

1 remains discovered on the site; and establishing on-site monitoring
2 provisions and/or requirements for professional Tribal monitors
3 during all ground-disturbing activities. A copy of this signed
4 agreement shall be provided to the Planning Director and Building
5 Official prior to the issuance of the first grading permit.

- 6 d. 5.5-4: Prior to issuance of a grading permit (any ground-disturbing
7 activity), the Project applicant(s) shall include the following
8 wording on all construction contract documentation:

9 "If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety
10 Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur
11 until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings
12 as to origin. Further, pursuant to California Public Resources
13 Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free
14 from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and
15 disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner
16 determines the remains to be Native American, the Native
17 American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within a
18 reasonable time frame. Subsequently, the Native American
19 Heritage Commission shall identify the "most likely descendant"
20 within 24 hours of receiving notification from the Coroner. The
21 most likely descendant shall then have 48 hours to make
22 recommendations and engage in consultations concerning the
23 treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code
24 Section 5097.98".

- 25 e. 5.5-5: Prior to grading permit final, trenching and other ground-
26 disturbing construction activities associated with the sewer and
27 water line improvements along existing roadways shall be
28

1 monitored for the presence of buried prehistoric or historic features
2 and sites.

3 f. 5.5-6: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Project shall
4 comply with the provisions and recommendations of the PRIMP in
5 order to monitor, identify, and preserve any paleontological
6 resources encountered during ground disturbance activities.

7 E. Geology and Soils

8 1. Impacts:

9 According to the 2012 Geo Report, one moderate to weak lineament
10 trending N5-10W, and two weak lineaments, one also trending N5-10W and
11 one trending N15-20E are located on the Project site. It was concluded in
12 the 2012 Geo Report that the lineaments noted on-site are associated with
13 ancient geologic features, contacts, and localized jointing/dike trends and
14 not associated with active on-site Holocene faulting. No impacts are
15 anticipated due since these lineaments are not active and no mitigation is
16 required. The off-site Project components will not be located within active
17 faults, nor within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. No impacts are
18 anticipated and no mitigation is required.

19 According to the 2012 Geo Report, there is a potential for seismic activity.
20 With the incorporation of mitigation measures, the potential for liquefaction
21 or seismically-induced dynamic settlement is considered low in the areas
22 proposed for development at the site. Impacts are considered less than
23 significant with mitigation incorporated. No additional mitigation is
24 required. An extremely limited portion of the off-site sewer facilities and
25 natural gas facilities will be located in an area identified as "very low" for
26 liquefaction. Compliance with Mitigation Measures, as well as adherence to
27 the standard design criteria for the installation of these facilities shall insure
28

1 that any Project impacts will remain less than significant. No additional
2 mitigation is required.

3 The possibility of ground shaking at the site may be considered similar to
4 the southern California region as a whole. The site is situated in an area of
5 active as well as potentially-active faults. Even though the Project will be
6 subject to strong seismic ground shaking, with the incorporation of
7 mitigation measures, and the exposure of people or structures to potential
8 substantial adverse effects (including the risk of loss, injury, or death), these
9 will be greatly minimized. Any Project impacts will be considered less than
10 significant and no additional mitigation is required. Due to the proximity of
11 the off-site water and sewer lines to the Colinas del Oro site, it can be
12 anticipated that the same faulting and seismicity hazards discussed above
13 would apply to the off-site Project components. Based on a review of the
14 RCLIS, the off-site Project components will not be located within active
15 faults, nor within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Any impacts
16 will be mitigated through standard design and installation requirements
17 required by the water, sewer and gas agencies. No additional mitigation is
18 required.

19 It is anticipated that Project components are not likely located on a geologic
20 unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the
21 Project, and potential result in on, or off-site landslide, lateral spreading
22 collapse, or rockfall hazards, or be located on a geologic unit or soil that is
23 unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and
24 potentially result in ground subsidence. In terms of the off-site reservoir, it
25 is not possible to prevent some damage to a reservoir during groundshaking,
26 but it is possible to avoid a catastrophic failure if a release of the water in a
27 reservoir can cause significant harm to surrounding land uses. Mitigation
28

1 measures have been included to reduce any impacts from tank failure to a
2 less than significant level. In addition, compliance with mitigation
3 measures, as well as adherence to the standard design criteria for the
4 installation of the Project components shall insure that any Project impacts
5 will remain less than significant. No additional mitigation is required.

6 Surface water affecting the site is primarily limited to precipitation. Runoff
7 water from seasonal storms, which is not retained by either vegetation or
8 soil, moves down-gradient via the natural incised drainage
9 canyons/channels onsite. Site development plans will require provisions for
10 adequate control and disposal of surface water. Mitigation has been
11 included to address the surface water. In addition, mitigation measures are
12 included in the Hydrology and Water Quality Subchapter of the Draft EIR.
13 Due to the potential for the introduction of stormwater pollutants directly
14 into the local groundwater table, stormwater basins will need to
15 be sealed/lined. Stormwater basins should not be located over the Good
16 Hope and San Jacinto "Claim" line and/or large shaft opening areas, and/or
17 at the toe of descending structural fill slopes. These have also been added as
18 Project design mitigation measures.

19 With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, any impacts will be
20 reduced to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is required.
21 Seeps, springs, or other indications of a high regional groundwater level
22 were not noted on the subject property. Based on the available data, the
23 depth to the regional groundwater table is estimated at greater than ± 43 feet.
24 However, groundwater was encountered at depths as shallow as ± 13 feet in
25 previous excavations conducted at lower elevations onsite. Perched
26 groundwater onsite may also occur along the contact between the bedrock
27 and fill materials, or along discontinuities, foliation, jointing, and/or
28

1 fractures due to migration from adjacent drainage areas and development
2 during and/or after periods of above normal or heavy precipitation or
3 irrigation. Below the local water table, groundwater has likely collected
4 within the previous shaft and stoped areas of the old mine workings that
5 have not yet collapsed or been in-filled in the past. Inasmuch as rapid draw-
6 down of the water table would cause a sudden change in the stress field
7 conditions within the mine, pumping groundwater for irrigation or other
8 purposes is not recommended. Mitigation measures have been included to
9 address these potential impacts. With the inclusion of these mitigation
10 measures, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level. No
11 additional mitigation is required.

12 Due to the relatively shallow bedrock that underlies the site, the potential
13 for subsidence does not exist on-site. Therefore, the potential for this
14 phenomena to affect the site is considered low. No features generally
15 associated with areal subsidence (i.e., radially-directed drainages flowing
16 into a depression(s), linearity of depressions associated with mountain
17 fronts, etc.) have been observed on-site. Based on this information
18 (contained in the 2012 Geo Report) there is no information that active
19 faulting or excessive groundwater withdrawal, or ground fissures, or
20 hydroconsolidation in the specific site vicinity, is occurring at this time.
21 Therefore, the potential for areal subsidence or ground fissures is deemed
22 low. A mitigation measure has been included to require compliance with
23 the recommendations contained within the 2012 and 2014 Geo Reports.
24 Compliance with the provisions contained in the 2012 and 2014 Geo Report
25 will provide the mitigation needed to reduce impacts to a less than
26 significant level. No additional mitigation is required. Only a small portion
27 of the off-site sewer and natural gas facilities will be located in an area
28

1 identified as “susceptible” to subsidence. No other areas are identified that
2 could impact the off-site Project components.

3 In terms of the off-site reservoir, it is not possible to prevent some
4 damage to a reservoir if subsidence occurs, but it is possible to avoid a
5 catastrophic failure if a release of the water in a reservoir can cause
6 significant harm to surrounding land uses. A mitigation measure has been
7 included to reduce any impacts from tank failure to a less than significant
8 level. In addition, compliance with mitigation measures, as well as
9 adherence to the standard design criteria for the installation of the off-site
10 facilities shall insure that any Project impacts will remain less than
11 significant. No additional mitigation is required.

12 Indications of significant mass wasting phenomena on the site were not
13 observed during review of stereoscopic photographs of the area or during
14 site reconnaissance field mapping. Mitigation measures have been included
15 to address these potential impacts. With the incorporation of these
16 mitigation measures, any impacts will be reduced to a less than significant
17 level. The potential for mass wasting phenomena to affect the site and the
18 potential for seismically induced landsliding will be considered low. No
19 additional mitigation is required. Based on the locations for the off-site
20 Project components; either within existing roadways, existing right-of ways
21 or adjacent to similar structures, it is anticipated that the potential for both
22 mass wasting phenomena and for seismically induced landsliding to be
23 considered low. However, to ensure that any potential impacts are reduced
24 to a less than significant level, adherence to mitigation measures will be
25 required to address any potential impacts. With the incorporation of these
26 mitigation measures, any impacts will be reduced to a less than significant
27 level. The potential for mass wasting phenomena to affect the off-site site
28

1 Project components will be considered low. No additional mitigation is
2 required. Implementation of the Project will result in a change to the
3 topography or ground surface relief features, and will create cut or fill
4 slopes. No slopes greater than 2:1 are proposed. Grading activities will
5 initially dominate the construction environment. It is anticipated that
6 blasting, overexcavation, and/or line shooting will be necessary for bedrock
7 cuts and utility corridors across much of the western portion of the site. A
8 mitigation measure has been added to address these geological conditions
9 that will be encountered during grading on-site. Any impacts will be
10 considered less than significant after mitigation. A mitigation measure will
11 require Project compliance with the "Fill Placement" and "Rock Placement
12 Guidelines" contained in the 2012 Geo Report or the 2014 Geo Report, if
13 applicable. Compliance with these Guidelines will reduce any Project
14 impacts to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is required.
15 There is the potential for differential settlement within transition lots, non-
16 uniform subgrade soils, and perched water conditions. A mitigation measure
17 has been added to address these geological conditions that will be
18 encountered during grading on-site. Any impacts will be considered less
19 than significant after mitigation. A mitigation measure has been added to
20 address slope stability. Any impacts will be considered less than significant
21 after mitigation.

22 Due to the nature and locations of the off-site Project components, they are
23 anticipated to make minimal changes to the topography or ground surface
24 relief features and will most likely not create cut or fill slopes greater than
25 2:1 or higher than 10 feet. Due to the proximity of these off-site Project
26 components proximity to the Colinas del Oro site, they will be required to
27 comply with the applicable sections and recommendations contained in the
28

1 2012 Geo Report, or 2014 Geo Report, if applicable. Compliance with these
2 Guidelines as well as adherence to the standard design criteria for the
3 installation of these facilities will reduce any Project impacts to a less than
4 significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

5 The expansion potential of the on-site earth materials is generally very low
6 to medium. Based on engineering analyses, post-tensioned foundations will
7 be recommended for engineered fills with low expansive materials.
8 Mitigation measures have been included to address the potential for
9 expansive soils. Adherence to these mitigation measures will reduce
10 impacts to a less than significant level.

11 No additional mitigation is required.

12 Based on the locations for the off-site Project components; either within
13 existing roadways, existing right-of ways or adjacent to similar structures, it
14 is anticipated that they are located on an expansive soil, as defined in
15 SECTION 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating
16 substantial risks to life or property to be considered low. However, to
17 ensure that any potential impacts are reduced to less than significant level,
18 adherence to a mitigation measure will be required to address any potential
19 impacts. With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, any impacts
20 will be reduced to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is
21 required.

22 Implementation of the Project may result in potential impacts that could
23 result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; change deposition,
24 siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel or stream or bed of a lake;
25 result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site; or be impacted
26 by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off
27 site. Impacts to these resources are discussed in great detail in Section 5.9
28

1 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the DEIR. Mitigation has been proposed
2 that would reduce Project impacts to a less than significant level. No
3 additional mitigation is required.

4 Cumulatively, development of the Project will be affected by geotechnical
5 constraints on the property. None of the future Project-related activities are
6 forecast to cause offsite changes in geology or soils or the constraints
7 affecting the Project area. Therefore, the Project has no potential to make a
8 cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant geology or soils
9 impact.

10 2. Mitigation:

11 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
12 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

- 13 a. 5.6-1: Prior to grading permit final, removal of all undocumented
14 artificial fill, colluvium/topsoil, younger alluvial deposits, and the
15 surficial weathered older alluvial-channel deposits and bedrock
16 materials will be necessary prior to fill placement. On a preliminary
17 basis, remedial grading is estimated to consist of the removal of the
18 upper ± 2 to ± 20 feet, or greater, of undocumented artificial fill,
19 potentially compressible native soils and/or weathered surficial older
20 alluvium/bedrock materials, below existing grades.
- 21 b. 5.6-2: Due to the potentially compressible and collapsible nature of
22 Quaternary Alluvium - Younger soils, they are considered
23 unsuitable for support of structures and/or improvements in their
24 existing state and therefore, will be needed to be removed and
25 recompacted, in areas proposed for development, prior to grading
26 permit final.

- 1 c. 5.6-3: Topsoil/Colluvium soils shall be removed and recompactd,
2 if not removed by planned excavation, should settlement sensitive
3 improvements be proposed within their influence, prior to grading
4 permit final.
- 5 d. 5.6-4: The weathered near surface (upper ± 2 to ± 3 feet) channel
6 deposits of Quaternary Very Old Alluvial-Channel Deposits are
7 unsuitable for support of settlement sensitive improvements in their
8 existing state, and will require removal and recompactd, if not
9 removed by planned excavation, prior to grading permit final.
- 10 e. 5.6-5: The weathered near surface (upper 1 to ± 2 feet) of the
11 bedrock is unsuitable for support of settlement-sensitive
12 improvements, and will require removal and recompactd, if not
13 removed by planned excavation, should settlement-sensitive
14 improvements be proposed within their influence, prior to grading
15 permit final.
- 16 f. 5.6-6: The Project site will be subject to strong seismic ground
17 shaking and will expose people or structures to potential substantial
18 adverse effects. The Project design and construction shall comply
19 with the recommendations contained within the 2012 Geo Report, or
20 the 2014 Geo Report, if applicable, as it pertains to strong seismic
21 ground shaking, prior to grading permit issuance.
- 22 g. 5.6-7: Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the reservoir,
23 the developer shall obtain a geotechnical study that addresses the
24 maximum amount of acceleration forecast from the maximum
25 credible earthquake; incorporate this information into the design of a
26 new reservoir. The design must prevent a catastrophic tank failure,
27 yet allow stored water to be released in a controlled manner that can
28

1 be captured on the site and conveyed to a nearby stream channel or
2 drainage facility.

3 h. 5.6-8: Debris/impact walls and/or diversion devices should be
4 constructed, where reentrant canyons intercept the proposed
5 development and/or cut slopes. The actual location and need for
6 such devices would best be evaluated at the 40-scale plan stage,
7 prior to the issuance of a grading permit, when design grades are
8 semi-finalized or finalized. The effects of surface flooding should be
9 evaluated by the design engineer at that time.

10 i. 5.6-9: Due to the potential for the introduction of stormwater
11 pollutants directly into the local groundwater table, stormwater
12 basins will need to be sealed/lined, prior to grading permit final.

13 j. 5.6-10: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, it shall be
14 determined that stormwater basins are not located over the Good
15 Hope and San Jacinto "Claim" line and/or large shaft opening areas,
16 and/or at the toe of descending structural fill slopes.

17 k. 5.6-11: Prior to map recordation, the CC&R's shall indicate the
18 potential for perched groundwater conditions, and this shall be
19 disclosed to all interested/affected parties, homeowners, and any
20 homeowners association.

21 l. 5.6-12: Inasmuch as rapid draw-down of the water table would cause
22 a sudden change in the stress field conditions within the mine,
23 pumping groundwater for irrigation or other purposes shall be
24 prohibited.

25 m. 5.6-13: The potential for areal subsidence or ground fissures is
26 deemed low, except as indicated on Figure 5.6-1. Prior to the
27 issuance of a grading permit, the Project shall comply with the
28

1 recommendations contained within the 2012 Geo Report for those
2 areas identified on Figure 5.6-1, as it pertains to areal subsidence or
3 ground fissures.

4 n. 5.6-14: Should features such as perched boulders, corestones, etc.
5 exist in natural or cut slopes above the proposed residential or
6 commercial development, and not be removed by the proposed
7 grading, then debris/impact walls and/or diversion devices should be
8 constructed, where these features intercept the proposed
9 development and/or cut slopes. The actual location and need for
10 such devices would best be evaluated prior to the issuance of a
11 grading permit, at the 40-scale plan stage, when design grades are
12 finalized and following a supplemental review.

13 o. 5.6-15: Appropriate safety considerations for potential caving and
14 sloughing, such as shoring or layback cuts, should be incorporated
15 into the construction design details, which shall be submitted to, and
16 approved by, the County, in order to assure stability, prior to the
17 issuance of a grading permit.

18 p. 5.6-16: In order to facilitate foundation construction and trenching of
19 utilities, as well as to mitigate rock hardness, overexcavation of cut
20 pads in hard rock areas should be performed to a minimum depth of
21 3 feet below finish grade, or 2 feet below foundations, whichever is
22 greater, and subsequently replaced with properly compacted fill,
23 prior to grading permit final.

