July 2017 | Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

TEMECULA VALLEY CHARTER SCHOOL County of Riverside

Prepared for:

County of Riverside Contact: Larry Ross 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor Riverside, California 92502

Prepared by:

951.955.9294

PlaceWorks Contact: Dwayne Mears, Principal, Schools Facilities Planning 3 MacArthur Place, Suite 1100 Santa Ana, California 92707 714.966.9220 info@placeworks.com www.placeworks.com



<u>Secti</u>	ion		Page
1.	INTR		1
	1 1	PROJECT LOCATION	1
	1.2	ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING	
	1.3	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2
	1.4	EXISTING ZONING AND GENERAL PLAN	4
	1.5	COUNTY ACTION REQUESTED	4
2.	ENVI	RONMENTAL CHECKLIST	21
	2.1	BACKGROUND	
	2.2	ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	
	2.3	DETERMINATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY)	
	2.4	EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	
3.	ENVI	RONMENTAL ANALYSIS	
	3.1	AESTHETICS	
	3.2	AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES	
	3.3	AIR QUALITY	
	3.4	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	
	3.5	CULTURAL RESOURCES	
	3.6	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	71
	3.7	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	
	3.8	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	
	3.9	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	
	3.10	LAND USE AND PLANNING	
	3.11	MINERAL RESOURCES	
	3.12	NOISE	
	3.13	POPULATION AND HOUSING	
	3.14 2.15	PUBLIC SERVICES	
	5.15 3.16	ΤΡΑΝΙΣΟΩΡΤΑΤΙΩΝ /ΤΡΑΕΕΙΩ	112
	3.10	LITH ITTES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	113
	3.17	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	
4	DEE		120
4. E			
ວ.			
	COU	NTY OF RIVERSIDE	
	TEM	ECULA VALLEY CHARTER SCHOOL	
	PLAC	EWUKKS	145

APPENDICES

- Appendix A Health Risk Assessment
- Appendix B Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Background and Modeling Data
- Appendix C1 Habitat Assessment
- Appendix C2 Fairy Shrimp Survey
- Appendix D Geotechnical Investigation
- Appendix E Paleontological Technical Study
- Appendix F Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
- Appendix G Noise and Vibration Background and Modeling Data
- Appendix H Traffic Impact Analysis

Page

List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>

Figure 1	Regional Location	5
Figure 2	Local Vicinity	7
Figure 3	Aerial Photograph	9
Figure 4	Site Photographs	11
Figure 5	Site Photographs	13
Figure 6	Site Plan 15	
Figure 7	Elevations, Multipurpose Building	17
Figure 8	Elevations, Classroom Building C2	19
Figure 9	MSHCP Criteria Cells and Constrained Linkage	53
Figure 10	Plant Communities Map	57
Figure 11	Project Trip Distribution	.119
Figure 12	Cumulative Developments Location Map	.123
Figure 13	Project Site Access Improvements	.129

List of Tables

Table		Page
Table 1	Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissions	
Table 2	Maximum Daily Regional Operational Phase Emissions	
Table 3	Localized Construction Emissions	
Table 4	Health Risk Assessment Results	
Table 5	MSHCP Review Summary	
Table 6	Acreage of Plant Communities on the Project Site	55
Table 7	Special Status Plant Species Potentially Occurring on the Project Site	
Table 8	Construction Best Management Practices	74
Table 9	Project-Related GHG Emissions	
Table 10	Stationary Source Land Use Noise Standards	
Table 11	Existing and Future Noise Level Estimates	
Table 12	Project-Related Construction Noise Levels	
Table 13	Vibration Levels for Typical Construction Equipment	
Table 14	Architectural Damage Vibration Levels from Construction Equipment	

Table 15	Average Annoyance Vibration Levels from Construction Equipment	108
Table 16	Study Area Intersections	114
Table 17	Intersection Level of Service Descriptions	115
Table 18	Existing Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service	117
Table 19	Project Trip Generation	117
Table 20	Intersection Delay and LOS, Existing Plus Project Conditions	118
Table 21	Intersection Delay and LOS, EAP Conditions	122
Table 22	Intersection Delay and LOS, 2018 No Project Conditions	122
Table 23	Intersection Delay and LOS, 2018 with Project and Cumulative Projects Traffic Condit	ions
		125
Table 24	EMWD Forecast Water Supplies and Demands, acre-feet per year	134
Table 25	Landfills Serving Murrieta and Menifee	135

AAQS	ambient air quality standards
AB	Assembly Bill
ACM	asbestos-containing materials
ADT	average daily traffic
amsl	above mean sea level
AQMP	air quality management plan
AST	aboveground storage tank
BAU	business as usual
bgs	below ground surface
BMP	best management practices
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAFE	corporate average fuel economy
CalARP	California Accidental Release Prevention Program
CalEMA	California Emergency Management Agency
Cal/EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
Cal/OSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
CalRecycle	California Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDE	California Department of Education
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act
cfs	cubic feet per second
CGS	California Geologic Survey
CMP	congestion management program
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	community noise equivalent level

CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂ e	carbon dioxide equivalent
Corps	US Army Corps of Engineers
CSO	combined sewer overflows
CUPA	Certified Unified Program Agency
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DPM	diesel particulate matter
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	environmental impact report
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHG	greenhouse gases
GWP	global warming potential
НСМ	Highway Capacity Manual
HQTA	high quality transit area
HVAC	heating, ventilating, and air conditioning system
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
L _{dn}	day-night noise level
L _{eq}	equivalent continuous noise level
LBP	lead-based paint
LCFS	low-carbon fuel standard
LOS	level of service
LST	localized significance thresholds
M_W	moment magnitude
MCL	maximum contaminant level
MEP	maximum extent practicable
mgd	million gallons per day
MMT	million metric tons

MPO	metropolitan planning organization
MT	metric ton
MWD	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NO _X	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
O ₃	ozone
OES	California Office of Emergency Services
PM	particulate matter
POTW	publicly owned treatment works
ppm	parts per million
PPV	peak particle velocity
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
REC	recognized environmental condition
RMP	risk management plan
RMS	root mean square
RPS	renewable portfolio standard
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SIP	state implementation plan
SLM	sound level meter
SoCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SO_X	sulfur oxides
SQMP	stormwater quality management plan
SRA	source receptor area [or state responsibility area]
SUSMP	standard urban stormwater mitigation plan
SWP	State Water Project
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminants
TNM	transportation noise model

tpd	tons per day
TRI	toxic release inventory
ТТСР	traditional tribal cultural places
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
UST	underground storage tank
UWMP	urban water management plan
V/C	volume-to-capacity ratio
VdB	velocity decibels
VHFHSZ	very high fire hazard severity zone
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compound
WQMP	water quality management plan
WSA	water supply assessment

The Temecula Valley Charter School Board of Directors is seeking approval from Riverside County for development of a public charter school for 600 K-8 students in the community of French Valley in unincorporated Riverside County. Temecula Valley Charter School is proposing to relocate an existing charter school campus from 35755 Abelia Street in French Valley (about 1.4 miles southeast of the proposed project site) to the proposed campus—two parcels on the west side of Winchester Road (State Route 79) between Keller Road and Pourroy Road.

