close proximity to the mesquite hummocks is essential to this evaluation.

As noted in previous comments (see IP-2-3), MSWD is involved in a plan to stabilize the groundwater at 2009 levels through a variety of measures identified in the Water Management Plan. As a result of actions taken by local water agencies, recharge of the groundwater is occurring with a goal of eliminating groundwater overdraft (Water Management Plan, page 6-1). Management and protection of the groundwater is an important goal for MSWD as their ability to provide water to their customers depends on a reliable supply of groundwater. Existing pumps may no longer function as groundwater levels decline below the level where water is currently extracted through pumping; the financial investment necessary to drill deeper to obtain water is significant. MSWD has a vested interest in protecting and enhancing the groundwater that goes beyond the requirements of the CVMSHCP.

The inclusion of MSWD as a Permittee of the CVMSHCP has benefits in terms of the maintenance, restoration, and enhancement of mesquite hummocks. Coordination with MSWD, CVWD and other water agencies as they implement the Water Management Plan, including the objective to eliminate groundwater overdraft, is expected to benefit the protection of mesquite hummocks. Data to be provided by MSWD will fill gaps in our knowledge of the hydrological regimes, soil conditions and other elements necessary to maintain mesquite hummocks. The additional data collected will clarify and help define the Adaptive Management needs for

mesquite. These data would otherwise have to be obtained by CVCC at an additional cost. The funding to be provided by MSWD to remove non-native tamarisk will help restore the natural hydrological regime associated with mesquite by removing the high water using tamarisk trees that currently dominate some of the mesquite areas. As a non-Permittee, MSWD is not obligated to participate or contribute to mesquite hummock protection. They currently have the ability to withdraw groundwater without any specific mitigation requirements related to Covered Species and natural communities. As there are no endangered species which are completely dependent on mesquite hummocks, requirements for mitigation are considerably less than under the CVMSHCP. As a Permittee, MSWD is required to work with CVCC to ensure the long-term maintenance of the mesquite hummock Natural Community.

Comment IP-2-8

> **Mesquite hummocks are important for several species. Chapter 9 of the Proposed MA mentions the need to evaluate the impacts of groundwater management on crissal thrasher Habitat, and on yellow bat Habitat, particularly in mesquite areas. (Proposed MA, pages 9-159 and 9-224) Chapter 9 also indicates that preservation of mesquite hummocks for Coachella Valley round-tailed ground squirrel is "desirable" (Proposed MA, page 9-236). Therefore, we question whether the current wait and see approach with regard to the lowering of the groundwater table within the Proposed MA provides adequate conservation measures to deal with the declining health of mesquite hummocks, especially within the Willow Hole Conservation Area.**

Response IP-2-8

This comment provides a summary of the importance of mesquite hummock habitat for various sensitive species. As discussed in Responses IP-2-2 and IP-2-6, mitigation for groundwater withdrawal impacts are not required under CEQA as groundwater withdrawal is not a Covered Activity under the Major Amendment. Any impacts from that activity would be addressed in future CEQA and/or NEPA analyses. However, general measures addressing groundwater withdrawal are included in the Major Amendment and SEIR/SEIS for the purposes of full disclosure. Conservation measures that address the health of the mesquite hummocks occurring within Conservation Areas, including the Willow Hole Conservation Area, are discussed in the Major Amendment, as outlined in Response IP-2-7, and in the Final SEIR/SEIS, as outlined in Responses IP-2-4 and IP-2-6. As described in Response IP-2-7, monitoring and evaluation of the status of the mesquite hummock Natural Community has been underway since 2011. The study of mesquite hummocks currently in progress has identified critical restoration and information needs that will be addressed through the Major Amendment and the participation of MSWD as a Permittee under the CVMSHCP.