24 q. 5.6-17: Oversized materials exist on-site and will be generated
25 during some bedrock excavations, which will require specialized
26 placement techniques during grading. No oversized materials greater
27 than 8 inches in diameter, should be placed within 10 feet of
28

1 finished grade. This will necessitate the need for scraper/dozer pits
2 and/or rockfill blankets if the oversized materials cannot be reduced
3 in size, during grading. Additionally, proper disclosure to all
4 interested/affected parties, homeowners, and any homeowners
5 association, will be required regarding the potential for difficult
6 excavation, hard rock, oversize materials and their hold-down
7 distances from finish grade, etc. Local utility entities may require a
8 more stringent backfill grain size restriction (i.e., less than 4 inches
9 in maximum size), which may require impact or select grading
10 during utility backfill. Prior to grading permit final, the Project will
11 be developed in compliance with the "Fill Placement" and "Rock
12 Placement Guidelines" contained in the 2012 Geo Report.

13 r. 5.6-18: Prior to grading permit final, entire cut areas of affected lots
14 should generally be overexcavated to a minimum depth of 3 feet
15 below finish grade, or 2 feet below the foundation, whichever is
16 greater, and/or a maximum ratio of fill thickness on the lot of 3:1
17 (maximum:minimum), and replaced with compacted fill. The
18 County of Riverside requires that the minimum fill thickness
19 beneath a lot be at least half of the maximum fill thickness on the
20 lot. Removal bottoms should be sloped toward the street, or other
21 approved areas. In areas of hard rock, the overexcavation should be
22 performed such that a minimum 1 percent gradient is maintained
23 toward the front of the lot in order to reduce the potential for the
24 accumulation of water (from irrigation or rainfall) in the fill caps. A
25 minimum of 2 feet of compacted fill is recommended below all
26 foundations.

27 s. 5.6-19: Prior to grading permit final, fill slopes should be properly
28

1 built and compacted to a minimum relative compaction of 90
2 percent throughout, including the slope surfaces. Any cut slopes
3 proposed should be designed at gradients of 2:1 and should not
4 exceed 30 feet in height, without a specific slope stability
5 evaluation. While stabilization of such cut slopes is not currently
6 anticipated, locally adverse geologic conditions (e.g., adverse joints
7 and/or fractures, discontinuities, etc.) may be encountered which
8 may require remedial grading or laying back of the slope to an angle
9 flatter than the adverse geologic condition. In addition, existing
10 natural slopes that remain outside areas of proposed development,
11 may be prone surficial instability, as was noted during our previous
12 investigation of the property (GSI, 2006). These natural slopes
13 should have drainage directed away from their tops and bottoms,
14 and will also require regular and periodic maintenance. General
15 guidelines for slope construction are presented in Appendix E. At a
16 minimum, the proposed slopes should be constructed in accordance
17 with 2010 CBC (CBSC, 2010) requirements. Irrigation of natural
18 slopes is not recommended.

- 19 t. 5.6-20: The post-tensioned slab zone should be delineated or
20 indicated on all grading plans. In addition, based on preliminary
21 evaluation of the proposed finish grade elevations, and the relatively
22 steep subsurface topography on portions of the site, post-tensioned
23 foundations are also specifically recommended for proposed fill
24 areas that equal or exceed about ≥ 25 feet in thickness, at the
25 conclusion of grading. Additional evaluations will be conducted
26 prior to the issuance of a grading permit, at the 40-scale plan stage,
27 when design grades are semi-finalized or finalized.

- 1 u. 5.6-21: Based on engineering analyses, post-tensioned foundations
2 will be recommended for engineered fills with low expansive
3 materials. Expansion Index [E.I.] >21 and <51) exhibiting plasticity
4 indices greater than 15, -200 >10% and medium to medium
5 expansive soils (E.I. 51 to 90). Additional E.I. and Plasticity Index
6 (P.I.) testing should be performed during site development to further
7 evaluate the preliminary test results obtained, prior to grading permit
8 issuance.
- 9 v. 5.6-22: The off-site Project components shall comply with the
10 recommendations contained within the 2012 Geo Report, and 2014
11 Geo Report, where applicable. Additional evaluations will be
12 conducted prior to the issuance of a grading permit, at the 40-scale
13 plan stage, when design grades are semi-finalized or finalized.

14 F. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

15 1. Impacts:

16 Grading operations on the Project site have the greatest potential to create a
17 significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine
18 transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or create a significant
19 hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable
20 upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials
21 into the environment. Air Quality hazards to the public or the environment
22 through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the
23 release of hazardous materials into the environment have been discussed in
24 Section 5.3 of the Draft EIR. The potential impacts anticipated during
25 grading activities are first characterized in a general nature and then
26 described as they relate to the known and identified hazards on the Colinas
27 del Oro Site.

1 Both during construction and once the Project is occupied, the transport of
2 hazardous materials to the Project site can result in additional potential for
3 accidental spills, leaks, or other hazards such as fire or explosion. A primary
4 route to the Project site is expected to be the SR 74. For such transporters,
5 the existing regulatory environment will ensure that the hazardous materials
6 and any hazardous wastes transported to and from the Project site will be
7 properly managed. These regulations are codified in Titles 8, 22, and 26 of
8 the California Code of Regulations. In addition the haulers must comply
9 with all existing applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations
10 regarding transport, use, disposal, handling and storage of hazardous wastes
11 and material. Compliance with these laws and regulations related to
12 transportation will minimize potential exposure of humans or the
13 environment to significant hazards from transport of such materials and
14 wastes. These regulations are considered sufficient to control potential
15 hazards from accidents to a less than significant impact level.

16 All other site specific impacts including possible underground storage
17 tanks, aboveground storage tanks, sumps, clarifiers, pools and pits, stained
18 soils, solid waste, waste water, petroleum products, other chemicals,
19 pesticides, radon, PCB's, Asbestos, lead, landfills, oil wells, blasting were
20 found to be less than significant.

21 Based on the EDR database Federal and State ASTM searches, no
22 properties within 1.25 miles of the center of the site are on the following
23 lists: National Priority List ("Superfund Sites"), Proposed National Priority
24 List, Delisted National Priority List, Department of Defense Sites, Formerly
25 Used Defense Sites, Corrective Action Report, Surperfund Consent Decree,
26 Annual Workplan Sites, Records of Decision, Proposition 65 Records, Cal-
27 Sites, Toxic Pits, California Bond Expenditure Plan, Indian Reservation,
28

1 Manufactured Gas Plants. Neither the Colinas del Oro site or the locations
2 of the off-site Project Components are located on sites which are included
3 on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government
4 Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to
5 the public or the environment. Still, should any hazards or hazardous
6 materials that are unknown at this time be unearthed during construction, a
7 mitigation measure has been included in Section 5.7.5 below, that will
8 reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.

9 Cumulatively, because most hazards are Project specific, they will be
10 mitigated on-site, or within the limits of the off-site Project components.
11 The Project is not forecast to make a cumulatively considerable contribution
12 to site-specific hazards and hazardous material issues. Hazards from the
13 prior mining activities on-site will be addressed on-site. There will be no
14 need to transport hazardous materials off-site. Hazards from the prior
15 mining activities on-site shall be subject to the regulatory oversight of the
16 State of California, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Prior
17 to conducting any on-site grading activities for any implementing project
18 (i.e. subdivision tract map), the County of Riverside, Department of
19 Environmental Health, Environmental Cleanup Programs (DEH-ECP) will
20 be provided with a grading clearance letter issued by DTSC specifying
21 areas which have been cleared for grading and may be issued a grading
22 permit. Upon successful completion of site remediation under DTSC's
23 oversight and established standards, DEH-ECP will be provided a Remedial
24 Action Certification letter issued by DTSC. No grading permits shall be
25 finalized, nor any building permits shall be issued, by the County of
26 Riverside, until DTSC has determined in a "closure/no further action" letter
27 that the required remediation activities have been met. For those potential
28

1 hazards or hazardous material issues with a potential for direct significant
2 impact, mitigation measures have been provided that can reduce the
3 Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.
4 Hazards associated with blasting will be of short duration and mitigated to a
5 less than significant level. No cumulative impacts are anticipated from
6 blasting.

7 As the County grows, the demand for public service resources to respond to
8 hazard and hazardous material grows incrementally. The Project will add to
9 the cumulative demand for such resources. The demand for such resources
10 can only be offset by generation of sufficient funds to pay for such services.
11 According to a Fiscal Impact Analysis for Project prepared by David
12 Taussig & Associates, Inc. at full development the Project will provide
13 sufficient funds to cover the costs of public services provided by the
14 County. Based on this finding, the Project will not make a cumulatively
15 considerable contribution to demand for public service resources that
16 provide hazard and hazardous material responses.

17 2. Mitigation:

18 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
19 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

- 20 a. 5.7-1: Prior to grading permit final, and during construction, should
21 an accidental release of a hazardous material occur, the following
22 actions will be implemented: construction activities in the
23 immediate area will be immediately stopped; appropriate regulatory
24 agencies will be notified; immediate actions will be implemented to
25 limit the volume and area impacted by the contaminant; the
26 contaminated material, primarily soil, shall be collected and
27 removed to a location where it can be treated or disposed of in
28

1 accordance with the regulations in place at the time of the event; any
2 transport of hazardous waste from the property shall be carried out
3 by a registered hazardous waste transporter; and testing shall be
4 conducted to verify that any residual concentrations of the
5 accidentally released material are below the regulatory remediation
6 goal at the time of the event. All of the above sampling or
7 remediation activities related to the contamination will be conducted
8 under the oversight of Riverside County Site Cleanup Program. All
9 of the above actions shall be documented and made available to the
10 appropriate regulatory agencies prior to closure of the contaminated
11 area.

- 12 b. 5.7-2: Prior to grading permit final, if an unknown contaminated
13 area is exposed during construction, the following actions will be
14 implemented: any contamination found during construction will be
15 reported to the Riverside County Site Cleanup Program and all of
16 the sampling or remediation related to the contamination will be
17 conducted under the oversight of the Riverside County Site
18 Program; construction activities in the immediate area will be
19 immediately stopped; appropriate regulatory agencies will be
20 identified; a qualified professional (industrial hygienist or chemist)
21 shall test the contamination and determine the type of material and
22 define appropriate remediation strategies; immediate actions will be
23 implemented to limit the volume and area impacted by the
24 contaminant; the contaminated material, primarily soil, shall be
25 collected and removed to a location where it can be treated or
26 disposed of in accordance with the regulations in place at the time of
27 the event; any transport of hazardous waste from the property shall
28

1 be carried out by a registered hazardous waste transporter; and
2 testing shall be conducted to verify that any residual concentrations
3 of the accidentally released material are below the regulatory
4 remediation goal at the time of the event. All of the above actions
5 shall be documented and made available to the appropriate
6 regulatory agencies prior to closure of the contaminated area.

7 c. 5.7-3: To the extent feasible, the length of time that construction
8 activities occur within the SR 74 right-of-way shall be limited. To
9 the extent that construction activities must occur within the SR 74
10 right-of-way, the Traffic Management Plan prepared for
11 construction activities shall provide adequate emergency access to
12 all parcels of land at all times, and shall include measures to ensure
13 that during an evacuation, the right-of-way is accessible for this
14 purpose. Prior to grading permit issuance, the County shall verify
15 and approve that the construction Traffic Management Plan
16 incorporates adequate measures to ensure emergency access and
17 availability of SR 74 should an evacuation be needed.

18 d. 5.7-4: Prior to grading permit issuance, the underground storage
19 tank shall be removed from the site and the soil in the area and be
20 analyzed for possible contamination. Any work conducted shall be
21 in compliance with guideline set by an oversight agency such as the
22 DEH or the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).

23 e. 5.7-5: If buried drums or any other storage canisters are discovered
24 at the site during future site development, it is recommended that
25 they be documented, properly disposed of offsite, and that the soil
26 around such structures be properly assessed and possibly analyzed
27 for contaminants, prior to grading permit final.
28

- 1 f. 5.7-6: Prior to grading permit final, any remnant mine shafts shall
2 be properly and safely closed at the Project site. This includes
3 identifying and remedying any and all hazards associated with the
4 mine. Any work conducted in the mine area should be in compliance
5 with guideline set by an oversight agency such as the DEH or the
6 Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).
- 7 g. 5.7-7: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, additional site
8 characterization of the tailings shall be conducted to further
9 determine if these wastes are considered hazardous to human health
10 or the environment. All tailings will be specially handled. Any work
11 conducted shall be in compliance with guidelines set by an oversight
12 agency such as the DEH or the Department of Toxic Substances
13 Control (DTSC).
- 14 h. 5.7-8: If any materials are discovered at the site during any future
15 soil moving activities that may contain asbestos, it is recommended
16 that a qualified contractor be contacted to remove such materials.
17 Any work conducted shall be in compliance with guidelines set by
18 an oversight agency such as the DEH or the Department of Toxic
19 Substances Control (DTSC), prior to grading permit final.
- 20 i. 5.7-9: If any materials are discovered at the site during any future
21 soil moving activities that may contain lead, it is recommended that
22 a qualified contractor be contacted to remove such materials. Any
23 work conducted shall be in compliance with guidelines set by an
24 oversight agency such as the DEH or the Department of Toxic
25 Substances Control (DTSC), prior to grading permit final.
- 26 j. 5.7-10: Tailing deposits shall be transported to the proposed
27 commercial area of the site and deposited in an engineered
28

1 underground enclosure, prior to grading permit final. This enclosure
2 should be designed to accomplish the following parameters:

3 1. All pathways where surface or ground water can migrate into
4 and through the tailing deposits will be eliminated. The top
5 of the enclosure which will be entirely water proof will be
6 designed to cause water entering the subsurface to be
7 directed to the edges of the structure and away from the
8 tailings. This will preclude any leaching of heavy metals into
9 the native soils and groundwater;

10 2. All site utilities will be located above the top of the
11 enclosure. This will preclude the need to expose the tailings
12 in the event of a need to repair a utility. Thus, once
13 deposited, there will be no reason for any future personnel to
14 be exposed to the tailing deposits. A deed restriction will
15 be recorded that documents the existence of the enclosure.

16 k. 5.7-11: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a blasting report, shall
17 be submitted to the County as part of the grading plan check review.
18 Said blasting report shall contain, at a minimum, the following
19 information:

- 20 1. Explosive handling
21 2. Chemical exposure
22 3. Compliance with 2010 California Fire Code Chapter 33 and
23 the California Code of Regulations, Title 19, Subchapter 4,
24 Article 6.

25 The following shall be required:

- 26 a. The use and handling of explosives is restricted to
27 permittees, their employees and authorized
28

1 representatives, who shall be at least 21 years of age;
2 however, persons between the ages of 18 and 21
3 years may be permitted to use and handle such
4 explosives if they are under the direct personal
5 supervision of an experienced competent permittee,
6 employee or authorized representative over the age of
7 21 years.

8 b. Smoking shall not be permitted while explosives are
9 being used or handled, and no one within 50 feet of
10 explosives shall possess matches, lighters, open light
11 or other fire or flame. Exception: The lighting of
12 safety fuse in conjunction with approved blasting
13 operations.

14 c. No person shall use or handle explosives while under
15 the influence of intoxicating liquors, or narcotics.

16 d. Authorized containers or Class II magazines shall be
17 used for taking detonators and other explosives from
18 storage magazines to the blasting area.

19 e. When blasting is done in congested areas or in close
20 proximity to a structure, railway, or highway, or any
21 other installation that may be damaged, the blast shall
22 be covered before firing with a mat constructed so
23 that it is capable of preventing fragments from being
24 thrown. Appropriate provisions (water) shall be
25 available in brush areas to extinguish a fire that may
26 occur as a result of blasting operations.

27 f. Persons authorized to prepare explosive charges or
28

1 of mobile radio transmitters on all access
2 roads between 1,000 feet and 3,000 feet of the
3 blasting operations. The sign shall be in
4 contrasting 8 inch letters on a white
5 background and shall read "BLASTING
6 AREA -NO RADIO TRANSMITTING".
7 Signs shall be displayed only at time of
8 blasting.

9 3. No electric blasting shall be done under
10 overhead electric lines, or at such distance
11 where it is possible for the blasting line to be
12 blown in contact with any electric line unless
13 the power in the energized line is shut-off or
14 unless shot blow deflectors, hold downs,
15 mats, logs, or other material are placed over
16 the charge to confine the blast.

17 4. When blasting near overhead electric lines,
18 and when placing the lead and leg wires near
19 these lines, the lead and leg wires shall not be
20 placed parallel to the power line, and they
21 shall be securely anchored.

22 5. Before a blast is fired, the person in charge
23 shall make certain that surplus explosive
24 materials are in a safe place, that persons and
25 vehicles are at a safe distance or under
26 sufficient cover, and that a loud warning
27 signal has been sounded. It shall also be
28

1 water quality in the San Jacinto River Watershed.

2 2. Mitigation:

3 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
4 significant impacts by the following mitigation measure:

- 5 a. 5.8-1: With the exception of the area set aside for as natural open
6 space, prior to grading permit final, future development shall include
7 the construction of all onsite and offsite drainage facilities as
8 required by the County Flood Control and Water Conservation
9 District as described in this Subchapter of the EIR.