1.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is in the unincorporated community of French Valley in western Riverside County. French Valley is surrounded by unincorporated county to the south and east; unincorporated county and the City of Menifee to the north; and the City of Murrieta and unincorporated county to the west (see Figure 1, *Regional Location*). French Valley is part of the larger San Jacinto Basin, a broad valley interspersed with hills that spans much of western Riverside County. The basin is bounded by the Santa Ana Mountains on the southwest and the San Jacinto Mountains on the northeast. Regional access to the site is via Winchester Road (SR-79), which passes next to the eastern site boundary.

The project site is about 14.6 acres and consists of two parcels: Assessor's Parcels Number (APN) 476010059 and APN 476010013. The site is about 1,120 feet north of the intersection of SR-79 with Pourroy Road/Abelia Street (see Figure 2, *Local Vicinity*). The proposed school site is approximately 8.5 acres, consisting of all of parcel -059 and the east edge and southeastern part of parcel -013.

An unnamed existing road, partly paved and partly dirt, provides access from SR-79 to the residences on the western parcel.

The site includes approximately 1,235 linear feet of Koon Street along the southern site boundary. The project would develop Koon Street to its ultimate half-width, or about 18 feet wide including curb and gutter; the area of Koon Street to be developed would be about 0.5 acre.

The project would also develop the eastern half-width of a segment of Pourroy Road, currently a dirt road, extending from its intersection with Flossie Way about 385 feet south to an existing paved segment of Pourroy Road. The area of Pourroy Road to be developed is about 0.16 acre.

In this document, "project site" refers to the two parcels totaling 14.6 acres plus the sites of the two roadway improvements that total about 0.65 acres. "School site" refers to the 8.5-acre site of the proposed school.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

1.2.1 Existing Land Use

The western parcel is developed with two single-family residences, one garage, and two above-ground water tanks. The eastern parcel is vacant and appeared to have been tilled shortly before a site visit on July 21, 2016 (see Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*, and Figures 4 and 5, *Site Photographs*).

1.2.2 Surrounding Land Use

The project site is surrounded by rural residential uses to the west and north; a single-family home abuts the northern site boundary on west. The project site is surrounded by vacant land to the south and by vacant land and agricultural uses to the east across SR-79 (see Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*). Lake Skinner Recreation Area is about 1.7 miles to the southeast, and Diamond Valley Lake is about 3 miles to the northeast. Interstate 215 is about 4.1 miles to the west. Two concrete culverts pass under SR-79 east of the project site, carrying stormwater southeastward under the roadway.

1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.3.1 Proposed Land Use

The project consists of construction and operation of a K-8 charter school for 600 students. Six one-story school buildings, totaling about 44,998 square feet of building area, would be clustered in the east-central part of the project site around a quad (see Figure 6, *Site Plan*). The buildings would consist of four classroom buildings containing 31 classrooms and totaling 27,180 square feet; a 9,468-square-foot multipurpose building; and an 8,350-square-foot administration building. The multipurpose building, which would be built in the south-central part of the project site, would be about 27 feet high, and the four classroom buildings would each be about 18 feet high (see Figures 7, *Elevations, Multipurpose Building,* and 8, *Elevations, Classroom Building C2*).

Most of the westerly parcel onsite would be left as is. The vacant single-story residence atop the hill in the northwestern part of the project site, and the garage, two aboveground water tanks and a concrete pad in the west-central part of the project site would remain. A mobile home in the west-central part of the project site would remain.

The northwestern part of the project site, a hill topped by a vacant single-family residence, would be left as is.

Athletic Facilities

Athletic facilities would consist of the multipurpose room, and a soccer field in the southwest corner of the school site.

Access and Parking

School site access would be via Koon Street, currently a paper street, which would begin at the Flossie Way/Pourroy Road, extend along the project site's southern boundary and end in a cul-de-sac at SR-79. School access from the Koon Street cul-de-sac would be via two 1-way driveways forming an elongated one-way loop next to the east site boundary, with the school's 100-space parking lot in the center of the loop. A fire land would extend over paved areas around the school buildings. A flow-through drop-off lane would loop around the periphery of the parking lot.

A new driveway would be built just west of the campus connecting an existing driveway from the remaining residence on the hill to Koon Street.

Project development would also include paving approximately 385 feet of Pourroy Road extending south from the intersection of Koon Street to a currently paved portion of Pourroy Road. The areas of Koon Street and Pourroy Road that would be developed would total about 0.65 acre.

Landscaping

About 3.3 acres of landscaping would be installed; the majority of which would be in the southwest part of the school site and would include the new soccer field; with most of the remainder being along the northeast campus perimeter (see Figure 5, *Site Plan*).

Hardscape

The project proposes development of about 180,500 square feet, or about 4.1 acres, of pavement, including a surface parking lot, driveways, and walkways.

1.3.2 Project Operation

Staff

Project operation would employ about 40 faculty and staff.

Calendar and Schedule

Currently, student school days on the academic calendar of the existing Temecula Valley Charter School for the 2016-17 school year extend from August 17, 2016, to June 2, 2017. However, the academic calendar for the opening year of the charter school (which is anticipated for fall of 2018) and beyond may change based on the needs of the Temecula Valley Charter School or Temecula Valley Unified School District.

The schedule for the existing Temecula Valley Charter School extends from 8:50 AM to 2:50 PM for elementary grades, and from 7:55 AM to 2:50 PM for middle school grades, on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays; school is dismissed early at 1:45 PM for all grades on Wednesdays. However, the calendar and schedule will be subject to change based on the needs of the school or the Temecula Valley Unified School District.