10 H. Land Use and Planning

11 1. Impacts:

12 Development of the Project will result in change of the land uses and
13 planning designations of the general Project area. Approval of the Project
14 will cause an intensification of development greater than that which
15 presently occurs on the site and currently in the area. The Project design
16 includes buffers, design standards and design guidelines that will serve to
17 integrate the Project into the Meadowbrook Community. Currently,
18 surrounding development would be characterized as very low density rural
19 residential and small scale rural commercial development along a major
20 east-west transportation corridor (SR 74). Both SR 74 and Ethanac Road
21 (located to the northeast of the proposed Project site) are classified as
22 Expressways on the Circulation Element of the County's General Plan. The
23 right-of-way (ROW) for the Expressway classification is 184'. Based on
24 this ROW, the number of travel lanes on SR 74 would be increased from the
25 current 4-lane configuration. Also, Ethanac Road would be improved,
26 widened, and re-aligned at the intersection of SR 74 to accommodate the
27 anticipated traffic in the County, at buildout, consistent with County
28

1 roadway and intersection development standards. In addition, under the
2 proposed General Plan Update, the character of the immediate vicinity of
3 the proposed Project, on both sides of SR 74 would be altered, based on the
4 recommended land uses. If approved by the Board of Supervisors,
5 approximately 80 acres of Commercial Retail (CR) and 75 acres of Medium
6 High Density Residential (MHDR) would be permitted within up to 1 mile
7 of the proposed Project vicinity, adjacent to SR 74. Utilizing a CR floor
8 area ratio of 0.25 this equates to roughly, 871,000 feet of CR uses. Utilizing
9 the mid-range of the permitted density range of the MHDR designation of
10 6.5 d.u./acre, this equates to roughly 487 dwelling units in the MHDR
11 development fabric, also within up to 1 mile from the proposed Project site.
12 Lastly, according to the proposed General Plan Update, the proposed
13 Project site is being recommended to be developed as Light Industrial (LI).
14 The proposed Project is a mixed use, commercial, residential, recreational
15 and open space project, which will be more compatible with the future
16 development in the area than uses permitted under the LI designation.

17 Cumulatively, the Project will make a considerable contribution to changes
18 within the existing land uses in the Meadowbrook; however, since the water
19 and sewer extensions to the Project will only serve the Project, and, since
20 the Project serves to implement the Rural Village Overlay of the General
21 Plan, these impacts are not considered cumulative.

22 Implementation of the Project will also result in cumulative impacts to the
23 existing zoning; however, the Project will be consistent with the proposed
24 zoning with the approval of the Project's General Plan Amendment,
25 Change of Zone (CZ) and Specific Plan (SP) and will not be considered
26 cumulative for the reasons discussed above.

27 2. Mitigation:
28

1 No mitigation is required for direct project impacts, and no mitigation is
2 available for cumulative impacts related land use and planning resources.

3 I. Mineral Resources

4 1. Impacts:

5 The Project has not been used for mining in recent years. The Project is not
6 expected to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in
7 an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the
8 region or the residents of the State. In addition, since the Project site is
9 designated MRZ-3a, implementation of the Project will not result in the loss
10 of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site
11 delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.
12 According to Figure OS-5, Mineral Resources, of the General Plan, the
13 Project site is not located in a "State Designated Aggregate Resource Area."
14 Any impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is
15 required. The majority of the off-site Project components are located within
16 existing roadways, their right-of-ways, or, adjacent to similar facilities
17 (reservoirs). These off-site Project component areas serve to provide
18 vehicular and pedestrian access, as well as potential for expansion to the
19 roadway surface and or similar facilities. No mining activities occur in these
20 areas and none are either planned or feasible. No significant cumulative
21 impact to mineral resources is anticipated from the implementation of the
22 Project.

23 Mitigation measures have been added to the Project where potential exists
24 to expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or
25 abandoned quarries or mines. With the incorporation of these mitigation
26 measures, any impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

1 No significant cumulative impact is anticipated from the implementation of
2 the Project.

3 2. Mitigation:

4 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
5 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

- 6 a. 5.10-1: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the open test shaft
7 (approximately ±15 feet in depth) should be located and temporarily
8 fenced, prior to clean-out and proper backfill, to keep equipment and
9 construction/field personnel away from the open test shaft, in
10 accordance with CAL/OSHA (2011) requirements.
- 11 b. 5.10-2: Prior grading final permit, any unidentified open test
12 excavations, shafts, or stopes shall be identified and properly filled.
- 13 c. 5.10-3 For shafts, the anticipated remedial measure would consist of
14 the removal of all near surface loose soil and rock within the shaft
15 opening, the placement of a lean concrete slurry plug and/or
16 concrete cap, in-turn capped with a minimum of 5 feet of compacted
17 fill, and incorporating structural setbacks near the shaft opening.
18 These recommendations assume that the shaft is poorly backfilled. If
19 the quality (relative compaction) of the shaft backfill is better
20 than anticipated, these remedial recommendations may be modified
21 somewhat, based on review and approval by the controlling
22 authorities. The preliminary remedial measures for stope areas might
23 consist of, but may not be limited to, backfilling the near surface
24 workings with onsite materials, imported crushed rock, or a lean
25 concrete slurry. All test excavations, shafts, and/or stopes identified
26 onsite, should be surveyed and properly abandoned following local
27 and State requirements and be refined based on the requirements of
28

1 the controlling authorities and conditions exposed in the field prior
2 to and/or during earthwork construction. If additional concealed
3 mine workings or other subsurface structures are uncovered/revealed
4 during grading, prior to grading final permit, they will need to be
5 further evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine what, if any,
6 remedial measures or recommendations, consistent with the
7 Mitigation Measures, are considered warranted.

8 d. 5.10-4: Due to the potential for slope instability, potential problems
9 with required keyway construction, and the potential to disturb
10 proposed sealed shaft/stoped areas, descending slopes greater than
11 15 feet in vertical height should not toe-out on the Good Hope and
12 San Jacinto "Claim" line and/or at large shaft opening areas.
13 Descending slopes within these areas will need to be set-back from
14 the Good Hope and San Jacinto "Claim" line (previously established
15 setback lines) and/or large shaft opening areas by an approximate
16 lateral distance of ± 40 feet. These items shall be addressed prior to
17 grading permit issuance.

18 e. 5.10-5: In addition, all proposed building pads (commercial and
19 residential) will need to be located outside the "restricted zone."
20 Based on the actual surveyed locations of the shaft/stoped areas
21 encountered during the closure of the mine and sealing of the mine's
22 test excavations, shafts, and/or stopes, additional restricted areas
23 and/or shaft setbacks zones may be required. These items shall be
24 addressed prior to grading permit issuance.

25 f. 5.10-6: Due to the potential for settlement and associated distress
26 within the areas where any Project roadways cross the "restricted
27 zone" onsite, should be constructed at high angles in order to
28

1 minimize the amount of damage should settlement occur.
2 Appropriately located up-gradient and down-gradient cut-off valves
3 for the utilities, to facilitate repair, should be incorporated into the
4 design. This shall be addressed prior to grading permit issuance.

5 J. Noise

6 1. Impacts:

7 Construction noise is unavoidable and sensitive land uses adjacent to the
8 Project site or already completed phases within the Project site could
9 potentially be impacted during construction activity. However, the noise
10 would be temporary and limited to the duration of the construction in any
11 one location. Each new phase will temporarily impact adjacent existing
12 residences during construction. However, these temporary impacts will
13 cease once each Project component is completed.

14 These impacts will not be considered cumulatively significant. Off-site
15 existing homes are located sufficiently far from any areas where blasting
16 might be needed as to not create a highly disturbing noise event. If blasting
17 is needed, restriction to the hours of 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. would seem
18 appropriate to minimize public disturbance or interfere with quiet
19 residential activity. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant
20 shall retain a qualified contractor/consultant and have that
21 contractor/consultant prepare a comprehensive Blasting Plan for this
22 grading activity. In addition, with the likely distance separation between
23 any likely blasting location and the existing homes, blasting activity
24 impact potential is less-than-significant and will not be considered
25 cumulatively significant. Project grading plan proposes an 11,000 cubic
26 yards (CY) of earthwork export. Impacts from the off-site material haulage
27 truck trips are expected to be less than significant and no mitigation is
28

1 required. The on-site construction equipment that will create the maximum
2 potential vibration is a large bulldozer or loaded truck. Construction activity
3 vibration impacts are judged as less-than-significant. PA 1, a mixed use area
4 and PA 2 a high density residential area are of particular concern because of
5 their planned proximity to SR 74. As the northern portion of PA 2
6 angles away from SR 74, only a small southeastern portion of this
7 PA 2 is immediately adjacent to SR 74. Although PA 1 shares the
8 eastern property line with SR 74, it is a mixed use parcel, and therefore
9 strategic planning to place the commercial uses adjacent to SR 74 to act
10 as a shield for interior residential structures could provide noise mitigation.
11 Mitigation is provided that will reduce impacts to a less than significant
12 level.

13 Construction of pipelines and stationary facilities will create temporary
14 noise impacts. However, construction noise levels are exempt from local
15 ordinance standards if they occur during allowable hours of lesser noise
16 sensitivity. Linear construction such as pipelines will utilize similar
17 equipment, but will occur primarily in already traveled roadways. Much of
18 the pipeline construction will be within the SR 74 right-of-way where
19 existing traffic noise levels are near 75 dB at 50 feet. Given that pipeline
20 construction will occur for only a few days near any individual receiver and
21 that equipment noise levels would be similar to ambient traffic noise,
22 impacts are considered less-than-significant as long as construction occurs
23 within prescribed hours.

24 Long-term noise concerns from the increase of residential and commercial
25 uses at the Project site are primarily based on vehicular operations on
26 Project area roadways. These concerns were addressed using the California
27 specific vehicle noise curves (CALVENO) in the federal roadway noise
28

1 model (the FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model, FHWA-RD-
2 77-108). The model calculates the Leq noise level for a reference set of
3 input conditions, and then makes a series of adjustments for site-specific
4 traffic volumes, distances, speeds, or noise barriers.

5 Cumulative traffic noise impacts are represented by the difference between
6 future with project and existing noise levels. Again, the largest cumulative
7 traffic noise increase is +1.1 dB CNEL on SR 74 in front of the Project site.
8 Therefore, individual project only traffic noise increases as well as
9 cumulative traffic noise increases are considered to be less-than-significant.

10 2. Mitigation:

11 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
12 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

- 13 a. 5.11-1: For high-noise activities (dumping of ballast materials for
14 example) taking place adjacent to existing sensitive receptors, small,
15 portable noise barriers should be placed near the noise-producing
16 equipment, between the noise source and the receptors. These
17 barriers may be constructed from on-site (for example) from 4-foot
18 by 8-foot sheets of marine plywood (minimum one-inch thickness)
19 or one and one eighth inch (1 1/8") tongue-in-groove sub-floor,
20 backed with three and a half inch thick R-11 fiberglass insulation for
21 sound absorption. Several such panels may be hinged together in
22 order to be self-supporting and to provide a continuous barrier.
- 23 b. 5.11-2: All construction equipment shall be required to minimize
24 noise from construction activities. Equipment mufflers shall be
25 maintained in proper operating order. All equipment shall be
26 operated in the quietest manner feasible.

- 1 c. 5.11-3: To the extent feasible, the noisiest operations shall be
2 scheduled to occur simultaneously in the construction program to
3 avoid prolonged periods of annoyance.
- 4 d. 5.11-4: During construction, best efforts should be made to locate
5 stockpiling and/or stationary noise-generating construction
6 equipment from the property line of existing sensitive receptors,
7 when and where feasible.
- 8 e. 5.11-5: To reduce noise impacts associated with noise-generating
9 construction equipment, temporary diesel-or gasoline-powered
10 generators, and where a portable diesel-or gasoline-powered
11 generator is necessary, it shall have a maximum noise muffling
12 capacity and be located as far as technically feasible placed from
13 noise sensitive uses.
- 14 f. 5.11-6: No music or electronically reinforced speech from
15 construction workers shall be audible at noise-sensitive property.
- 16 g. 5.11-7: All Project workers exposed to noise levels above 80 dBA
17 shall be provided with personal protective equipment for hearing
18 protection (i.e., earplugs and/or earmuffs); areas where noise levels
19 are routinely expected to exceed 80 dBA shall be clearly posted with
20 signs requiring hearing protection be worn.
- 21 h. 5.11-8: If blasting is required, blasts should be restricted to the hours
22 of 8 a.m. to 4 p.m.
- 23 i. 5.11-9: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall
24 retain a qualified contractor/consultant and have that
25 contractor/consultant prepare a comprehensive Blasting Plan for this
26 grading activity, as appropriate, and to the extent blasting required.
27 This plan shall include, at a minimum, the following
28

1 aspects/information:

- 2 1. Type of blasting media to be used (TNT, ANFO, etc.).
- 3 2. Drilling method. Bore hole diameter, depth of bore hole,
- 4 number of holes per shot, stemming, burden, weight/volume
- 5 of explosives, accelerants, fuse types, etc.
- 6 3. Amount of material expected to be produced per blast.
- 7 4. Monitoring plans for blast-induced ground vibrations and
- 8 air overpressure (sound).
- 9 5. Monitoring plans for drilling-induced ground vibrations and
- 10 noise impacts on all uses, including wildlife.
- 11 6. Monitoring plans for potential adverse effects caused by
- 12 blasting relative to slope stability.
- 13 7. Monitoring plans for potential adverse effects caused by
- 14 blasting relative to the hydrologic characteristics of the rock
- 15 body.
- 16 8. Recommendations for minimizing any potential drilling and
- 17 blasting impacts, as appropriate.
- 18 9. All necessary blasting permits.

19 j. 5.11-10: Future traffic noise levels for sensitive uses adjacent to SR
20 74 could result in exterior noise loading is greater than 65 dB
21 CNEL. Mixed Use Planning Area 1 and residential Planning Area 2
22 are both adjacent to SR 74 and sensitive uses within these
23 development areas may be exposed to high traffic noise levels. In
24 order to meet the Riverside County exterior noise compatibility
25 guideline at the closest Project lots under General Plan build-out
26 traffic noise, prior to the issuance of a building permit, one or more
27 of the following mitigation measured will be required to ensure
28

1 residential uses in PA 1 and PA 2 adjacent to the SR 74 are
2 adequately protected from roadway noise sources:

3 1. Sensitive uses adjacent to SR 74 could achieve the 65 dB
4 CNEL noise contour by setting homes further than the
5 setback distances at least 50 feet from Project access
6 roadways.

7 2. A 6'-0" foot high perimeter wall or berm at homes backing
8 up to or abutting SR 74 could provide up to 6 dB attenuation.

9 3. Mixed use area PA 1, adjacent to SR 74, could place
10 commercial structures immediately adjacent to the roadway
11 to acoustically shield interior residential uses. Such design
12 strategies could eliminate any needed noise mitigation in PA
13 1.

14 4. Recreational space such as a noise protected community park
15 or pool may be considered to meet noise protection standards
16 such that individual residential balconies or patios would not
17 require to be mitigated below the 65 dB CNEL threshold.

18 k. 5.11-11: Interior noise levels can achieve the 45 dB CNEL building
19 code standard with standard construction features such as dual paned
20 windows and the ability to close windows. Supplemental ventilation,
21 in conjunction with air conditioning, is required in any livable space
22 where window closure to shut out roadway noise is needed to meet
23 interior standards. This shall be reflected on plans prior to building
24 permit issuance, and inspected for compliance, prior to building
25 final inspection.

26 l. 5.11-12: Verification of code compliance for any future residential
27 uses within PA 1 and PA 2 shall be provided to the Building
28

Department prior to issuance of a building permit.

K. Population and Housing

1. Impacts:

The Project represents 0.09% of the forecasted population for the SCAG Subregion in 2008 and 0.06% in 2035. As a percent of Project area forecast comprised of the surrounding cities and the Meadowbrook Community, the Project represents 0.31% in 2008 and 0.18% by 2035. Additionally, the Project represents 1.3% of the forecasted population for the Elsinore Area Plan as projected for the area buildout in the General Plan for Riverside County. The Project comprises less than one-quarter of a percent of SCAG's projections through 2035, and more than .08% of the County's projections through 2030. Any Project impacts are considered less than significant.

These are cumulative impacts; however, they are not necessarily significant. However, the Project does not improve the region's jobs/housing balance. Therefore, the residential population growth from the Project is considered cumulatively considerable and significant, only in terms of the jobs-housing balance.

Therefore, although the proposed Project is anticipated to result in significant population/housing impacts, mitigation for such impacts is not currently available. As a result, CEQA requires Riverside County to make certain findings and to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth herein.

2. Mitigation

No mitigation is proposed.

L. Public Services

1. Impacts:

1 a. Fire

2 The County Fire Department has established response times of 6
3 minutes 30 seconds for urban areas and 10 minutes 30 seconds for
4 rural areas (e.g., urban development is located more than 3 miles
5 from a County fire station or rural development is located more than
6 5 miles from a County fire station). Due to the project site's
7 proximity to the existing Goodmeadow Station #9 (about two miles
8 north of the project site), it would probably fall within the County's
9 guidelines for a response time of 6 minutes 30 seconds. With a
10 potential for development of up to 490 dwelling units within the
11 Colinas del Oro Specific Plan area (plus 69,500 square feet of
12 general commercial), there will not be a need for an additional fire
13 station in the project vicinity, either onsite or as part of adjacent
14 proposed urban/suburban development, based on standards for
15 Category 2 Urban service.

16 Cumulative projects, which are proposed within the general Project
17 vicinity, are based on the assumption that up to about 36,952
18 dwelling units may be constructed within the Elsinore Area Plan
19 (EAP). This cumulative change in type and amount of development
20 within the planning area will require more or larger stations
21 commensurate with development levels and locations for each of the
22 proposed cumulative projects. The Project contributes
23 approximately 0.99 percent of the total units within the cumulatively
24 proposed projects, which represents a relatively small, but still
25 cumulatively considerable amount. The Project will have an
26 incremental, yet less than significant impact to Fire Services. Thus,
27 the Project will have a cumulative adverse impact to the County Fire
28

1 Department's ability to provide an acceptable level of service
2 without mitigation. These impacts are forecast to include an
3 increased number of emergency and public service calls due to the
4 increased presence of structures and population.

5 Each Project proponent shall participate in the Development Impact
6 Fee Program as adopted by the Riverside County Board of
7 Supervisors to mitigate a portion of these impacts. This will provide
8 funding for capital improvements such as land, equipment
9 purchases, and fire station construction. The Fire Department
10 reserves the right to negotiate developer agreements associated with
11 the development of land and/or construction of fire facilities to meet
12 service demands through the regional integrated fire protection
13 response system. The 490 units and 69,500 square feet of mixed- use
14 commercial envisioned at the Colinas del Oro Specific Plan area
15 will contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts related to the
16 need for fire station construction and other mitigation to reduce
17 cumulative effects on Fire Services.

18 The Project's potentially significant or cumulative considerable
19 impacts to Fire Protection Services can be reduced to less than
20 significant and payment of fees by all cumulative projects can
21 effectively reduce the overall cumulative impacts to such services.
22 Therefore, cumulative impacts are considered less than significant.

23 b. Sheriff Law Enforcement Services

24 The County development review process and building permit plan
25 check process include review by the County Sheriff Department to
26 ensure incorporation of defensible space concepts in site design and
27 construction. Additionally, development fees required by Riverside
28

1 County Ordinance No. 659.7 may be used at the County's discretion
2 to provide additional facilities for the Sheriff Department. A portion
3 of these fees can be used to fund the acquisition of land, buildings,
4 staffing, and equipment necessary to mitigate law enforcement
5 impacts. Therefore, potential impacts related to the need for new or
6 physically altered Sheriff Services are considered to be less than
7 significant after payment of development impact fees at the time of
8 project construction.

9 Cumulative projects which are proposed within the general Project
10 vicinity are based on the assumption that up to about 36,952
11 dwelling units may be constructed in the future within the Elsinore
12 Area Plan (EAP), with a potential population of 111,215 persons
13 based on the County's average population per dwelling unit (3.01
14 persons). This cumulative change in type and amount of
15 development within the planning area will require more Sheriff
16 Services commensurate with development levels and population for
17 each of the proposed cumulative projects. The Project contributes
18 approximately 0.99 percent of the total units/population within the
19 cumulatively proposed projects, which represents a relatively small,
20 but still cumulatively considerable amount. The Project will have an
21 incremental, yet less than significant impact to Sheriff Services.
22 Thus, the Project will contribute to a cumulative adverse impact to
23 the County Sheriff Department's ability to provide an acceptable
24 level of service without mitigation. These impacts are forecast to
25 include an increased number of emergency and public service calls
26 due to the increased presence of urban/suburban uses and
27 population.
28

1 Each Project proponent shall participate in the Development Impact
2 Fee Program as adopted by the Riverside County Board of
3 Supervisors to mitigate a portion of these impacts. This will provide
4 funding for capital improvements such as land, equipment purchases
5 and fire station construction. The Sheriff Department reserves the
6 right to negotiate developer agreements associated with the
7 development of land and/or construction of Sheriff Services support
8 facilities to meet service demands. The 490 units and 69,500 square
9 feet of mixed-use commercial development envisioned at the
10 Colinas del Oro Specific Plan area will contribute incrementally to
11 cumulative impacts related to the need for additional Sheriff
12 Services manpower and equipment and other mitigation to reduce
13 cumulative effects on Sheriff Services.

14 The payment of development impact fees and the annual property
15 taxes generated by the proposed development, the Project's
16 potentially significant cumulative impacts to Sheriff Services can be
17 reduced to a less than significant level and payment of fees by all
18 cumulative projects can effectively reduce the overall cumulative
19 impacts to such services. Therefore, cumulative impacts are
20 considered less than significant.

21 c. School/ Education Services

22 Per SB 50, the payment of the statutory school fees constitutes full
23 mitigation of potential impacts upon the affected school district(s).
24 Although the payment of mitigation fees by this Project is
25 considered its fair share and adequate contribution toward mitigation
26 for this potentially significant project specific and cumulative
27 impact, every added high school student will be adding to an
28

1 overcrowded situation. Options PUHSD can implement to address
2 overcrowding are portable classrooms, year round schedules, single-
3 track YRE (Year Round Education) model, and Multi-track YRE
4 model.

5 Cumulatively, the Project, in conjunction with other projects
6 anticipated within the Elsinore Area Plan (EAP) will generate
7 students in excess of what the local schools are presently able to
8 accommodate. The payment of school impact fees and provision of
9 school sites within each future development, commensurate with
10 each project's level of impact, is considered adequate fair share
11 contribution to cumulative impacts associated with development,
12 which leads to a determination of less than significant. There is also
13 a potential to locate an elementary school on the Project site. If this
14 should transpire, it will also further address any potential cumulative
15 impacts from the Project.

16 d. Library Services

17 This Project will allow for a maximum of 490 dwelling units to be
18 constructed. The Project involves residential development, so the
19 demand for library services will increase incrementally over time.
20 As stated in the Existing Setting Report (March 2000) prepared for
21 the Riverside County General Plan, the American Library
22 Association suggests that an appropriate service criterion for library
23 facilities and reserves should be at a rate of 0.5 square foot of library
24 space and 2.5 volumes per capita. Applying this suggested service
25 criteria to the project build-out estimates, along with the persons-
26 per-dwelling unit standard used for western Riverside County, of
27 3.01 (single-family residential) and 2.34 (multi-family residential),
28

1 approximately 655 square feet of library space and an additional
2 3,273 volumes will be needed to support the project. Currently,
3 Perris Library, which serves the project area, is approximately 2,172
4 square feet and contains 80,000 volumes. Therefore, the increase in
5 residents associated with the Project build-out would significantly
6 affect existing library facilities and services.

7 In order to reduce impacts associated with additional residents
8 increasing the demand on the local library system, Riverside County
9 Ordinance No. 659.7 sets forth a fee for residential projects of is
10 \$341 per single-family dwelling unit and \$286 per multi-family
11 dwelling unit. This fee pays for library materials only, and not the
12 acquisition and construction of additional library facilities. The
13 project Proponent will be required to pay this development impact
14 fee, which is considered sufficient to reduce impacts to library
15 facilities and/or services to less than significant levels.

16 Cumulatively, the Project, in conjunction with other projects
17 anticipated within the Elsinore Area Plan (EAP), will generate
18 demand for Library Services in excess of what the local library
19 system is presently able to accommodate. The payment of library
20 impact fees commensurate with each project's level of impact is
21 considered adequate fair share contribution to mitigate both Project,
22 and cumulative impacts associated with development, which leads to
23 a determination of less than significant impacts.

24 e. Health Services

25 The Project is anticipated to generate a new population of 1,309
26 persons. Currently, the County of Riverside has been identified as
27 having adequate facilities and Health Services for its population, but
28

1 the Project includes a General Plan Amendment that will allow an
2 increase in population within the Community of Meadowbrook. This
3 combined with cumulative growth forecasts in the Project area will
4 result in the population in this portion of the County to be higher
5 than anticipated in the County's General Plan. Therefore, the Project
6 will create a need for medical services, which was not anticipated in
7 the General Plan.

8 Since the Project may include land uses that will allow medical
9 offices and urgent care clinics, local medical services may be
10 provided within the project in response to free market demand.
11 Hospital beds and major facilities, such as trauma units and
12 emergency rooms, are not allowed within the Project. However,
13 there is one hospital and three medical clinics within approximately
14 ten miles of the project site. This fact coupled with the Periodic
15 Medical Needs Assessment, which is required by Mitigation
16 Measure 4.15.7A of the County General Plan EIR, can ensure that
17 adequate medical services are available to the project residents.
18 Based on this analysis, the potential adverse impacts related to
19 medical services are considered less than significant.

20 The Project, in conjunction with other projects anticipated within the
21 Elsinore Area Plan (EAP) will generate a population that is
22 anticipated to incrementally increase the need for Health Service
23 facilities. The County has established a structure to expand health
24 service facilities based on future identified demand and the Project
25 will generate future funds that can be used to support this effort.
26 Project impacts will be considered less than significant. This is
27 considered adequate fair share contribution to cumulative impacts
28

1 associated with development, which leads to a determination of less
2 than significant impact to Health Services.

3 2. Mitigation:

4 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
5 significant impacts by the following mitigation measure:

- 6 a. 5.13.3-1: To assure that the future project development incorporates
7 defensible space concepts, the design of each tract shall be reviewed
8 with the Sheriff Department prior to submittal of any tract maps,
9 conditional use permits or other entitlements.

10 M. Recreation

11 1. Impacts:

12 The following is the formula used to determine the recreational facilities
13 generated by a Project residential population of 1,309 residents, at 5 acres
14 per 1,000 residents:

15 $243 \text{ units} \times 3.01 \text{ persons/house} = 731 \text{ residents}$

16 $247 \text{ units} \times 2.34 \text{ persons/house} = 578 \text{ residents}$

17 $(1,309/1000) \times 5 = 6.6 \text{ acres}$

18 As a general planning "rule of thumb," a project should provide
19 approximately five acres of park and recreational area per 1,000 persons.
20 With a forecast population of 1,309 persons, total acreage of park and
21 recreation area should encompass approximately 6.6 acres.

22 A total of approximately 10.0 acres of active park area will be implemented
23 in conjunction with the Project. In addition, the Project includes passive
24 open space to be utilized for hiking and viewing and other passive activities,
25 of approximately 40.4 acres. Based on the amount of recreational area and
26 related facilities that will be incorporated into the Project, the Project has no
27 potential to cause any significant adverse effects on recreational demand by
28

1 the Project and other projects in the area. However, the construction of the
2 proposed recreational facilities will require grading with associated
3 unavoidable significant adverse air quality impacts in the short term. No
4 other potential significant physical effects have been identified with use of
5 approximately 48.8 acres (or 38.6% of the Project site) of park/open space
6 areas designated for recreational facilities in SP 364.

7 The Project is located within an area where Quimby Act fees could apply.
8 However, the Project proposes to install park and recreation resources for
9 the residents of the Project. Based on the provision of these park and
10 recreation facilities, the Project is fully consistent with this significance
11 threshold and no adverse impacts are forecast to result if the project is
12 implemented as proposed. A final determination regarding fees and park
13 and recreation resources will occur at the time the Project is implemented,
14 but the facts support a finding that the proposed park and recreation
15 resources are adequate.

16 The provision of on-site park and recreation facilities will ensure that the
17 existing facilities will not incur substantial physical deterioration. The
18 Fiscal Impact Analysis for the Project indicates that adequate recurring
19 financial resources will be available to support the on-site recreation
20 facilities. Any impacts are considered less than significant and no additional
21 mitigation is required.

22 A comprehensive trail system is planned within SP 364, and connects
23 residential neighborhoods to the parks, recreational areas, mixed-use area
24 and off-site existing and proposed trails. There are two types of Regional
25 Trails – Urban and Open Space. Regional Trails are located within PA4a,
26 PA4b, PA6, and PA7, and connect off-site at the southeastern and
27 northwestern portions of the Project.

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

1 Cumulatively, the Project, in conjunction with other projects anticipated
2 within the Meadowbrook Community will generate a population that is
3 anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing local park and recreation
4 facilities. The Project will provide active and passive park and recreation
5 facilities as well as a regional trail (a total of approximately 10.0 acres of
6 active park area will be implemented in conjunction with the Project). In
7 addition, the Project includes passive open space to be utilized for hiking
8 and viewing and other passive activities (approximately 40.4 acres) that
9 exceeds the requirement of the Project. This is considered a beneficial
10 fair share contribution to cumulative impacts associated with future
11 development, which results in a determination of less than significant
12 impact to Recreation resources.

13 2. Mitigation:

14 No mitigation is required.

15 N. Transportation and Traffic

16 1. Impacts:

17 The Project will contribute to the generation of additional traffic on local
18 and regional roadways. The County has indicated that, due to their
19 intersection spacing criterion, the southerly Project intersection should not
20 be a signalized intersection with full-turning movements. Instead the
21 County Traffic Engineer has conditioned this Project Access to be restricted
22 to right-in/right-out turning movements, (enforced with a raised median)
23 while maintaining the existing southbound left-in and westbound left-out
24 from Richard Street. The Project Access will be stop controlled. Based on
25 the information contained in Table 5.15-2, Existing Plus Ambient Growth
26 Plus Project Intersection Delay and Level of Service, and Table 5.15-4,
27 Existing Plus Ambient Growth Plus Project Plus Cumulative Projects
28

1 Intersection Delay and Level of Service, this intersection is projected to
2 operate at an acceptable Levels of Service.

3 Approval of SP No. 364 will not result in inadequate parking capacity, as
4 the SP No. 364 document in and of itself does not generate any parking
5 needs. Short-term construction (grading and building) of SP No. 364 will
6 not result in any significant impacts that would result in inadequate parking
7 capacity. There are sufficient areas within the Project site that can be used
8 for parking and staging during the construction phase of the Project. In
9 addition, long-term implementation of the Project will not result in
10 inadequate parking capacity. SP 364, as well as County of Riverside
11 Ordinance No. 348 contain parking standards that will be required for any
12 future development. Adherence to these standards will ensure that future
13 uses will provide adequate parking. Therefore, any impacts will be
14 considered less than significant and no additional mitigation will be
15 required.

16 The Project will not create any roadways or road improvements that could
17 increase hazards to a circulation system design feature (e.g., sharp curves or
18 dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment). To the
19 contrary, roadway improvements to area roadways, as a result of
20 implementation of the Project, will reduce hazards in the area. The
21 roadways will all be designed to meet all Riverside County Transportation
22 requirements. Impacts will be considered less than significant and no
23 additional mitigation is required. Since there are no agricultural uses in the
24 immediate Project are, no impacts to farm equipment are anticipated.

25 The Project may affect the operation of the immediate circulation network,
26 as it is adjacent to SR 74, as well as several local roadways. Any impacts
27 during the construction phase of the Project will be short-term and
28

1 considered less than significant. Mitigation Measure 5.15-5 (below) will be
2 implemented to ensure that Project impacts during construction will remain
3 less than significant. Operational impacts will also be considered less than
4 significant, as all roadway improvements will be constructed in accordance
5 with the County standards. No additional mitigation is required.

6 Development of the Project will result in the need for new roads (the
7 widening of expansion of SR 74 along the Project frontage and on-site
8 streets. These improvements will be made by the Project developer.
9 According to the Project's Fiscal Impact Analysis annual recurring revenues
10 to the County General Fund at Project buildout will equal \$1,264,978
11 compared to recurring fiscal costs of \$1,004,149, a net benefit to the County
12 of approximately \$260,838. Roadway maintenance and traffic signal
13 maintenance were factored into the recurring fiscal costs. Since the Project
14 will operate with a net benefit to the County, any impacts will be considered
15 led than significant. No additional mitigation is required. A copy of the FIA
16 is provided in Volume 2, Technical Appendices, to the DEIR.

17 All access to the Project will be designed and installed per County of
18 Riverside standards. Since the Project will meet this criterion,
19 implementation of the Project will not result in inadequate emergency
20 access or access to nearby uses. No impacts are anticipated and no
21 mitigation is required.

22 Both regional and community trails have been provided as part of the
23 Project. These trails are intended for "multi-use," which would not preclude
24 them being used as bike trails. These trails, in addition to the ability to ride
25 bicycles within the Project will be supportive of the policies of alternative
26 transportation.

1 Implementation of the SP will help support and foster alternative
2 transportation methods within and to and from the community. Any impacts
3 are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

4 The analysis contained in the transportation impact analysis (TIA) for the
5 Project determined that roadway improvements in the study area are not
6 needed either with or without the Project.

7 Cumulatively, based on careful evaluation of the timing of area planned
8 road improvement, the improvements required to address cumulative traffic
9 and circulation system effects are currently in place, and the Project will
10 need to make limited improvements on-site to mitigate Project-specific
11 impacts during the short-term and at buildout. Therefore, the Project is not
12 forecast to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the further
13 decline in the level of service at the identified study area intersections.