1.3.3 Project Phasing

Site Clearance

Site clearance would include removal of the mobile home in the west-central part of the project site.

Construction

The overall construction schedule is one year, from summer/fall 2017 through summer 2018.

- Site Preparation and Grading. School site preparation and grading are expected to take about two months, commencing in summer 2017. The school site is expected to be balanced, with no soil export or import anticipated. A total of 8.5 acres of the school site would be disturbed during project construction.
- **Utility Trenching.** Utility Trenching is anticipated to take approximately one month, August 2017.
- Building Construction. Building construction is scheduled for nine months, September 2017 through May 2018.
- Asphalt Paving, Finishing, and Landscaping. Asphalt paving, finishing, and landscaping are expected to be completed in one month, May 2018.
- Architectural Coating. Architectural coating is anticipated to take three months, March through May 2018.

1.4 EXISTING ZONING AND GENERAL PLAN

The existing zoning and Riverside County General Plan designations for the project site are both Rural Residential (R-R); the R-R zone permits development of single-family residences. Schools are permitted in the R-R zoning with a Public Use Permit.

1.5 COUNTY ACTION REQUESTED

- Adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for CEQA clearance
- Approval of Development Plan
- Approval of Public Use Permit (PUP00931)

Figure 1 - Regional Location 1. Introduction



Figure 2 - Local Vicinity 1. Introduction



TEMECULA VALLEY CHARTER SCHOOL INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

Figure 3 - Aerial Photograph 1. Introduction



Project Boundary

------ Temecula Sphere of Influence Boundary

400 Scale (Feet)

Base Map Source: Google Earth Pro, 2016

Figure 4 - Site Photographs 1. Introduction



View looking northeast from the south part of the project site.



View looking northwest from the east part of the site.

Figure 5 - Site Photographs 1. Introduction



View looking west across the site from the northeast corner of the site.



View looking south across the site from the north part of the site

TEMECULA VALLEY CHARTER SCHOOL INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE



Base Map Source: WLC Architects, 2016

CURVED SHEET METAL ROOF WITH SHEET METAL FASCIA - PAINTED PLASTER STUCCO - PAINTED COLOR 1 = GALVANIZED RAILING AND CONCRETE STAIR NDOW FRAME AND TINTED GLAZING - TYP WAY COVER - PAINTED PLASTER STUCCO CONTROL JOINT - TYP 27'-0" 22 - 0" Multipurpose Building - North Elevation $\left(1\right)$ GALVANIZED RAILING AND **•**^{27 • 0*} 28.0" **•**^{22 · 0*} 22'-0" 18' - 0"**+** 10'-0" **•** IST FLOOR Multipurpose Building - South Elevation (2)METAL WALKWAY COVER -PAINTED GALVANIZED RAILING AND CONCRETE RAMP 27 - 0* CONCRETE STAIR 27 - 0* 10° - 0° **Ф** Multipurpose Building - East Elevation -(3) Multipurpose Building - West Elevation (4)

Figure 7 - Elevations, Multipurpose Building 1. Introduction

30

0

TEMECULA VALLEY CHARTER SCHOOL INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE





Scale (Feet)

0

30

2.1 BACKGROUND

1. Project Title: Temecula Valley Charter School

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: County of Riverside Planning Department 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor Riverside, CA 92502

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Larry Ross, Principal Planner 951.955.9294

4. Project Location:

The 14.6-acre project site is in the community of French Valley in western Riverside County. The site is on the west side of SR-79, approximately 780 feet southeast of the intersection of Keller Road and SR-79.

- Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Temecula Valley Charter School 35755 Abelia Street Winchester, CA 92596
- 6. General Plan Designation: Rural Residential
- 7. Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R)

8. Description of Project: The proposed project would be a public charter school for 600 students in grades K-8.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site is surrounded by rural residential uses to the west and north; a single-family home abuts the northern site boundary on west. The project site is surrounded by vacant land to the south and by vacant land and agricultural uses to the east across SR-79. Lake Skinner Recreation Area is about 1.7 miles to the southeast, and Diamond Valley Lake is about 3 miles to the northeast. Interstate 215 is about 4.1 miles to the west. Two concrete culverts pass under SR-79 east of the project site, carrying stormwater southeastward under the roadway.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required:

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," or "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Aesthetics	l.	Agriculture / Forestry Resources		Air Quality
Biological Resources	\boxtimes	Cultural Resources	\boxtimes	Geology / Soils
Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards / Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality
Land Use / Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise
Population / Housing	L.,	Public Services		Recreation
Transportation / Traffic		Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance

2.3 DETERMINATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

L_____I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signatu:e

Date

Charissa Leach, P.E., Assistant TLMA Director For

Larry Ross, Project Planner

Printed Name

2.4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

- 8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No
	Issues	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact
I. /	AESTHETICS.				
1. 9	SCENIC RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?				X
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?			x	
2.	MT. PALOMAR OBSERVATORY. Would the project:				
a)	Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?			x	
3. (OTHER LIGHTING ISSUES. Would the project:				
a)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
11.	II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.				
4.1	AGRICULIURE. would the project:		1	1	
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non- agricultural use?				x
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?				X
c)	Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?				X

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No
_	Issues	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact
d)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
5. F	OREST. Would the project:	1	.	.	
a)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				x
b)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				x
III.	AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criter pollution control district may be relied upon to make the fol	ria established b lowing determina	y the applicable itions.	air quality man	agement or air
6.7	AIR QUALITY IMPACTS. Would the project:	1	i	i	(
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			x	
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e)	Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?				
f)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
g)	Is the boundary of the proposed school site within 500 feet of the edge of the closest traffic lane of a freeway or busy traffic corridor? If yes, would the project create an air quality health risk due to the placement of the School?				X
h)	Would the project create an air quality hazard due to the placement of a school within one-quarter mile of: (a) permitted and nonpermitted facilities identified by the jurisdictional air quality control board or air pollution control district; (b) freeways and other busy traffic corridors; (c) large agricultural operations; and/or (d) a rail yard, which might reasonably be anticipated to emit hazardous air emissions, or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste?			X	