14 In 2002, the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program was
15 initiated in Western Riverside County. Under the TUMF, developers of
16 residential, industrial and commercial property are required to pay a
17 development fee to fund regional transportation projects, which mitigates
18 cumulative impacts to the roadway segments and intersections included in
19 the TUMF program. The TUMF funds both local and regional arterial
20 projects. The applicant shall participate in the funding or construction of
21 off-site improvements, including traffic signals that are needed to serve
22 cumulative traffic conditions through the payment of required Western
23 Riverside County TUMF, in addition to the County of Riverside
24 Development Impact Fee (DIF) and other fair share contributions as
25 directed by the County, including any future Road Bridge Building District.
26 The Project's contribution to the TUMF program as a fair share contribution
27 is considered sufficient to address the Project's fair share toward a
28

1 mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate any potential
2 cumulative impacts.

3 2. Mitigation:

4 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
5 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

- 6 a. 5.15-1: Construct SR-74 from the north Project boundary to the
7 south Project boundary at its ultimate half-section width as an
8 Expressway (220 foot right-of-way) including landscaping and
9 parkway improvements in conjunction with development.
- 10 b. 5.15-2: Participate in the phased construction of off-site traffic
11 signals through payment of traffic signal mitigation fees. The traffic
12 signals within the study area at buildout should specifically include
13 an interconnect of the traffic signals to function in a coordinated
14 system.
- 15 c. 5.15-3: The following study area intersection improvements are
16 required for both the Existing Plus Ambient Growth Plus Project
17 and the Existing Plus Ambient Growth Plus Project Plus Cumulative
18 scenarios. It is assumed that the Project will be implemented in one
19 phase and no additional phased improvements will be necessary.

20 SR-74 (NS) at:

- 21 1. Richard Street/Project South Access (EW) - #10.
22 a. Stripe a northbound left turn lane.
- 23 2. Project North Access (EW) - #11.
24 a. Stripe a northbound left turn lane.
25 b. Install a traffic signal.
- 26 3. Theda Street (EW) - #13.
27 a. Install a traffic signal.
- 28

1 d. 5.15-4: Prior to any construction of any Project components within
2 any existing roadway right-of-way, the developer shall submit a
3 traffic control plan (TCP) for review and approval by the
4 appropriate agency that has jurisdiction over that roadway.

5 O. Utilities and Service Systems

6 1. Impacts:

7 a. Water Supply

8 According to Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD),
9 there is an adequate water supply and sewer capacity to meet the
10 demand of the Project. Based on the analysis in EIR No. 530 and the
11 referenced documentation, the water, wastewater and recycled water
12 management systems are capable of meeting the cumulative demand
13 for these systems. Recycled water is available in the EVMWD
14 system, but is not available to the Project site. Additionally, the
15 Project will not cause cumulatively considerable significant adverse
16 impacts on these systems.

17 b. Energy (Electricity, Natural Gas and Dry Utilities)

18 Development proposed by the Project would result in a permanent
19 and continued use of electricity and natural gas resources. Sufficient
20 power and distribution capabilities exist to provide electrical
21 services to the Project. Since the project would constitute a small
22 incremental increase of the current residential customer base and the
23 Project has been required to install Energy Star-rated models of
24 appliances and be served by existing service and transmission lines
25 within and around the Project area. Additionally, the Project's
26 cumulative energy impacts are concluded to a less than significant
27 cumulative impact.

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

c. Solid Waste

Project impacts to landfill capacity from construction and demolition debris were found to be less than significant with an annual contribution over 7 years of 151 tons. Mitigation measures address construction debris recycling and reuse to achieve a reduction in waste beyond the County requirement of a 50 percent reduction by weight. Implementation of this measure would reduce the construction waste from the Project at a higher level than required by the County. The Project will comply with County Conditions of Approval and will exceed those requirements with implementation of mitigation measures outlined above. Additionally, cumulative impacts to landfill capacity will be less than significant due to the Project construction debris representing a less than substantial cumulative increment with mitigation. The Project's contribution to cumulative demand for landfill capacity is approximately 0.0002 percent of annual landfill capacity demand. Therefore, due to available capacity and implementation of the above mitigation measures, which provide for recycling on site to reduce project operational waste, cumulative impacts to the existing landfills resulting from waste generated by the Project during operations are considered less than significant.

d. Maintenance of Public Facilities and other Governmental Services

The Project is forecast to generate sufficient funds to ensure maintenance of public facilities and other governmental services that are paid for out of the County General Fund. For public utilities such as water, wastewater and energy, these systems are enterprise funded, which means that the extension of utilities and provision of

1 service is based upon direct payment for receipt of the utility
2 connection and delivery of the resource or service. For roads, law
3 enforcement, fire, etc. funds are received and allocated based upon
4 initial development fees and payment of property taxes and other
5 direct fees as a service (such as planning) provided by the County.
6 The data in the fiscal impact report (FIA) indicate that the
7 infrastructure systems required to support the Project development
8 in the future will be sufficient to maintain public facilities and other
9 governmental services in the routine course of occupancy in the
10 future.

11 2. Mitigation:

12 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
13 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

14 a. 5.16.3-1: Prior to issuance of a building permit:

- 15 1. To utilize energy efficiently, all residential buildings, large
16 public buildings (library, public community center, schools,
17 and joint-use facilities), large private recreation buildings
18 and large commercial buildings (retail and office) shall
19 exceed the 2008 California Energy Code – Title 24, Part 6
20 energy efficiency standards by 35%. To meet this rating
21 standard, combinations of the following energy efficiency
22 design elements or future elements shall be used to achieve
23 at least a 35% energy savings compared to the 2008 Building
24 Energy Standards:

- 25 a. Tankless water heaters
26 b. High efficiency lighting
27
28

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

- c. Low energy HVAC systems with tighter HVAC ducts
- d. Improved drywall, insulation and sealing installation
- e. "Cool roofs" reflect the sun's light back to the sky
- f. Heat-repelling radiant barrier roof foil reflect the sun's heat back to the sky
- g. Double-paned windows
- h. Dual-glazed, Lo E2 windows
- i. Other energy conservation measures developed between 2011 and 2017 when the propose project is envisioned to begin actual construction.

2. To utilize energy efficiently, homebuilders shall install Energy Star- rated model appliances, if the homebuilder chooses to install major appliances such as a dishwasher, washing machine, and refrigerator in the new residential units.

3. To utilize energy efficiently, major appliances installed in large public buildings (library, public community center, schools, and joint-use facilities) and large private recreation buildings shall be Energy Star- rated.

4. To utilize energy efficiently, street lights shall be installed with energy- efficient lighting, such as approved LED lights the meet the requirements of County Ordinance No. 655.

5. To increase renewable energy sources and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, large public buildings (library, public community center, schools, and joint-use facilities) and large private recreation buildings shall be installed with

1 solar panels, photovoltaic cells, solar thermal systems or
2 other renewable energy generating technology.

3 6. To increase renewable energy sources and reduce
4 greenhouse gas emissions, homebuilders shall offer to home
5 buyers solar panels, photovoltaic cells, solar thermal systems
6 or other renewable energy generating technology as part of
7 the homebuilder's option program.

8 7. Where professional management is available, such as an
9 HOA, recycled water shall be used in residential front-yards
10 and backyards, i.e. private common area, and in adjacent
11 street parkways, subject to EVMWD and County approvals.

12 8. Where professional management is not available, grass turf
13 (live not artificial) shall be limited to 33% of the landscaped
14 area of a conventional single-family detached lot.

15 b. 5.16.3-2: Prior to recordation of a final map by the County, the
16 current or subsequent project applicant shall construct, or enter into
17 an agreement and post security, in a form and amount acceptable to
18 the Building and Safety Department, guaranteeing the
19 undergrounding of proposed utility distribution lines in conformance
20 with applicable County standards and the County's Capital
21 Improvement Policy.

22 c. 5.16.3-3: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, tentative tract maps
23 shall be conditioned to require that all electrical service lines
24 (excluding transmission lines) serving development within the
25 project will be installed underground. This includes existing service
26 facilities that may have to be relocated temporarily during grading.

- 1 d. 5.16.3-4: Prior to grading permit final, the contractor shall
2 temporarily relocate existing overhead facilities, as necessary to
3 maintain service, while grading and installing the new underground
4 system is underway.
- 5 e. 5.16.3-5: Gas service shall remain available to all existing customers
6 during construction of new and replacement gas lines within the
7 project site.
- 8 f. 5.16.4-1: The project proponent shall recycle, reuse, and/or reduce
9 the amount of construction and demolition materials (i.e., concrete,
10 asphalt, wood, etc.) generated by development of the project that
11 would otherwise be taken to a landfill. This diversion of waste must
12 exceed a 50 percent reduction by weight. The project shall complete
13 the Riverside County Waste Management Department Construction
14 and Demolition Waste Diversion Program – Form B and Form C to
15 ensure compliance. Form B – Recycling Plan must be submitted and
16 approved by the Riverside County Waste Management Department
17 and provided to the Department of Building and Safety prior to the
18 issuance of building permits. Form C – Reporting Form must be
19 approved by the Riverside County Waste Management Department
20 and submitted to the Department of Building and Safety prior to
21 building final inspection.
- 22 g. 5.16.4-2: The Homeowners Association established for the proposed
23 development shall establish green waste recycling through its yard
24 maintenance or waste hauling contracts. Green waste recycling
25 includes such things as grass recycling (where lawn clippings from a
26 mulching type mower are left on the lawn) and on- or off-site
27 composting. This measure shall be implemented to reduce green
28

1 waste going to landfills. If such services are not available through
2 the yard maintenance or waste haulers in the area, the HOA shall
3 provide individual homeowners with information about ways to
4 recycle green waste individually and collectively. Homeowners shall
5 be notified of such in the CC&Rs. This shall be performed prior to
6 map recordation.

- 7 h. 5.16.4-3: To assure compliance with the California Solid Waste
8 Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991 (AB 1327), which requires the
9 local jurisdiction to require adequate areas for collecting and loading
10 recyclable materials, prior to issuance of building permits for any
11 multi-unit residential, commercial or industrial facilities, clearance
12 from the Riverside County Waste Management Department is
13 needed to verify compliance with AB 1327 in terms of installation
14 of recycling access areas at these facilities.

15 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that all applicable regulatory
16 requirements and feasible mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts have been considered and
17 are applied as conditions of the Project approval, yet the following impacts potentially resulting from the
18 Project cannot be fully mitigated and will be only partially avoided or lessened by the mitigation
19 measures hereinafter specified; a statement of overriding findings is therefore included herein:

20 A. Population/Housing

21 1. Impacts:

22 The Project would cumulatively exceed official regional or local population
23 projections and would induce population growth in an area – primarily
24 directly, by proposing new homes. This would be considered an
25 unavoidable adverse impact. Indirect effects from implementation of the
26 Project (the through the extension of roads or other infrastructure) would
27 not create any unavoidable adverse impacts, as the roadways and other
28

1 infrastructure (with the exception of water and sewer) are already available
2 in the Project vicinity. Water and sewer extensions proposed by the Project
3 will only be adequate to serve the needs of the Project. The Project does not
4 improve the region's jobs/housing balance. Therefore, the residential
5 population growth from the Project is considered an unavoidable adverse
6 impact in terms of the jobs-housing balance.

7 2. Mitigation:

8 The proposed Project cannot be fully mitigated below a level of significance
9 for this issue area. There is no mitigation that is applicable.

10 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered the following
11 alternatives identified in EIR No. 530 in light of the environmental impacts which cannot be fully
12 mitigated or substantially lessened and has rejected those alternatives as infeasible for the reasons
13 described below:

14 A. Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

- 15 1. This alternative assumes that the proposed Project, including supporting
16 infrastructure (i.e., roadways and utilities connections), would not be
17 constructed. The site would remain vacant.
- 18 2. Under the No Build Alternative, the construction of new structures and
19 recreational facilities would be prohibited. This alternative would therefore
20 fail to achieve any of the Project objectives.
- 21 3. Under the No Development Alternative, infrastructure improvements that
22 would benefit County residents would not occur, including a 7.0 acre
23 community park/community center site, a 3,000 square foot community
24 center, the installation of a regional trail and the preservation of 40.4 acres
25 of permanent open space.
- 26 4. Because no discretionary action would be required, payment of TUMF fees
27 pursuant to County Ordinance No. 824 would not occur, which would
28

1 reduce the County's ability to implement long-range transportation
2 infrastructure improvements.

3 5. Because no discretionary action would be required, no roadway
4 improvement fees would be paid into the County's Development Impact
5 Fee.

6 6. No permanent open space would be established, and therefore, no formal
7 protection of the on-site biological resources would occur.

8 B. Alternative 2 – Reduced Project Density Alternative

9 1. This alternative assumes that there would be no General Plan Amendment
10 or Zone Change to allow development on the site as proposed under
11 Specific Plan No. 364. Existing designations and zoning would allow for
12 the development of up to 117 single-family residences with minimum lot
13 sizes of 0.5 acres. This alternative would not include the preservation of
14 40.4 acres in the western portion of the Project site. No commercial and/or
15 office uses would be allowed.

16 2. Under the Reduced Project Density Alternative, none of the nine Project
17 objectives would be met. This alternative would not develop a master-
18 planned community, provide Improvements that will contribute to a more
19 efficient system of regional drainage, promote walkability throughout the
20 community, ensure that residential planning areas are located in close
21 proximity to services, transportation links and recreational amenities,
22 establish recreational facilities capable of serving Colinas del Oro as well as
23 the entire Elsinore region, implement housing type diversity by providing a
24 variety of single family and multi-family residential homes designed to be
25 marketable within the evolving economic profile within Riverside County,
26 establish a community-wide circulation system that meets the community
27 needs and accommodates a variety of transportation modes, develop
28

1 guidelines for architecture, landscaping, color treatments, paving, walls,
2 fencing, signage, and entry treatments that are consistent with the County-
3 wide Design Standards & Guidelines, and reinforce the community theme
4 of “Western Community”, or develop an environment that is visually
5 attractive and efficiently and effectively organized, including a pleasing
6 landscape palette.

7 C. Alternative 3 – Meadowbrook Study (Industrial) Alternative

- 8 1. Under this Alternative, the entire site could be developed as some form of
9 industrial use. With the exception of the restricted zone, the entire site could
10 be utilized for development. Either the LI or BP scenarios could be utilized,
11 as they would be the most appropriate application of industrial uses in the
12 Meadowbrook area. Both of these scenarios will allow a 0.25 to 0.6 FAR.
13 Due to the topography, the lower end of the FAR range was utilized in
14 determining potential square footage. Therefore, based on the Project
15 acreage, approximately 1,376,496 square feet of industrial development
16 would be allowed on the Project site in lieu of the 69,500 square feet of
17 commercial/office area proposed by the Project, and 490 residential
18 dwelling units proposed by the Project. This Alternative was selected for
19 consideration, as it is consistent with an alternative considered for the
20 Project site entitled “Rural Village Study at Meadowbrook, Proposed Land
21 Use Designations, Scenario 2,” dated November 24, 2008, which is the land
22 use plan that was developed by the General Plan Advisory Committee, has
23 been to two (2) Planning Commission Workshops and is the preferred plan
24 for the pending General Plan Update.
- 25 2. Implementation of the Meadowbrook Study (Industrial) would not meet any
26 of the objectives of the proposed Project.

1 3. This Alternative will have fewer impacts than the Project to Population/
2 Housing Resources, Public Services Resources (Libraries, Schools), and
3 Recreation Resources. This Alternative will have similar impacts than the
4 Project to Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural
5 Resources, Geology and Soils Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials
6 Resources, Hydrology/Water Quality Resources, Mineral Resources. This
7 Alternative will have greater impacts than the Project to Aesthetic
8 Resources, Air Quality Resources, Noise Resources, Land Use/Planning,
9 Public Services Resources (Fire and Sheriff Services),
10 Transportation/Traffic Resources, and Utilities Resources (Solid Waste,
11 Water and Sewer, and Natural Gas and Electricity). Although
12 implementation of the Reduced Impact Alternative would reduce the
13 Project's impacts to the environment, implementation of this alternative
14 would not fully eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts
15 to air quality during both construction and long-term operation, or its
16 significant and unavoidable impacts to noise during construction. The
17 Project's contribution to cumulatively significant visual impacts also would
18 not be eliminated.

19 D. Alternative Site

20 1. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2) requires that an EIR identify
21 alternatives to the Project, but does not expressly require that it discuss
22 alternative locations for the Project. In the case of EIR No. 530, the County
23 required analysis of a site specific alternative location. The Alternative
24 Location is located immediately to the northwest of the Project site, and is
25 identified as APN 346-090-006. It is an approximately 160-acre parcel.
26 90% of the Alternative Location site is designated RR on the General Plan,
27 with the remaining 10% designated RM. The Alternative Location parcel is
28

1 located within Cell J of the MSHCP. Based on the MSHCP requirements,
2 the analysis in the DEIR assumed that 55% of the Alternative Location site
3 would be conserved. That left approximately 89.4 acres remaining for
4 development. The Project, netting out the open space in PA's 6 and 7
5 results in 83.7 acres of developable area. For purposes of the analysis, the
6 Alternative Location contained all of the same components of the Project.

7 2. The Alternative Location would result in greater impacts due to its more
8 "remote" location, location within Cell J, proximity to greater biological
9 resources, and a need to extend the off-site water and sewer facilities. The
10 Alternative Location will have fewer impacts than the Project to the
11 Hazards and Hazardous Materials Resources.

12 3. The Alternative Location will have similar impacts to the proposed Project
13 to Agricultural Resources; Hydrology/Water Quality Resources; Mineral
14 Resources; Noise Resources; Population/Housing Resources; Public
15 Services Resources (Fire and Sheriff Services, Libraries, and Schools);
16 Recreation Resources; Transportation/Traffic Resources; and Utilities
17 Resource (Solid Waste).

18 4. The Alternative Location will have similar to, or greater than, impacts than
19 the Project to Aesthetic Resources; Air Quality Resources; Biological
20 Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology and Soils Resources; Land
21 Use/Planning Resources; and Utilities Resources.

22 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has balanced the "economic,
23 legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project, against the unavoidable adverse
24 environmental effects thereof, and has determined that the following benefits outweigh and render
25 acceptable those environmental effects:

26 A. The population/housing impacts are outweighed and rendered acceptable because the
27 proposed Project would provide for a variety of housing types within the Project site,
28

1 which would assist the County in meeting for the County's overall housing needs.

- 2 B. The population/housing impacts are outweighed and rendered acceptable because the
3 proposed Project would preserve in perpetuity 40.4 acres of open space.
- 4 C. The population/housing impacts are outweighed and rendered acceptable because
5 development of the Project will generate additional employment opportunities (during and
6 following construction) for skilled labor within Riverside County. Environmentally
7 superior Project alternatives would not create an array of new employment opportunities to
8 utilize the skilled labor pool within Riverside County to the same extent as the proposed
9 Project, as each alternative would involve a substantial reduction in the amount of
10 proposed construction and commercial/mixed use space.
- 11 D. The population/housing impacts are outweighed and rendered acceptable because the
12 Project will create an aesthetically pleasing and distinct community identity (sense of
13 place) through the establishment of design criteria for architecture, landscaping, walls,
14 street improvements, signs, entry monuments, and other planning and design features.
15 Riverside County has determined and finds that it is more important in this case to obtain
16 the benefit of the Project's aesthetic enhancement for the community than to forego the
17 Project out of regard for the air quality impacts.
- 18 E. The population/housing impacts are outweighed and rendered acceptable because the
19 Project will construct regional and community trails which will help to accommodate the
20 recreational needs of both Project and nearby residents.

21 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that State CEQA Guidelines
22 (Section 15126, (g)), requires an EIR to discuss how a proposed Project could directly or indirectly lead to
23 economic, population, or housing growth. The following growth-inducing impacts were considered in
24 relation to the proposed Project:

- 25 A. SP No. 364 would result in an increase of approximately 1,475 people living at the site,
26 which is 1,123 above that allowed by current planning designations. This increase would
27 not significantly affect the population of the County. In addition, it is anticipated that many
28

1 of the proposed residents of the Specific Plan would be residents that are already living
2 somewhere within Riverside County. Population increases that may result from the
3 implementation of the proposed Project would be generally consistent with the population
4 increases previously projected by SCAG, which estimates an annual growth of
5 approximately 25,055 persons within unincorporated Riverside County. For these reasons,
6 the number of new homes proposed by the Project would not be considered substantial
7 from a growth inducement perspective.

8 B. Urbanization of the Project site will not influence continued development within adjacent
9 properties. SR 74, the major thoroughfare in the Project area, and a major east/west
10 roadway between I-15 and I-215, has been recently widened. The Project will be required
11 to install additional improvements to SR 74, but these will only service the Project itself.
12 The proposed improvements would not provide a thoroughfare to other, previously
13 undeveloped areas. As a result, the Project roadway improvements would not induce
14 growth.

15 C. The off-site Project components, water and sewer service, will be and extended to the
16 Project site, via the immediate area; however, the size of these facilities will be only
17 sufficient to meet the needs of the Project. Natural gas lines will also be extended to the
18 Project site. Regardless of whether they will be sized for the Project, or even larger, the
19 limiting factor for additional growth in the area will be the water and sewer facilities. Even
20 though the surrounding area is primarily vacant or rural-type properties, the infrastructure
21 improved/expanded by the Project will not contribute to elimination of potential
22 constraints for future development in this area.

23 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Project will implement
24 applicable elements of the Riverside County General Plan as follows:

25 A. Land Use Element

- 26 1. The Project includes a GPA and Change of Zone to allow development of
27 the site with uses other than those planned in the General Plan. These
28

1 changes would allow greater density development of the site. Under the
2 current Rural Residential land use designation, the Project site could be
3 developed with up to 117 single-family residences. The proposed
4 Project would include a GPA to allow for the development of a target
5 of 80 medium-density residences, 163 medium high-density residences, 247
6 very high-density residences, and up to 69,500 square feet of
7 commercial/office uses on site. While the Specific Plan would not be
8 consistent with existing General Plan or Elsinore Area Plan land use maps,
9 the proposed Project includes a GPA, which would change the on-site land
10 use designations from Very Low Density Residential to Mixed Use, Very
11 High Density Residential, Medium High Density Residential, Medium
12 Density Residential, Open Space Recreation, and Open Space Conservation,
13 as reflected on the Specific Plan Land Use Plan. The proposed changes to
14 the General Plan land use designations are allowed pursuant to policies
15 within the Administrative Element. With approval of the proposed GPA, the
16 Project would be consistent with land use designations; therefore, the
17 proposed Project would be consistent with this policy. Analysis of
18 applicable policies of the Land Use Element is presented throughout EIR
19 No. 530 and concludes that the Project would not conflict with any
20 applicable policy of the General Plan Land Use Element. Furthermore the
21 proposed Project complies with all design standards for the various land use
22 designation and considers the unique characteristics and features of the
23 Project site and surrounding community. The proposed Project is consistent
24 with the General Plan Land Use Element, and is therefore consistent with
25 the General Plan.

26 B. Circulation Element

- 27 1. The Project will construct or contribute its fair share of the costs associated
28

1 with the improvement of roadways and certain intersections. The Project
2 will implement mitigation measures that address Project-specific and
3 cumulative transportation and traffic impacts, and based thereon, the Board
4 of Supervisors finds that the Project is consistent with the General Plan
5 Circulation Element. All required improvements that are directly
6 attributable to the Project would be constructed as part of the Project and
7 fair share costs would be contributed for improvements to affected off- site
8 roadways through payment of the TUMF, and County's Development
9 Impact Fee. In addition, the Specific Plan would provide for a variety of
10 transportation options. The Specific Plan includes the provision of bike
11 lanes for bicyclists and trails and sidewalks for pedestrians. Bus stops can
12 be accommodated along SR 74 (at the discretion of Riverside Transit
13 Agency). The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan
14 Circulation Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

15 C. Multipurpose Open Space Element

16 1. The Multipurpose Open Space Element of the General Plan describes an
17 open space system which includes methods for the acquisition,
18 maintenance, and operation of a variety of open spaces. The County's open
19 spaces are utilized for visual relief, natural resources protection, habitat
20 protection, recreational uses, and protection from natural hazards for public
21 health and safety. The western portion of the Project site is proposed for
22 open space recreation and conservation. This area contains habitat targeted
23 by the MSHCP for preservation and contributes to a regional wildlife
24 linkage for various animal species. The Project will have direct effects on
25 0.622 acres of Riparian/Riverine Areas (refer to Riparian/Riverine Areas
26 Impacts Map of the DBESP). Direct effects will result from (1) the
27 removal of all 0.440 acres of the Southern willow scrub vegetation and
28

1 habitat growing along the upland swales (100 percent), and (2) the removal
2 of 0.180 acres the upland swales (82 percent).

3 The Project will also result in indirect impacts on Riparian/Riverine Areas.
4 The tree removal phase of the project would have indirect effects on some
5 of the common wildlife species that use the trees growing on the site. A
6 predatory bird species like the red-tailed hawk that perches in trees while
7 resting or foraging will likely exclude the site from its range, and relocate to
8 another suitable habitat available in the vicinity. Perching bird species
9 would either move into the conserved areas of the site or abandon the entire
10 site and relocate to other suitable habitat available in the vicinity.

11 The loss of upland swales to channel storm water runoff downslope in a
12 manner that prevents erosion would also be an indirect effect of the project.
13 Topography is steep in the western portion of the site, sloping down to areas
14 of low relief in the eastern half.

15 Implementation of the Project will not result in cultural resource impacts
16 (including paleontological resources), that will exceed the established
17 thresholds of significance. Nonetheless, as part of mitigation for potential
18 impacts to unknown cultural resources, all ground-disturbing activities
19 would be monitored.

20 Furthermore, the proposed Project would provide adequate on-site facilities
21 to meet the local parkland and open space requirements of Riverside County
22 Ordinance 460, Section 10.35, and State Quimby Act requirements. The
23 proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan's Multipurpose Open
24 Space Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

25 D. Safety Element

- 26 1. The Project complies with all applicable building codes, County
27 Ordinances, and State and Federal laws. The Project complies with all
28

1 applicable provisions of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act,
2 and as concluded by the Project geotechnical study, the Project site is not
3 subject to significant hazards associated with earthquake induced
4 liquefaction, landsliding, or settlement (assuming the implementation of
5 mitigation). In addition, the proposed Project would not be subject to flood
6 or dam inundation. The Project also would comply with all applicable
7 standards for fire safety and be consistent with the Riverside County Fire
8 Protection Master Plan. Furthermore, Project impacts associated with
9 hazardous waste and materials on the Project site would be mitigated below
10 a level of significance, and the proposed Project would not conflict
11 with any disaster preparedness plans nor subject individuals to significant
12 risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, erosion, seismic
13 activity, blowsand, or flooding. The proposed Project is consistent with the
14 General Plan Safety Element, and is therefore consistent with the General
15 Plan.

16 E. Noise Element

- 17 1. Project construction and operational noise impacts would be less than
18 significant with mitigation incorporated. Mitigation is provided to reduce
19 noise impacts to below a level of significance. With implementation of the
20 recommendations provided in the noise impact analysis and the required
21 mitigation measures, the Project would be consistent with the General Plan
22 Noise Element, and is therefore consistent with the General Plan.

23 F. Healthy Communities Element

- 24 1. The proposed project is consistent with the Healthy Communities
25 element. More specifically the project has been placed along a major transit
26 corridor, and includes several trails to encourage walking, as prescribed for
27 in policies HC 3.2 and 3.3. These trails are designed to carry pedestrians
28

1 through the site and beyond, connecting to open space trails to the
2 northwest of the project site as prescribed for in policies HC 5.4 and
3 6.4. These include bike trails, horse trails, pedestrian trails and jogging
4 trails. Additionally, the project features residential and mixed use
5 designations intended to foster walking between retail, jobs, and residential
6 uses which is specifically prescribed for in policies HC 6.5, HC 2.2 and HC
7 4.2. High density apartments are included in the project as prescribed for in
8 policy HC 3.1 and 3.4.

9 G. Air Quality Element

- 10 1. Although the Specific Plan would include sustainable residential building
11 features, including the design of homes to be 15 percent above Title 24
12 requirements, the Project is required to implement mitigation measures
13 intended to reduce direct and cumulative air quality impacts to the greatest
14 feasible extent. Implementation of the mitigation measures would ensure
15 consistency with the Air Quality Element. Not unlike other development
16 projects in Riverside County, and as disclosed in the EIR No. 441 for the
17 General Plan, direct and cumulative impacts to air quality would remain
18 significant and unmitigable. Although the Project would have significant
19 direct air quality impacts and its contribution to air quality impacts would
20 be cumulatively considerable, mitigation measures presented would reduce
21 those impacts to the greatest extent possible, in accordance with SCAQMD,
22 EPA, and CARB requirements. Implementation of the mitigation measures
23 and recommendations provided in Section 5.3 of EIR No. 530, and in the air
24 quality technical study would ensure that the proposed Project would be
25 consistent with the Air Quality Element and General Plan.
26
27
28

1 H. Housing Element

- 2 1. The purpose of the General Plan Housing Element is to meet the needs of
3 existing and future residents in Riverside County through the establishment
4 of policies to guide County decision-making and to establish an action plan
5 to meet the County's housing goals in the next seven years. The Project
6 would further the goals of the General Plan Housing Element by reducing
7 the use of energy in residences and providing higher density residential
8 units that would contribute to meeting the County's housing needs.
9 Although the land uses proposed by the Project would require a GPA, there
10 are no characteristics of the Project that would inhibit the County's ability
11 to achieve the goals set forth by the General Plan Housing Element.
12 Accordingly, the proposed Project would be consistent with the General
13 Plan Housing Element and General Plan.

14 I. Administration Element

- 15 1. The Administration Element contains information regarding the structure of
16 the General Plan as well as general planning principles and a statement
17 regarding the vision for Riverside County. The General Plan Amendment
18 proposed by the Project would be consistent with the Administration
19 Element policies governing Foundation Amendments, as the proposed
20 Project would help to achieve the purposes of the General Plan through
21 compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

22 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Project would not conflict
23 with the conservation requirements of the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
24 (MSHCP) in that:

- 25 A. The Project site is not located within an MSHCP Criteria Area, but is located
26 approximately 125 feet southeast of Cell #3564 and Cell Group J. The off-site water
27 improvements are not located within a Cell, Cell Group or Subunit of the Elsinore or Mead
28

1 Valley Area Plans. At one point, the underground 12-inch water line will be located
2 approximately 265 feet west of Cell #3974 of the Ramsgate Subunit (5) of the Elsinore
3 Area Plan (no Cell Group). The off-site sewer improvements are located within Cells 3974
4 and 4078 of the Ramsgate Subunit (5) of the Elsinore Area Plan (no Cell Group). The
5 underground 6-inch force sewer main will be located beneath the existing edges of
6 pavement of SR 74 and Wasson Canyon Road. The off-site sewer improvements will be
7 located in the northern and western portions of the Cell, and avoid the areas proposed for
8 conservation. The same conclusions would apply to any natural gas facilities.

9 The Project will have direct effects on 0.622 acres of Riparian/Riverine Areas (refer to
10 Riparian/Riverine Areas Impacts Map of the DBESP). Direct effects will result from (1)
11 the removal of all 0.440 acres of the Southern willow scrub vegetation and habitat growing
12 along the upland swales (100 percent), and (2) the removal of 0.180 acres the upland
13 swales (82 percent). The Project will also result in indirect impacts on Riparian/Riverine
14 Areas. The tree removal phase of the project would have indirect effects on some of the
15 common wildlife species that use the trees growing on the site. A predatory bird species,
16 like the red-tailed hawk that perches in trees while resting or foraging will likely exclude
17 the site from its range, and relocate to other suitable habitat available in the vicinity.
18 Perching bird species would either move into the conserved areas of the site or abandon the
19 entire site and relocate to other suitable habitat available in the vicinity. To mitigate the
20 direct effects on 0.622 acres of onsite Riparian/Riverine Areas, prior to the issuance of a
21 grading permit, the applicant shall purchase 1.244 acres (or at a ratio determined by the
22 appropriate resource agency(s) of compensatory mitigation credits. Mitigation Measure
23 5.4-1 has been added to require mitigation to impacts to 0.66 acre of onsite
24 Riparian/Riverine Areas at a ratio of 2:1, or at a ratio determined by the appropriate
25 resource agency(s). Accordingly, the proposed Project would not conflict with the MSHCP
26 policy related to required protection of species associated with riparian/riverine areas and
27 vernal pools (MSHCP Section 6.1.2).

- 1 B. Based on Figure 6-1 of the MSHCP, the site is not located within a Narrow Endemic Plant
2 Species Survey Area, the off-site water improvements are not located within a Narrow
3 Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, and the off-site sewer (and natural gas) improvements
4 are not located within a Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area. (MSHCP Section
5 6.1.3).
- 6 C. The site has no direct physical relationship to the assembly of Proposed Linkage 3 or to
7 Proposed Core 1. Development in the northwest portion of the site will be located over
8 1,000 feet from a proposed MSHCP Conservation Area. 1,000 feet is four times the 250-
9 foot buffer used in the MSHCP to complete an edge analysis. As such, development on
10 that portion of the parcel will not adversely affect biological resources within the proposed
11 MSHCP Conservation Area. Off-site water improvements have no relationship to the
12 assembly of Proposed Core 1. The construction of the underground water service
13 improvements (12-inch and 20-inch water lines) will not adversely affect biological
14 resources within the proposed MSHCP Conservation Area, nor will the permanent water
15 service improvements (reservoirs and pump station). The water service improvements will
16 not be subject to Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface for the
17 management of edge effects as presented in Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP, Volume 1, The
18 Plan. Off-site sewer improvements have no relationship to the assembly of Proposed Core
19 D. The construction of the underground sewer service improvements (6-inch forced main)
20 will not adversely affect biological resources within the proposed MSHCP Conservation
21 Area. Off-site sewer improvements will not be subject to Guidelines Pertaining to the
22 Urban/Wildlands Interface for the management of edge effects as presented in Section
23 6.1.4 of the MSHCP, Volume 1, The Plan. The same conclusions would apply to any
24 natural gas facilities (MSHCP Section 6.1.4).
- 25 E. Based on Figures 6-2 (Criteria Area Species Survey Areas) and 6-3 (Amphibian Species
26 Survey Areas) of the MSHCP, the site is not located in an area where additional surveys
27
28

1 are needed for certain species in conjunction with MSHCP implementation in order to
2 achieve coverage for these species.