		Detentially	Less Than Significant	Less Then	
		Significant	Mitigation	Significant	No
IV		Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact
7. \	VILDLIFE AND VEGETATION. Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			x	
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?			x	
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Wildlife Service?			x	
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			x	
e)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
f)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				x
g)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				Х
۷.	CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
8. H	Alter or destroy on historic site?				V
d) h)	Aller or desiroy dri filstoric site?				X
5)	historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?		X		
9. /	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	1	t		
a)	Alter or destroy an archaeological site?				X
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		X		
c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	
d)	Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?				X
			Less Than Significant		
-----	---	---	---	--	--
		Potentially Significant	With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No
	Issues	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact
10.	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project of cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code sectio geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of California Native American tribe, and that is:	ause a substanti n 21074 as eithei the landscape, s	al adverse chan r a site, feature, sacred place, or	ge in the signific place, cultural la object with cult	ance of a tribal ndscape that is ural value to a
a)	Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c). of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 for the purpose of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance to a California Native tribe.		X		
VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
11.	ALQUIST-PRIOLO EARTHQUAKE FAULT ZONE OR	COUNTY FAUL	T HAZARD ZC	NES	•
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death				x
b)	Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?				x
12.	LIQUEFACTION POTENTIAL ZONE				
a)	Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
13.	GROUND-SHAKING ZONE	1		1	
a)	Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
14.	LANDSLIDE RISK				
a)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable due to the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?			X	
15.	GROUND SUBSIDENCE	I	1	I	
a)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?			x	
16.	OTHER GEOLOGIC HAZARDS				
a)	Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?			X	
17.	SLOPES				
a)	Change topography or ground surface relief features?			X	
b)	Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?				X
c)	Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?				x

			Less Than Significant		
		Potentially Significant	With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No
40	Issues	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact
18.	SULS			v	
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion of the loss of topsoil?			~	
	the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
c)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				х
19.	EROSION	i	i		
a)	Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?			X	
b)	Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?			X	
20.	WIND EROSION AND BLOWSAND FROM PROJECT	EITHER ON OF	R OFF SITE		
a)	Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blows and, either on or off site?			X	
21.	PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES	I	I		
a)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?		X		
VII	. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the proj	ect:			
22.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	t	t		
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			Х	
VII	I. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. v	Vould the project	:		
23.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	I	I		
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				Х
d)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
e)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	

		Potentially	Less Than Significant With	l ess Than	
	Issues	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	No Impact
24.	AIRPORTS				
a)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
b)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
25.	HAZARDOUS FIRE AREA				
A)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			x	
1X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the WATER QUALITY IMPACTS	project:			
a)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or				
	area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.			Х	
b)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
c)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre- existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			x	
d)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			x	
e)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
f)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				Х
g)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			Х	
h)	Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors)?			x	
27.	FLOODPLAINS				
a)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site			Х	

		Detentially	Less Than Significant	Less Ther	
	Issues	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	No Impact
b)	Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?			X	
c)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
d)	Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?				X
Χ.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
28.	LAND USE	[1	I	
a)	Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?			X	
b)	Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?			X	
29.	PLANNING		1		
a)	Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?				X
b)	Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?				X
c)	Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?				X
d)	Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?				X
e)	Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?				X
XI.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
30.	MINERAL RESOURCES		1		
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?			х	
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
c)	Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?				X
d)	Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?				X
XII	. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
31.	AIRPORT NOISE		i		
a)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				x
b)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

			Less Than Significant		
	lssues	Potentially Significant	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No
32.	RAILROAD NOISE	impuot	incorporatou	inipuot	inipuot
a)	For a project within 0.25 mile of a railroad track, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				x
33.	HIGHWAY NOISE				
a)	Would project-generated traffic cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
34.	OTHER NOISE				1
a)	Would the project include stationary sources of noise generating a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
35.	NOISE EFFECTS ON OR BY THE PROJECT				1
a)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
b)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
c)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
d)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			Х	
XII	I. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	1			
36.	HOUSING	i .	i		i
a)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
b)	Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?			X	
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
d)	Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?				X
e)	Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?			X	
f)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			x	

		Potentially	Less Than Significant With	l ess Than	
	Issues	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	No Impact
XI	V. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in subs new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for n of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in other performance objectives for any of the public services:	tantial adverse p new or physically n order to mainta	hysical impacts a altered governm ain acceptable se	associated with t ental facilities, th ervice ratios, res	he provision of ne construction ponse times or
37.	FIRE SERVICES			X	
38.	SHERIFF SERVICES			X	
39.	SCHOOLS				X
40.	LIBRARIES				X
41.	HEALTH SERVICES				X
X١	/. RECREATION.				
42.	PARKS AND RECREATION	1	1		
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				x
b)	Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				x
c)	Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?				x
43.	RECREATIONAL TRAILS	1	1	Γ	
a)	Would the project adversely affect a recreational trail or bikeway included in the Riverside County Southwest Area Plan Trails and Bikeway System?				х
X٧	I. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:	:			
44.	CIRCULATION	_			
a)	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			x	
b)	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			x	
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				x
d)	Alter waterborne, rail, or air traffic?				X

		Potentially	Less Than Significant With	Less Than	
	Issues	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	No Impact
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			x	
f)	Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?			X	
g)	Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	on during the project's X			
h)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
i)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				Х
45.	BIKE TRAILS	i	i	ii	
a)	Would the project adversely affect a bikeway included in the Riverside County Southwest Area Plan Trails and Bikeway System?				Х
XV	II. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would th	e project:			
46.	WATER	,	1		
a)	Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			x	
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			x	
47.	SEWER	i	i	· · · · · ·	
a)	Require or result in the construction of new waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			х	
e)	Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			x	
48.	SOLID WASTE	i	· i		
a)	Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
b)	Does the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?				x
49.	UTILITIES		1		
a. E	lectricity			X	
b. N	latural Gas			X	
с. С	communication Systems			X	
d. S	trom Water Drainage			X	
e. S	itreet Lighting			X	
f)	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?			X	

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g)	Other Governmental Services?			X	
XV	III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			x	
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			x	

This page intentionally left blank.

Section 2.4 provided a checklist of environmental impacts. This section provides an evaluation of the impact categories and questions contained in the checklist and identifies mitigation measures, if applicable.

3.1 **AESTHETICS**

Would the project:

1. SCENIC RESOURCES

a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?