3 The site is located within the Burrowing Owl Survey Area (Figure 6-4 of the MSHCP). As
4 such, a Nesting Season Survey following the Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for
5 Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Area was completed on
6 July 1, 2013. While conducting surveys for the Nesting Season Survey, burrowing owls
7 were not observed. Critical burrowing owl habitats capable of being used for roosting or
8 nesting were not being used on the site (i.e., natural burrows). And, animal signs diagnostic
9 of burrowing owls were not discovered anywhere on the site (i.e., molted feathers, cast
10 pellets, prey remains, eggshell fragments, and/or excrement at or near a burrow entrance).
11 There was no evidence of either active habitats presently being used by burrowing owls, or
12 habitats abandoned within the last three years on the site or in the buffer zone.

- 13 F. Based on Figure 6-5 (Mammal Species Survey Areas) of the MSHCP, the site is not
14 located in an area where additional surveys are needed for certain species in conjunction
15 with MSHCP implementation in order to achieve coverage for these species.

16 The Project site was also assessed for potentially suitable habitat for plant species not
17 covered by the MSHCP. The following species were considered to have potential to occur
18 on the Project site: chaparral sand-verbena (*Abronia villosa* var. *aurita*) (California Native
19 Plant Society (CNPS) List 1B.1)2, Plummer's mariposa lily (*Calochortus plummerae*)
20 (CNPS List 1B.2), and Parry's spineflower (*Chorizanthe parryi* var. *parryi*) (CNPS List
21 1B.1). Two of the species, Plummer's mariposa lily and Parry's spineflower, may be
22 covered by the MSHCP in the future. These species are not Federal- or State listed, but
23 impacts to them if they are present in substantial numbers would be considered significant
24 by Riverside County and the CNPS in accordance with the California Environmental
25 Quality Act.

1 A focused survey was then conducted during the appropriate blooming periods to
2 determine whether these species are present or absent on the project site. The surveys were
3 negative.

- 4 G. Based on Figures 6-2 (Criteria Area Species Survey Areas), 6-3 (Amphibian Species
5 Survey Areas) and 6-5 (Mammal Species Survey Areas) of the MSHCP, the off-site water
6 improvements are not located in an area where additional surveys are needed for certain
7 species in conjunction with MSHCP implementation in order to achieve coverage for these
8 species.

9 The off-site water improvements are located within the Burrowing Owl Survey Area
10 (Figure 6-4 of the MSHCP). Based on Step I, Habitat Assessment, of the Burrowing Owl
11 Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
12 Area (March 29, 2006), an independent assessment was made of the presence of suitable
13 burrowing owl habitat along the alignments of the underground off-site water
14 improvements and at the sites of the permanent off-site water improvements. Most of the
15 areas located on both sides of the roadway alignments were developed and occupied.

16 Suitable burrowing owl habitats consisting of large open expanses of relatively sparsely
17 vegetated annual grassland and lowland scrub on gentle rolling and level terrain with an
18 abundance of active small mammal burrows are not present within or adjacent to the
19 proposed water service improvement areas. Excluding the existing paved rights-of-way,
20 most of the off-site water improvements survey areas are located within the front yards of
21 single-family residences. These areas were either landscaped in a variety of ways or
22 maintained as bare ground. Either way, they were not providing suitable burrowing owl
23 habitats. The burrow survey conducted in these areas was negative.

24 Undeveloped and unoccupied areas along approximately 665 feet of the paved right-of-
25 way of Kimes Lane were relatively undisturbed. Non-native grassland and remnant
26 Riversidean sage scrub were growing in these areas. Although the open spaces
27
28

1 were somewhat confined by chain-link fences, marginal habitat was provided. The burrow
2 survey conducted in these areas was negative.

3 During the survey, burrowing owls were not observed. Critical burrowing owl habitats
4 capable of being used for roosting or nesting were not being used (i.e., manmade structures
5 such as culverts). Animal signs diagnostic of burrowing owls were not discovered
6 anywhere (i.e., molted feathers, cast pellets, prey remains, eggshell fragments, and/or
7 excrement at or near a burrow entrance). There was no evidence of either active habitats
8 presently being used by burrowing owls, or habitats abandoned within the last three years
9 along the alignments of the underground off-site water improvements or at the sites of the
10 permanent off-site water improvements.

11 H. Based on Figures 6-2 (Criteria Area Species Survey Areas), 6-3 (Amphibian Species
12 Survey Areas) and 6-5 (Mammal Species Survey Areas) of the MSHCP, the off-site sewer
13 improvements are not located in an area where additional surveys are needed for certain
14 species in conjunction with MSHCP implementation in order to achieve coverage for these
15 species.

16 Proposed sewer service improvements are located within the Burrowing Owl Survey Area
17 (Figure 6-4 of the MSHCP). Based on Step I, Habitat Assessment, of the Burrowing Owl
18 Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
19 Area (March 29, 2006), an independent assessment was made of the presence of suitable
20 burrowing owl habitat along the alignment of the 6-inch force sewer main. Burrowing owl
21 habitat is not present along the alignment of the 6-inch force sewer main. The alignment is
22 located within the existing edges of pavement of SR 74 and Wasson Canyon Road. Step II,
23 Locating Burrows and Burrowing Owls, of the instructions is not necessary. The same
24 conclusions would apply to any natural gas facilities (MSHCP Section 6.3.2).

25 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that Specific Plan No. 364 is
26 consistent with the Riverside County General Plan.

2 **RESOLUTION NO. 2015-205**
3 **CERTIFYING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 540**
4 **AND ADOPTING SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 265, AMENDMENT NO. 1**
5 **(BOREL AIRPARK CENTER SPECIFIC PLAN)**

6 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65450 et. seq., public
7 hearings were held before the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in Riverside, California on July 21,
8 2015, to consider Amendment No. 1 to Specific Plan No. 265, Borel Airpark Center Specific Plan,
9 adopted by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Resolution No. 94-240 on October 4, 1994; and,

10 **WHEREAS**, all the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and
11 Riverside County CEQA implementing procedures have been satisfied, and Environmental Impact Report
12 (EIR) No. 540, prepared in connection with Specific Plan No. 265, Amendment No. 1, and related cases
13 (referred to alternatively herein as "the Project"), is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially
14 significant effects of the Project on the environment and measures necessary to avoid or substantially
15 lessen such effects have been evaluated in accordance with CEQA and Riverside County procedures; and,

16 **BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Board of Supervisors
17 of the County of Riverside, in regular session assembled on September 22, 2015 that:

- 18 A. Specific Plan No. 265, Amendment No. 1 ("SP No. 265 A1") modifies the Specific Plan to
19 remove the parcel containing the Rancho California Water District reservoir and the area
20 containing the extended runway for the French Valley Airport. Additionally, SP No. 265
21 A1 allows residential and recreational uses in the southeasterly portion of the Specific Plan
22 and revises the Circulation Plan.
- 23 B. SP No. 265 A1 is associated with General Plan Amendment No. 1123 (GPA No. 1123),
24 which was considered concurrently at the public hearing before the Board of Supervisors.
25 GPA No. 1123 would change the land use designation on the parcel owned by the Rancho
26 California Water District from Restricted Light Industrial and Open Space to Community
27 Development, Public Facilities (CD:PF). Additionally, the land use designations on the

FURNISH TO: CLERK OF COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BY: MICHELLE CLACK
DATE: 9/16/15

1 parcels identified as APNs 957-320-018 and 957-320-014 would be changed from
2 Industrial Park and Restricted Light Industrial to Community Development, Public
3 Facilities (CD:PF).

4 C. SP No. 265 A1 is also associated with Change of Zone No. 7806, which was considered
5 concurrently at the public hearing before the Board of Supervisors. Change of Zone No.
6 7806 proposes the following: revise the Specific Plan Zoning Ordinance as it pertains to
7 the renumbering of all Planning Areas, add new Planning Areas 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21 and
8 22 (related to TTM 36546), delete Planning Areas 6.2, 10.0, 20.0, and 33.0 , revise the
9 Specific Plan boundary to accommodate the runway extension to the French Valley
10 Airport, delete the Rancho California Water District reservoir site from the Specific Plan
11 Boundary, remove property from the Specific Plan's boundary which is now in the City of
12 Murrieta (PA's 10.0, 20.0 and 33.0), and formalize the boundaries for the Specific Plan's
13 Planning Areas.

14 D. SP No. 265 A1 is associated with Tentative Tract Map No. 36546 (TTM 36546), which
15 proposes a subdivision of 161.8 acres into 271 residential lots and 37 lettered lots, 13 of
16 which are for public streets, 10 for water quality basins, 8 designated as HOA, 2 are
17 designated for open space, and 4 designated for parks.

18 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental
19 impacts associated with the Project are potentially significant unless otherwise indicated, but each of these
20 impacts will be avoided or substantially reduced to a level that is less-than-significant with the
21 implementation of the proposed design features; mandatory compliance with federal, state, and local
22 regulations; and by the identified mitigation measures. Cumulative impacts were analyzed for the
23 proposed Project through a "summary of projections" approach, based on information contained in long-
24 range planning documents for the Project's vicinity.

25 A. Air Quality

26 1. Impacts:

27 As analyzed in Section 4.2.4 of the Final EIR No. 540, the Project-specific

1 evaluation of emissions demonstrates that after implementation of the
2 recommended mitigation measures, construction of the proposed Project
3 would not result in exceedances of regional air quality thresholds. Thus,
4 construction activity is not projected to result in unavoidable significant
5 adverse impacts. Once construction is completed the site will be occupied
6 by future residents. The emission forecast for the Project, once occupied
7 (over the long-term), do not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds; however,
8 mitigation is identified to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that also reduce
9 overall energy consumption and related criteria air pollutants.

10 There are no substantial point source emitters located within one mile of the
11 Project site. Therefore, the Project does not include any sensitive receptors
12 exposed to such emissions and it will not be exposed to any significant local
13 sources of pollution. No mitigation is required.

14 During construction activities of the proposed Project there will be odors
15 associated with equipment and materials such as diesel fuel odors from
16 construction equipment. These odors are normally not considered so
17 offensive as to cause sensitive receptors to complain and they will be short-
18 term. Over the long-term a portion of the future residential activities that
19 typically do not include activities that generate substantial odors.
20 Residential odors from vehicles and activities such as outdoor barbecues are
21 common components of the overall residential experience and do not pose a
22 significant odor exposure for future residents. Odors may emanate from the
23 industrial and commercial uses within the proposed Project during
24 operations that could affect the proposed residential development. Any
25 impacts are considered less than significant.

26 Cumulatively, the SCAQMD has recognized that there is typically
27 insufficient information to quantitatively evaluate the cumulative

1 contributions of multiple projects because each project applicant has no
2 control over nearby projects. Nevertheless, the potential cumulative impact
3 from the Project is discussed below.

4 Projects in the vicinity of the proposed Project could contribute to an
5 existing or projected air quality exceedance because the Basin is currently
6 nonattainment for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5. With regard to determining the
7 significance of the contribution from the proposed Project, the SCAQMD
8 recommends that any given project's potential contribution to cumulative
9 impacts should be assessed using the same significance criteria as for
10 project-specific impacts. Therefore, this analysis assumes that individual
11 projects that do not generate operational or construction emissions that
12 exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project specific
13 impacts would also not cause a cumulatively considerable increase in
14 emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment, and,
15 therefore, would not be considered to have a significant, adverse air quality
16 impact. This assumption included in the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality
17 Handbook that establishes the thresholds of significance for both project
18 specific and cumulative projects. Refer to the criteria contained in Table
19 4.2-5 of EIR No. 540.

20 Maximum daily construction activity emissions would be below SCAQMD
21 CEQA thresholds with or without mitigation. Mitigation is included to
22 reduce impacts associated with pollutants for which the air basin is not in
23 air quality compliance. Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) impacts
24 are less-than-significant even without application of available mitigation
25 and will not result in a cumulative impact. After application of the non-
26 discretionary mitigation measures (allow only gas hearths, low flow faucets,
27 toilets and showerheads), ROG emissions will not exceed the SCAQMD

1 operational threshold. Thus, operational emissions would be below
2 SCAQMD CEQA thresholds with implementation of the non-discretionary
3 mitigation measures and will be at a less than significant level and will not
4 be considered cumulative. Micro-scale air quality impacts are not
5 significant and will not be considered cumulative.

6 The zone of strong diesel odor impact from construction equipment is
7 typically 160 feet or less. Except where heavy equipment operations occur
8 in very close proximity to occupied dwellings or other odor-sensitive uses
9 (health care, outdoor restaurants, etc.) set-back distances are typically
10 adequate to preclude significant diesel odor impact potential. The Project
11 site would not be developed with land uses that are typically associated with
12 odor complaints.

13 2. Mitigation:

14 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
15 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

- 16 a. 4.2-1: Construction Equipment Emission Mitigation: utilize well-
17 tuned off-road construction equipment; establish a preference for
18 contractors using Tier 3 or cleaner heavy equipment; and, enforce 5-
19 minute idling limits for both on-road trucks and off-road equipment.
- 20 b. 4.2-2: Operational Emissions Mitigation: To reduce energy demand
21 associated with potable water conveyance, the Project shall be
22 designed to comply with the mandatory reductions in indoor water
23 usage contained in the incumbent CalGreen Code and the mandated
24 reduction in outdoor water usage contained in the County's water
25 efficient landscape requirements. Additionally, the Project shall
26 implement the following: landscaping palette emphasizing drought
27 tolerant plants; use of water-efficient irrigation techniques; and, U.S.

1 EPA Certified WaterSense labeled or equivalent faucets, high-
2 efficiency toilets (HETs), and water-conserving shower heads.

- 3 c. 4.2-3: Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project
4 proponent shall submit energy usage calculations to the Planning
5 Division verifying that the Project is designed to achieve 20%
6 efficiency beyond the 2015 California Building Code Title 24
7 requirements. Examples of measures that reduce energy
8 consumption include, but are not limited to, the following (it being
9 understood that the items listed below are not all required and
10 merely present examples; the list is not all-inclusive and other
11 features that reduce energy consumption also are acceptable):
12 increase in insulation such that heat transfer and thermal bridging is
13 minimized; limit air leakage through the structure and/or within the
14 heating and cooling distribution system; installation of electrical
15 hook-ups at loading dock areas; installation of dual-paned or other
16 energy efficient windows; use of interior and exterior energy
17 efficient lighting that exceeds then incumbent California Title 24
18 Energy Efficiency performance standards; installation of automatic
19 devices to turn off lights where they are not needed; application of a
20 paint and surface color palette that emphasizes light and off-white
21 colors that reflect heat away from buildings; design of buildings
22 with “cool roofs” using products certified by the Cool Roof Rating
23 Council, and/or exposed roof surfaces using light and off-white
24 colors; design of buildings to accommodate photo-voltaic solar
25 electricity systems or the installation of photo-voltaic solar
26 electricity systems; and installation of ENERGY STAR-qualified
27 energy-efficient appliances, heating and cooling systems, office

1 equipment, and/or lighting products.

2 In addition to the above discretionary mitigation measures, the
3 developer is also required to implement the following mandatory
4 measures established in SCAQMD rules and regulations.
5 Construction activities are not forecast to cause dust emissions to
6 exceed SCAQMD CEQA thresholds. Nevertheless, enhanced dust
7 control measures are required because of the particulate non-
8 attainment status of the air basin. These include: apply soil
9 stabilizers or moisten inactive disturbed areas; prepare and
10 implement a high wind dust control plan; stabilize previously
11 disturbed areas if subsequent construction is delayed; apply water
12 three times daily, or non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manu-
13 facturers' specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas,
14 unpaved road surfaces, and active construction areas; cover all stock
15 piles with tarps at the end of each day or as needed; provide water
16 spray during loading and unloading of earthen materials; minimize
17 in-out traffic from construction zone; cover all trucks hauling dirt,
18 sand, or loose material or require all trucks to maintain at least two
19 feet of freeboard; sweep streets daily if visible soil material is
20 carried out from the construction site; the contractor or builder shall
21 designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program
22 and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of
23 dust offsite; and post a publicly visible sign with the telephone
24 number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This
25 person shall respond and take corrective action within 24 hours.

26 To reduce air quality emissions associated with wood burning
27 fireplaces, the Project shall be designed to comply with the

1 mandatory SCAQMD Rule 445: utilize SCAQMD approved Rule
2 445 devices rather than wood burning fireplaces for any residential
3 use.

4 B. Biological Resources

5 1. Impacts:

6 The Project may result in impacts that may exceed thresholds of
7 significance for the following six issue areas: The proposed Project may
8 conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan,
9 Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or
10 state conservation plan; The proposed Project may have a substantial
11 adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on an
12 endangered, or threatened species; The proposed Project has the potential to
13 interfere substantially with the movement of native resident or migratory
14 fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife
15 corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; The proposed
16 Project may have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through
17 habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or
18 special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or
19 by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Wildlife Service;
20 The proposed Project may have a direct substantial adverse effect on any
21 riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or
22 regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of
23 Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; or The proposed
24 Project may have a direct substantial adverse effect on federally protected
25 wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but
26 not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal,
27 filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

1 As analyzed in Section 4.3.4 of the Final EIR No. 540, development of the
2 project will contribute to the change of the general area with an
3 intensification of development substantially greater than that which
4 presently occurs on the site; however, industrial and commercial
5 development, of a larger acreage and scale that the project is currently
6 permitted on the site. With the incorporation of mitigation, the project will
7 not cause adverse cumulative effects related to the reduction of sensitive
8 vegetation communities present in western Riverside County because there
9 are no such species located within the project area and the project can be
10 implemented consistent with the criteria identified in the MSHCP, the
11 planning document that defines cumulative biological resource values for
12 the Southwest Area Plan planning area. Due to the preservation/avoidance
13 of significant biological resources within the project site, and full mitigation
14 of any project-specific impacts, the proposed project is not forecast to cause
15 any direct or indirect significant unavoidable adverse impact to sensitive
16 biological resources.