No Impact. The project site is not in a scenic highway corridor. The nearest designated state scenic highway to the project site is part of SR-74 about 15 miles to the northeast (Caltrans 2011). No designated County scenic highways are identified in the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element; the nearest eligible County scenic highway to the project site is I-215 about 4.1 miles to the west (Riverside County 2015). Project development would not substantially damage scenic resources in a scenic highway. No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Scenic Resources and Visual Character

No scenic resources are present onsite. There are several small ornamental landscape trees onsite; however, such trees are common in residential areas and are not considered scenic resources. There are no historic buildings onsite, because the residential structures onsite are not shown on a 1978 historic photograph and therefore are not old enough to be eligible as historic resources (NETR.com 2016). There are no rock outcroppings onsite. The proposed school would change the visual character of the site from the existing vacant land and single-family residence to a school consisting of one-story buildings. Much of the site is currently bare land. Thus, development of the proposed school would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings and no impact would occur. No mitigation is needed.

Vistas

Vistas of the San Jacinto Mountains to the east, Palomar Mountain to the south, and San Bernardino Mountains to the north are visible from parts of the project site. The project proposes construction of onestory buildings, including a multi-purpose building that would be about 27 feet high; the remaining buildings

would be about 18 feet high. One offsite residence abuts the project site boundary north of the vacant residence. Project development would not block scenic vistas from that offsite residence because it is at the base of the small onsite hill. The next nearest residences to the project site are about 200 feet to the north and 350 feet to the west. Project development would not block vistas from the residence west of the site because such vistas are already blocked by the small onsite hill. Development would also not block vistas from the house about 200 feet north of the project site, because that house is nearly 15 feet higher than the proposed site of the buildings. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

2. MT. PALOMAR OBSERVATORY

a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is in the area where outdoor lighting is regulated under Riverside County Ordinance 655 to minimize interference with astronomical observations at the Mt. Palomar Observatory, which is about 23 miles southeast of the project site. Ordinance 655 sets forth limitations on the types and intensities of light fixtures allowed and requires that many types of outdoor lighting be extinguished between 11:00 PM and sunrise.

Specifically, Ordinance No. 655 identifies Zone "A" as comprising lands within a 15-mile distance of the observatory, while Zone "B" comprises lands located greater than 15 miles, but less than 45 miles from the observatory. The project site is located approximately 22.20 miles northwest of the Mt. Palomar Observatory. Ordinance No. 655 was adopted by the County Board of Supervisors on June 7, 1988, and went into effect on July 7, 1988. The intent of Ordinance No. 655 is to restrict the permitted use of certain light fixtures emitting into the night sky undesirable light rays, which have a detrimental effect on astronomical observation and research. Ordinance No. 655 contains approved materials and methods of installation, definitions, general requirements, requirements for lamp source and shielding, prohibitions and exceptions.

Parking lot lights, walkway lights, and exterior building lights would be aimed and shielded to cast their light downward on parking lots, walkways, and walls; thus, such lights would not cause substantial glare. No normally scheduled school operations would ever occur between 11:00 PM and sunrise, and all lights except for essential security lights would be extinguished during those hours. Safety and security lighting is permitted during that nighttime period. These are typically standard conditions of approval and are not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. With conformance with Ordinance No. 655, any impacts are expected to be less than significant from implementation of the project. No mitigation would be required.

3. OTHER LIGHTING ISSUES

a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would add exterior and interior building lights, parking lot lights, and walkway lights. No field lighting is proposed. Parking lot lights, walkway lights, and exterior building lights would be aimed and shielded to cast their light downward on parking lots, walkways,

and walls; thus, such lights would not cause substantial glare. Building exteriors would be constructed of lowglare materials and would not generate substantial amounts of daytime glare. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the project:

4. AGRICULTURE

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

No Impact. The eastern parcel of the project site is mapped as Farmland of Local Importance on the California Important Farmland Finder maintained by the Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP 2016a). Analysis of impacts to mapped important farmland under CEQA is limited to three categories of mapped farmland: Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland. No farmland in any of those categories is mapped onsite. No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?

No Impact. The project site is zoned for rural residential (R-R) use and not for agricultural use. Although the R-R zone permits limited agriculture, including farm animals (up to five animals per acre), analysis of impacts to agriculture under CEQA is focused on intensive commercial agriculture. The site is not zoned for such use. Williamson Act contracts restrict the use of privately owned land to agriculture and compatible open-space uses under contract with local governments; in exchange, the land is taxed based on actual use rather than potential market value. There are no Williamson Act contracts in effect for the project site (DLRP 2016b). No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?

No Impact. No zoning for agricultural use is present within 300 feet of the project site. The project site and parcels within such distance are zoned Rural Residential or Specific Plan (RCIT 2017). No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Less Than Significant Impact. There are several greenhouses about 800 feet east of the project site on land mapped as Unique Farmland (DLRP 2016a). Project development would not interfere with agricultural operations on this farmland, and impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

5. FOREST

a) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

No Impact. The project site is zoned for rural residential use; it is not zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland production. No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. There are a few scattered ornamental landscape trees onsite. The trees are not a forest and are not cultivated for forest resources. Project development would not cause a loss of forest land, and no impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. Project development would not cause an indirect impact on forest land, as substantiated above in Sections 4.a and 4.b. No mitigation is needed.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

The air quality section addresses the impacts of the proposed project on ambient air quality and the exposure of people, especially sensitive individuals, to unhealthful pollutant concentrations. A background discussion on the air quality regulatory setting, meteorological conditions, existing ambient air quality in the vicinity of the project site, and air quality modeling can be found in Appendix B. The health risk assessment conducted for the proposed project can be found in Appendix A.

The primary air pollutants of concern for which ambient air quality standards (AAQS) have been established are ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), coarse inhalable particulate matter (PM₁₀), fine inhalable particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and lead (Pb). Areas are classified under the federal and California Clean Air Act as either in attainment or nonattainment for each criteria pollutant based on whether the AAQS have been achieved. The South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), which is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), is designated nonattainment for O₃, and PM_{2.5} under the California and National AAQS, nonattainment for PM₁₀ under the California AAQS, and nonattainment for lead (Los Angeles County only) under the National AAQS (CARB 2015).

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

6. Air Quality Impacts

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. A consistency determination plays an important role in local agency project review by linking local planning and individual projects to the air quality management plan (AQMP). It fulfills the CEQA goal of informing decision makers of the environmental efforts of the project under consideration at an early enough stage to ensure that air quality concerns are fully addressed. It also provides the local agency with ongoing information as to whether they are contributing to clean air goals in the AQMP. The most recently adopted comprehensive plan is the 2012 AQMP, adopted on December 7, 2012 (see Appendix B to this Initial Study for a description of the 2012 AQMP).

Regional growth projections are used by SCAQMD to forecast future emission levels in the SoCAB. For southern California, these regional growth projections are provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and are partially based on land use designations in city/county general plans. Typically, only large, regionally significant projects have the potential to affect the regional growth projections.

The proposed project involves construction of a charter school facility in the County of Riverside to serve the educational needs of the local community. The proposed project is not a project of statewide, regional, or areawide significant that would require intergovernmental review under Section 15206 of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, the project would not have the potential to substantially affect SCAG's demographic projections. Additionally, the regional emissions generated by construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than the SCAQMD emissions thresholds, and SCAQMD would not consider the project a substantial source of air pollutant emissions that would have the potential to affect the attainment designations in the SoCAB. Thus, the project would not affect the regional emissions inventory or conflict with strategies in the AQMP. Impacts are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact. The following describes project-related impacts from short-term construction activities and long-term operation of the proposed project.

Short-Term Air Quality Impacts

Construction activities would result in the generation of air pollutants. These emissions would primarily be 1) exhaust emissions from off-road diesel-powered construction equipment; 2) dust generated by demolition, grading, earthmoving, and other construction activities; 3) exhaust emissions from on-road vehicles and 4) off-gas emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from application of asphalt, paints, and coatings.

Construction activities would occur on the approximately 8.5 acres of the 14.6-acre project site. Construction would involve site preparation, grading, construction of the new school facility, paving, and architectural coating. Construction activities would start in the summer of 2017 and would take approximately 12 months. Construction emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2013.2.2, based on the project's preliminary construction schedule, phasing, and equipment list

provided by the Temecula Valley Charter School (TVCS). TVCS indicates that the interior and exterior coatings applied onsite would be zero-VOC. The construction schedule and equipment mix are based on preliminary engineering and subject to changes during final design and as dictated by field conditions. Results of the construction emission modeling are shown in Table 1. As shown in the table, air pollutant emissions from construction-related activities would be less than their respective SCAQMD regional significance threshold values. Therefore, air quality impacts from project-related construction activities would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

	Criteria Air Pollutants (lbs/day) ^{1,2,3}					
Source	voc	NOx	со	SO ₂	PM10	PM _{2.5}
2017 Site Preparation	5	52	41	<1	11	7
2017 Rough Grading	6	70	48	<1	7	5
2017 Utility Trenching	<1	4	3	<1	<1	<1
2017 Building Construction	3	28	22	<1	2	2
2018 Building Construction	3	25	21	<1	2	2
2018 Building Construction + Architectural Coating	3	27	23	<1	2	2
2018 Building Construction + Architectural Coating + Asphalt Paving + Finishing/Landscaping	6	46	40	<1	4	3
Maximum Daily Emissions	6	70	48	<1	11	7
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Regional Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 1 Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissions

Source: CalEEMod, version 2013.2.2.

Notes: Totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

¹ The construction schedule is based on the preliminary information provided by the Applicant. Where specific information regarding project-related construction activities was not available, construction assumptions were based on CalEEMod defaults, which are based on construction surveys conducted by SCAQMD of construction equipment and phasing for comparable projects.

² Includes implementation of fugitive dust control measures required by SCAQMD under Rule 403, including watering disturbed areas a minimum of two times per day, reducing speed limit to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces, replacing ground cover quickly, and street sweeping with Rule 1186–compliant sweepers.

Long-Term Operation-Related Air Quality Impact

Long-term air pollutant emissions generated by the project would be generated by area sources (e.g., landscape fuel use, aerosols, and architectural coatings), mobile sources from vehicle trips, and energy use (natural gas) associated with the proposed new buildings. The primary source of long-term criteria air pollutant emissions generated by the proposed project would be mobile sources. The proposed project would generate 1,488 average daily trips during a weekday. Criteria air pollutant emissions for the proposed project were modeled using CalEEMod.

Table 2 identifies criteria air pollutant emissions from the proposed project. As shown in the table, projectrelated air pollutant emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD's regional emissions thresholds for operational activities. Overall, long-term operation-related impacts to air quality would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

	Criteria Air Pollutants (Ibs/day)					
Source	voc	NOx	со	SO ₂	PM10	PM _{2.5}
Area	2	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Energy	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Mobile Sources	4	5	47	<1	11	3
Total Emissions	6	5	47	<1	11	3
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Regional Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Source: CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2. Highest winter	or summer emissio	ns are reported. To	tals may not equal 1	100 percent due to r	oundina.	

 Table 2
 Maximum Daily Regional Operational Phase Emissions

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The SoCAB is designated nonattainment for O_3 and $PM_{2.5}$ under the California and National AAQS, nonattainment for PM_{10} under the California AAQS, and nonattainment for lead under the National AAQS (CARB 2015). According to SCAQMD methodology, any project that does not exceed or can be mitigated to less than the daily threshold values would not add significantly to a cumulative impact (SCAQMD 1993). Construction and operational activities would not result in emissions in excess of SCAQMD's significant thresholds. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project could expose sensitive receptors to elevated pollutant concentrations if it would cause or contribute significantly to elevated pollutant concentration levels. Unlike regional emissions, localized emissions are typically evaluated in terms of air concentration rather than mass so they can be more readily correlated to potential health effects.

Construction LSTs

Localized significance thresholds (LSTs) are based on the California AAQS, which are the most stringent, established to provide a margin of safety in the protection of public health and welfare. They are designated to protect sensitive receptors most susceptible to further respiratory distress, such as asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and people engaged in strenuous work or exercise. Construction LSTs are based on the size of the project site, distance to the nearest sensitive receptor, and Source Receptor Area. Receptors proximate to the proposed project site are the residences to the west and northwest.