17 The mitigation measures identified are feasible and in conjunction with the
18 developers commitment to permanently conserve approximately 94 acres
19 within MSHCP Core 2 area the proposed project would avoid or
20 substantially lessen the potentially significant impacts associated with
21 project biology resource impacts to a level of less than significant and no
22 unavoidable adverse or cumulatively considerable biology resource impacts
23 would occur.

24 With the incorporation of mitigation, the Project will not cause adverse
25 cumulative effects related to the reduction of sensitive vegetation
26 communities present in western Riverside County because there are no such
27

1 species located within the Project area and the Project can be implemented
2 consistent with the criteria identified in the MSHCP.

3 Cumulative biological impacts are defined as those impacts resulting from
4 the development within the MSCHP Plan Area as a result of build out of the
5 Cities and County's General Plans (MSHCP EIR/IES). Development of the
6 Project will contribute to the change of the general area with an
7 intensification of development substantially greater than that which
8 presently occurs on the site; however, industrial and commercial
9 development, of a larger acreage and scale that the project is currently
10 permitted on the site. With the incorporation of mitigation, the project will
11 not cause adverse cumulative effects related to the reduction of sensitive
12 vegetation communities present in western Riverside County because there
13 are no such species located within the project area and the project can be
14 implemented consistent with the criteria identified in the MSHCP, the
15 planning document that defines cumulative biological resource values for
16 the Southwest Area Plan planning area.

17 2. Mitigation:

18 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
19 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures:

- 20 a. 4.3-1: The construction of wildlife crossings will be done pursuant
21 to Section 6.6.2 E(2) of Volume 1 of the MSHCP (Joint
22 Project/Acquisition Review Process(Initial Project Review)).
23 Wildlife crossings will be sized, shaped, placed, constructed, and
24 landscaped pursuant to Section 7.5.2 of Volume 1 of the MSHCP
25 (Guidelines for Construction of Wildlife Crossings).
- 26 b. 4.3-2: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, any impacts to
27 CDFW jurisdiction will require a Lake and Streambed Alteration

1 Agreement (SAA) pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the California
2 Fish and Game Code. Due to the low quality waters of the State on
3 the project site, the preservation of the several acres of habitat in
4 Tualota Creek is considered sufficient mitigation to compensate for
5 the loss of less than one acre of these waters. This mitigation may
6 be altered through the conditions established in the SAA, but shall
7 not be less than identified in this measure.

8 c. 4.3-3: Pursuant to Objective 6 and Objective 7 of the Species
9 Account for the Burrowing Owl included in the Western Riverside
10 County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, within 30 days
11 prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a pre-construction
12 presence/absence survey for the burrowing owl shall be conducted
13 by a qualified biologist and the results of this presence/absence
14 survey shall be provided in writing to the Environmental Programs
15 Department. If it is determined that the project site is occupied by
16 the Burrowing Owl, take of "active" nests shall be avoided pursuant
17 to the MSHCP and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. However, when
18 the Burrowing Owl is present, relocation outside of the nesting
19 season (March 1 through August 31) by a qualified biologist shall be
20 required. The County Biologist shall be consulted to determine
21 appropriate type of relocation (active or passive) and translocation
22 sites. Occupation of this species on the project site may result in the
23 need to revise grading plans so that take of "active" nests is avoided
24 or alternatively, a grading permit may be issued once the species has
25 been actively relocated. If the grading permit is not obtained within
26 30 days of the survey a new survey shall be required.

27 d. 4.3-4: In order to avoid violation of the MBTA and California Fish

1 and Game Code, site-preparation activities (removal of trees and
2 vegetation) shall be avoided, to the greatest extent possible, during
3 the nesting season (generally February 1 to August 31) of potentially
4 occurring native and migratory bird species. If vegetation must be
5 removed during the nesting season, a qualified biologist will
6 conduct a nesting bird survey of potentially suitable nesting
7 vegetation prior to removal. Surveys will be conducted no more
8 than 3 days prior to scheduled removals. If active nests are
9 identified, the biologist will recommend buffers around the
10 vegetation containing the active nests. The vegetation containing
11 the active nest will not be removed, and no grading will occur within
12 the established buffer, until a qualified biologist has determined that
13 the nest is no longer active (i.e., the juveniles are surviving
14 independent from the nest). If clearing is not conducted within three
15 days of a negative survey, the nesting survey must be repeated to
16 confirm the absence of nesting birds.

- 17 e. 4.3-5: Non-native invasive plant species shall not be used in the
18 public property landscape palette and the HOA shall provide
19 homeowners with a copy of Table 6.2 of the MSHCP with a
20 prohibition against homeowners installing any plants on the list on
21 their property.

22 C. Cultural Resources

23 1. Impacts:

24 The Final EIR No. 530 explains the thresholds of significance in great detail
25 in section 4.4.3. Based on the information contained in the Phase I Report
26 and Phase II Report, implementation of the Project will not result in cultural
27 resource impacts that will exceed the established thresholds of significance.

1 Because the implementation of the Project is not forecast to cause any
2 direct, significant adverse impact to cultural resources, with implementation
3 of identified mitigation measures, the Project has no potential to make a
4 cumulatively considerable contribution to cultural resource impacts, in the
5 Project area or Riverside County in general. Based on the information
6 contained above, all potential cultural resource impacts would be limited
7 and with mitigation incorporated will remain at a less than significant level.
8 As a result, there will not be any unavoidable project specific or cumulative
9 adverse impacts to cultural resources from implementing the project as
10 proposed.

11 Cumulatively, based on the information contained in the Phase I Report and
12 Phase II Report, implementation of the Project will not result in cultural
13 resource impacts that will exceed the established thresholds of significance.

14 Because the implementation of the Project is not forecast to cause any
15 direct, significant adverse impact to cultural resources, with implementation
16 of identified mitigation measures, the Project has no potential to make a
17 cumulatively considerable contribution to cultural resource impacts, in the
18 Project area or Riverside County in general.

19 2. Mitigation:

20 The Project has been modified to mitigate or avoid the potentially
21 significant impacts by the following mitigation measures or conditions of
22 approval:

- 23 a. 10.Planning.19: County Archaeological Report (PDA) No. 4871
24 submitted for this project (TR36546) was prepared by Jean Keller,
25 Ph.D., Cultural Resources Consultant and is entitled: "An Updated
26 Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of Cultural Resource
27 Properties CA-RIV-4640, CA-RIV-4661, CA-RIV-6912, and 33-

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

23915, located within Tract Map 36546," dated July 2014. This document was signed and certified by the consultant on August 25, 2014.

(PDA) No. 4871 concluded: CA-RIV-4661 and P-33-23915 are located within an open space area and will not be adversely impacted by development of this Project. 2. The previously mapped location of CA-RIV-4640 and site CA-RIV-6912 are both situated in areas that will be impacted by development of this Project.

(PDA) No. 4871 recommends: 1.A Phase II testing and evaluation program shall be conducted for sites CA-RIV-4640 and CA-RIV-6912. Should future development be proposed in the area of P-33-23915, Phase II testing and evaluation should be conducted for this resource. If any ground disturbing activities are conducted within 100' of CA-RIV-4661, temporary protective orange fencing shall be installed and earthmoving activities shall be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and a tribal representative. All earthmoving activities associated with development of Tentative Tract Map 36546 are monitored by a qualified archaeologist and a tribal representative. Phase II work is required as described elsewhere in this conditions set. This study has been incorporated as part of this Project, and has been accepted.

- b. 60.Planning.24: The landowner agrees to relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including all Luiseño sacred items, burial goods and all archaeological artifacts that are found on the Project area to the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians for proper treatment and disposition.

1 If any human remains are encountered, all ground disturbing
2 activities in the vicinity of the discovery shall be immediately
3 terminated and the County Coroner's office contacted. If the
4 remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the
5 Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians shall be contacted concerning the
6 management and permanent disposition of the remains.

7 Tribal monitors from the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians shall be
8 allowed to monitor all initial grading, excavation, and
9 groundbreaking activities, including further surveys, to be
10 compensated by the Project Applicant/Developer. The Pechanga
11 Tribal monitors will have the authority to stop and redirect grading
12 activities to evaluate the significance of any archaeological
13 resources discovered on the property, in conjunction with the
14 archaeologist and the Planning Department.

15 Tribal monitors from the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians shall be
16 allowed to monitor all grading, excavation, and groundbreaking
17 activities, including further surveys, to be compensated by the
18 Project Applicant/Developer. The Pechanga Tribal monitors will
19 have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities to evaluate
20 the significance of any archaeological resources discovered on the
21 property, in conjunction with the archaeologist and the Planning
22 Department.

23 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the developer/permit
24 applicant shall enter into a contract with a Tribal monitor(s) from the
25 appropriate Native American Tribe(s) who, at the tribe's discretion,
26 shall be on-site during ground disturbing activities. The developer
27 shall submit a copy of a signed contract between the appropriate

1 Tribe and the developer/permit holder for the monitoring of the
2 Project, and which addresses the treatment of cultural resources, to
3 the Planning Department and the County Archaeologist. The Native
4 American Monitor(s) shall have the authority to temporarily divert,
5 redirect or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow recovery of
6 cultural resources. Native American groups shall be given a
7 minimum notice of two weeks that a monitor is required. If a
8 monitor is not available, work may continue without the monitor.
9 The Project Archaeologist shall include in the Phase IV
10 Archaeological Monitoring report any concerns or comments that
11 the monitor has regarding the Project and shall include as an
12 appendix any written correspondence or reports prepared by the
13 Native American monitor.

14 Native American monitoring does not replace any Cultural
15 Resources monitoring required by a County-approved
16 Archaeologist, but rather serves as a supplement for coordination
17 and advisory purposes for all groups' interests only.

18 The developer/permit applicant shall not be required to further
19 pursue any agreement for Native American monitoring of this
20 Project if after 60 days from the initial attempt to secure an
21 agreement the developer/permit applicant, through demonstrable
22 good faith effort, has been unable to secure said agreement from the
23 Tribe. A good faith effort shall consist of no less than 3 written
24 attempts from the developer/permit applicant to the tribe to secure
25 the required special interest monitoring agreement and appropriate
26 e-mail and telephone contact attempts. Documentation of the effort
27

1 made to secure the agreement shall be submitted to the County
2 Archaeologist for review and consideration.

3 Should repatriation of collected cultural items be preferred, it shall
4 not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been
5 submitted to the Riverside County Archaeologist. Should curation
6 be preferred, the developer/permit applicant is responsible for all
7 costs and the repository and curation method shall be described in
8 the Phase IV monitoring report.

- 9 c. 60.Planning.25: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the
10 developer/permit holder shall retain and enter into a monitoring and
11 mitigation service contract with a qualified Archaeologist for
12 services. The Project Archaeologist (Cultural Resource
13 Professional) shall develop a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan
14 which must be approved by the County Archaeologist prior to
15 issuance of grading permits. The Project Archaeologist shall be
16 included in the pre-grade meetings to provide Construction Worker
17 Cultural Resources Sensitivity Training including the establishment
18 of set guidelines for ground disturbance in sensitive areas with the
19 grading contractors and special interest monitors. A sign-in sheet
20 for attendees of this training shall be included in the Phase IV
21 Monitoring Report. The Project Archaeologist shall manage and
22 oversee monitoring for all initial ground disturbing activities and
23 excavation of each portion of the Project site including clearing,
24 grubbing, tree removals, grading, trenching, stockpiling of materials,
25 rock crushing, structure demolition and etc. The Project Monitor
26 shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect or halt the
27 ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and

1 potential recovery of cultural resources in coordination with the
2 special interest monitors. The developer/permit holder shall submit
3 a fully executed copy of the contract and a wet-signed copy of the
4 Monitoring Plan to the Riverside County Planning Department to
5 ensure compliance with this condition of approval.

- 6 d. 60.Planning.01: This site is mapped in the County's General Plan as
7 having a High potential for paleontological resources (fossils).
8 Proposed project site grading/earthmoving activities could
9 potentially impact this resource. HENCE: PRIOR TO ISSUANCE
10 OF GRADING PERMITS: The applicant shall retain a qualified
11 paleontologist approved by the County of Riverside to create and
12 implement a project-specific plan for monitoring site
13 grading/earthmoving activities (project paleontologist). The Project
14 paleontologist retained shall review the approved development plan
15 and grading plan and shall conduct any pre-construction work
16 necessary to render appropriate monitoring and mitigation
17 requirements as appropriate. These requirements shall be
18 documented by the Project paleontologist in a Paleontological
19 Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP). This PRIMP shall
20 be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior
21 to issuance of a Grading Permit.

22 Information to be contained in the PRIMP, at a minimum and in
23 addition to other industry standards and Society of Vertebrate
24 Paleontology standards, are as follows:

- 25 1. Description of the proposed site and planned grading
26 operations.
27

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

2. Description of the level of monitoring required for all earth-moving activities in the Project area.
3. Identification and qualifications of the qualified paleontological monitor to be employed for grading operations monitoring.
4. Identification of personnel with authority and responsibility to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for recovery of large specimens.
5. Direction for any fossil discoveries to be immediately reported to the property owner who in turn will immediately notify the County Geologist of the discovery.
6. Means and methods to be employed by the paleontological monitor to quickly salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays.
7. Sampling of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates.
8. Procedures and protocol for collecting and processing of samples and specimens.
9. Fossil identification and curation procedures to be employed.
10. Identification of the permanent repository to receive any recovered fossil material. *Pursuant the County of Riverside "SABER Policy", paleontological fossils found in the County of Riverside should, by preference, be directed to the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet. A written agreement between the property owner/developer and the repository must be in place prior to site grading.
11. All pertinent exhibits, maps and references.

1 responsible for the content of the report. This Paleontologist must be on
2 the County's Paleontology Consultant List. The report shall contain a
3 report of findings made during all site grading activities and an
4 appended itemized list of fossil specimens recovered during grading (if
5 any) and proof of accession of fossil materials into the pre-approved
6 museum repository. In addition, all appropriate fossil location
7 information shall be submitted to the Western Center, the San
8 Bernardino County Museum and Los Angeles County Museum of
9 Natural History, at a minimum, for incorporation into their Regional
10 Locality Inventories.

11 D. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

12 1. Impacts:

13 The proposed Project would exceed the SCAQMD suggested GHG
14 threshold of 3,000 MT/year with implementation of all reasonably available
15 mitigation measures related to Energy Efficient Project Design. The Project
16 would have a significant cumulative adverse impact with respect to GHG
17 emissions. Further, the inability to achieve CAP compliance with feasible
18 measures is considered a conflict with applicable plans, policies and
19 regulations. As such, the proposed Project would result in a significant
20 unavoidable adverse impact with respect to GHG emissions.

21 Cumulatively, the proposed Project would exceed the SCAQMD suggested
22 GHG threshold of 3,000 MT/year with implementation of all reasonably
23 available mitigation measures related to Energy Efficient Project Design.
24 The Project would have a significant cumulative adverse impact with
25 respect to GHG emissions. Therefore, CEQA requires Riverside County to
26 adopt a statement of overriding considerations set forth in this resolution.

27 ///

1 2. Mitigation:

2 a. The Mitigation Measures for potential Air Quality Impacts set forth
3 in section A above are incorporated herein by this reference.

4 E. Hydrology and Water Quality

5 1. Impacts:

6 One watercourse (Tucalota Creek) traverses the Project site generally from
7 north to southwest, and two small, ephemeral creek channels originate on
8 the property but do not flow in channels. The Tucalota Creek channel will
9 be permanently conserved on the Project site. Also, as part of the
10 permanent mitigation on the north side of the property, the other two
11 channels are being preserved. The northern portion of the property will be
12 retained with the existing natural habitat.

13 However, after development of the proposed residential Project the drainage
14 in the central portion of the Project site will be substantially altered. The
15 flows will be collected and delivered to a drainage system that will be
16 installed in conjunction with the proposed Project. The Project incorporates
17 water quality/water management basins that will collect the local runoff
18 ultimately, for discharge back into Tucalota Creek. Surface runoff will be
19 treated before released to the drainage pipes to remove first flush suburban
20 pollutants and the basins will detain flows sufficiently to prevent a
21 substantial increase in the storm water discharged from the Project site.
22 Thus, even though the drainage pattern will be modified onsite, the
23 proposed drainage system will not substantially alter the flow or course of a
24 stream or river in a manner that could result in substantial erosion or
25 siltation on- or off-site. The Project's potential impact to onsite or
26 downstream erosion or siltation is considered to be less than significant.

27 As described in the previous section, the proposed Project is a residential