Air pollutant emissions generated by construction activities are anticipated to cause temporary increases in air pollutant concentrations. Table 3 shows the maximum daily construction emissions (pounds per day) generated during onsite construction activities compared with the SCAQMD's LSTs. As shown in the table, the maximum daily NO_x , CO, PM_{10} , and $PM_{2.5}$ construction emissions generated from onsite construction-related activities would be less than their respective SCAQMD LSTs. Therefore, project-related construction activities would not have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant. The impact would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

	Pollutants(lbs/day) ^{1,2}						
Source	NOx	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}			
2017 Utility Trenching	4	3	0.27	0.25			
SCAQMD ≤1.00-acre LST	196	1,044	10.63	3.83			
Exceeds LST?	No	No	No	No			
2017 Building Construction	26	18	1.78	1.67			
2018 Building Construction	23	18	1.49	1.40			
2018 Building Construction + Architectural Coating	25	19	1.64	1.56			
SCAQMD 1.31-acre LST	218	1,184	12.86	4.40			
Exceeds LST?	No	No	No	No			
2018 Building Construction + Architectural Coating + Asphalt Paving + Finishing/Landscaping	44	36	2.67	2.50			
SCAQMD 1.81-acre LST	254	1,407	16.43	5.31			
Exceeds LST?	No	No	No	No			
2017 Site Preparation	52	39	10.48	6.78			
SCAQMD 3.50-acre LST	338	2,038	26.58	7.66			
Exceeds LST?	No	No	No	No			
2017 Rough Grading	70	47	7.08	4.60			
SCAQMD 4.00-acre LST	362	2,221	29.51	8.32			
Exceeds LST?	No	No	No	No			

Table 3 Localized Construction Emissions

Source: CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2; SCAQMD 2008, 2011.

Notes: In accordance with SCAQMD methodology, only onsite stationary sources and mobile equipment occurring on the proposed project site are included in the analysis. LSTs are based on receptors within 150 feet (46 meters) of the proposed project site in Source Receptor Area (SRA) 26.

¹ The construction schedule is based on the preliminary information provided by the Applicant. Where specific information regarding project-related construction activities was not available, construction assumptions were based on CalEEMod defaults, which are based on construction surveys conducted by SCAQMD of construction equipment and phasing for comparable projects.

Includes implementation of fugitive dust control measures required by SCAQMD under Rule 403, including watering disturbed areas a minimum of two times per day, reducing ground cover guickly, and stoot swooping with Rule 1186, compliant swoopers.

reducing speed limit to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces, replacing ground cover quickly, and street sweeping with Rule 1186-compliant sweepers.

Construction Health Risk

SCAQMD currently does not require health risk assessments to be conducted for short-term emissions from construction equipment. Emissions from construction equipment primarily consist of diesel particulate matter (DPM). The Office of Environmental Health Hazards Assessment (OEHHA) has recently adopted new guidance for the preparation of health risk assessments issued in March 2015. OEHHA has developed a cancer risk factor and noncancer chronic reference exposure level for DPM, but these factors are based on

continuous exposure over a 30-year time frame. No short-term acute exposure levels have been developed for DPM. The proposed project would be developed in approximately 12 months, which would limit the exposure to onsite and offsite receptors. SCAQMD currently does not require the evaluation of long-term excess cancer risk or chronic health impacts for a short-term project. In addition, construction activities would not exceed LST significance thresholds. For the reasons stated above, it is anticipated that construction emissions would not pose a threat to onsite and offsite receptors at or near the school, and project-related construction health impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Operation LSTs

Operation of the proposed project would not generate substantial quantities of emission from onsite, stationary sources. Land uses that have the potential to generate substantial stationary sources of emissions that would require a permit from SCAQMD include industrial land uses, such as chemical processing and warehousing operations where substantial truck idling could occur onsite. The proposed project does not fall within these categories of uses. While operation of the proposed project would result in the use of standard onsite mechanical equipment such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning units in addition to occasional use of landscaping equipment for site maintenance, air pollutant emissions generated from these activities would be nominal (see Table 2). Therefore, localized air quality impacts related to stationary-source emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Carbon Monoxide Hotspots

Areas of vehicle congestion have the potential to create pockets of CO called hotspots. These pockets have the potential to exceed the state one-hour standard of 20 parts per million (ppm) or the eight-hour standard of 9.0 ppm. Because CO is produced in greatest quantities from vehicle combustion and does not readily disperse into the atmosphere, adherence to ambient air quality standards is typically demonstrated through an analysis of localized CO concentrations. Hotspots are typically produced at intersections, where traffic congestion is highest because vehicles queue for longer periods and are subject to reduced speeds.

The SoCAB has been designated attainment under both the national and California AAQS for CO. Under existing and future vehicle emission rates, a project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour—or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited—in order to generate a significant CO impact (BAAQMD 2011). The proposed project would result in approximately 1,488 average daily trips during a weekday and 540 trips during the morning peak hour, which are substantially less than the volumes cited above. Furthermore, the SoCAB has since been designated as attainment under both the national and California AAQS for CO. The project would not have the potential to substantially increase CO hotspots at intersections in the vicinity of the project site. Localized air quality impacts related to mobile-source emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Health Risk Assessment

Section 21151.8 of the Public Resources Code requires evaluation of air quality hazards for school site acquisition or construction of a new elementary school. The project would expose sensitive receptors to elevated pollutant concentrations if it would place the project in an area with pollutant concentrations above ambient concentration in the SoCAB. Recent air pollution studies have shown an association between proximity to major air pollution sources and a variety of health effects. The project involves siting a school within a quarter-mile of SR-79; therefore, the health risks from mobile sources were evaluated for the proposed project (see Appendix A). The HRA evaluates carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic health risks and risks from toxic air contaminants. Table 4 shows the potential cancer and non-cancer risk for the students and staff at the proposed project site.

	Cancer Ris	sk (per million)	Chronic Hazard	A suite (d. Hauri)	9 Hour Horord		
Source	Staff Exposure	Student Exposure	Index	Hazard Index	8-Hour Hazard Index		
State Route 79	0.48	1.13	0.003	0.012	0.002		
SCAQMD Threshold	10	10	1.0	1.0	1.0		
Exceeds Threshold	No	No	No	No	No		
Source: Lakes AERMOD View, 9.1.0, 2015.							

Table 4 Health Risk Assessment Results

As shown in the table, based on a comparison to the carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic thresholds established by OEHHA and SCAQMD, hazardous air emissions generated from the mobile sources within a quarter-mile radius of the site are not anticipated to pose an actual or potential endangerment to students and staff occupying the proposed site, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?

Less than Significant Impact. See the discussion of the Health Risk Assessment in Section 6.d.

f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not result in objectionable odors. The threshold for odor is if a project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance, which states:

A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall

not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.

The type of facilities that are considered to have objectionable odors include wastewater treatments plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. The uses proposed by the project do not fall within the aforementioned land uses. Emissions from construction equipment, such as diesel exhaust and volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings and paving activities, may generate odors. However, these odors would be low in concentration, temporary, and are not expected to affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, odor impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The information in this section is based in part on the following technical studies, which are included as Appendices C1 and C2 to this Initial Study:

- Habitat Assessment, Phil Brylski and Dave Bramlet, May 24, 2017. (Appendix C1)
- Fairy Shrimp Survey, Summitwest Environmental, Inc., May 29, 2017. (Appendix C2)

Would the project:

7. Wildlife and Vegetation

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is in the plan area of two habitat conservation plans.

Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan

The Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRC MSHCP) has a plan area of about 1.26 million acres, or 1,970 square miles, extending from the western county boundary to the San Jacinto Mountains. Roughly 506,000 acres are designated reserves, and the plan covers 146 species and 14 natural communities. The WRC MSHCP was approved by the US Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) in 2004 and is administered by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA).

The project site is in criteria cell 5275 (Southwest Area, French Valley-Lower Sedco Hills subunit) of the WRC MSHCP (County of Riverside 2016b). The required studies for the project site included a WRC MSHCP consistency analysis and habitat assessments for burrowing owl, Narrow Endemic Plant Species, Criteria Area Plant Species, and Riparian/Riverine/Vernal Pool Resources. The main project site (APNs 476-010-013 and 476-010-059) is not located within the Narrow Endemic Species Survey Area (NEPSSA) or

Criteria Area Species Survey Area (CASSA); however, a portion of the proposed Flossie Way access road is located within the NEPSSA and CASSA.

Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan

The Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan (SKRHCP) has a plan area of about 534,000 acres in western Riverside County and was established to protect one listed species, the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*), listed as federally endangered and state threatened. The SKRHCP includes seven core reserves that totaled about 41,200 acres in 1996. The SKRHCP was approved by the US Fish and Wildlife Service and CDFW in 1990 and is administered by the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency. The project site is located within the SKR Fee Area and will be required to pay the required development fee (Riverside County Ordinance 663.10)

Western Riverside County MSHCP Criteria Cell Issues

The project site and Flossie Way access road are in Criteria Cell #5275 within the French Valley - Lower Sedco Hills subunit of the Southwest Area Plan of the western Riverside MSHCP (County of Riverside 2016b). Biological issues and considerations for this subunit are as follows: (1) conserve a large block of habitat generally east of I-215 and south of Scott Road for narrow endemic species; (2) provide connection to the Southwestern Riverside County Multi Species Reserve, (3) conserve clay soils supporting long-spined spine flower, Munz's onion and Palmer's grapplinghook, (4) maintain core and linkage habitat for bobcat, (5) determine presence of potential Core Area for Los Angeles pocket mouse along Warm Springs Creek, (6) maintain core and linkage habitat for Quino checkerspot butterfly, (7) maintain core area for western pond turtle, and (8) maintain core area for Riverside fairy shrimp.

Other goals for this subunit include conserving clay soil areas for narrow endemic plant species that are restricted to these soil types, including the Munz's onion, and habitat for the Quino checkerspot butterfly.

Table 5 lists the checklist information on the project site from the County Conservation Summary Report Generator. The project site is not within with survey requirements for any amphibians, or mammals, but is located within a habitat assessment area for the burrowing owl. The project site is not within an existing or proposed core area.

Is the project located in Criteria Area or Public/Quasi-Public Land?	Yes
Is the project located in Criteria Area Species Survey Area (CASSA)?	Yes*
Is the project located in Amphibian Species Survey Area?	No
Is the project located in Mammal Species Survey Area?	No
Is the project located adjacent to MSHCP Conservation Areas?	No
Is the project located in Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area (NEPSSA)?	Yes*
Are riverine/riparian/wetland habitats or vernal pools present?	No
Is the project located in Burrowing Owl Survey Area?	Yes
* The main project site (APNs 476-010-059 and 476-010-013) is not within a Criteria Area Species Survey Area (CASS/ Area (NEPSSA). The Flossie Way access road area (part of APN 476-010-054) is within a CASSA and NEPSSA.	A) or Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey

Table 5MSHCP Review Summary

Criteria Cell Coverage

The project site is located in the north-central part of Cell #5275 in an area that is not proposed for conservation. Clay soils are absent from the two parcels where the school would be built, however a small area of clay soils mapped by NRCS (2016) occurs in part of the 1.78-acre easement for the Flossie Way access road. The MSHCP (County of Riverside 2003b) identifies the conservation objectives of Cell #5275 as follows:

Conservation within this Cell will contribute to assembly of Proposed Constrained Linkage 18. Conservation within this Cell will focus on riparian scrub, woodland and forest habitat and adjacent agricultural land. Areas conserved within this Cell will be connected to riparian scrub, woodland and forest habitat and agricultural land proposed for conservation in Cell #5376 to the south and to agricultural land proposed for conservation in Cell #5372 to the east. Conservation within this Cell will range from 10% to 20% of the Cell focusing in the southern part of the Cell.

A regionally significant wildlife corridor identified in the MSHCP is Constrained Linkage 18, which is located south of the project site (Figure 5, *Project Site in relation to MSHCP Criteria Cells and Constrained Linkage 18*). Constrained linkage 18 is a narrow strip of riparian habitat along an unnamed drainage that links Paloma Valley (southwest of the project site) and Bachelor Mountain (east of the project site across SR-79). The linkage is constrained by adjoining agricultural uses, which, along with the narrow width of the riparian area, contribute to a large edge effect. The planning species for this linkage area are bobcat and Los Angeles pocket mouse.

The MSHCP describes the linkage as follows:

Proposed Constrained Linkage 18 consists of an unnamed drainage located in the southcentral region of the Plan Area. This Constrained Linkage connects Proposed Core 2 (Antelope Valley) to the west with Proposed Extension of Existing Core 7 (Lake Skinner/Diamond Valley Lake Extension). Existing agricultural use constrains the Linkage, and planned land uses surrounding the Linkage are limited nearly entirely to community Development. The Linkage also has a relatively high proportion of land affected by edge (approximately 250 acres of the total 310 acres) and will also be subject to Edge Effects also due to the widening or extension of several facilities including Washington Street, Briggs Road, and SR-79. Despite these issues, the Linkage nonetheless provides Live-In and movement Habitat for species. Guidelines Pertaining to Urban/Wildlands Interface for the management of edge factors such as lighting, urban runoff, toxics, and domestic predators are presented in Section 6.1 of this document. This Linkage likely provides for movement of common mammals such as bobcat. An adequate wildlife underpass or overpass may need to be implemented to insure movement of species in this area and to reduce the chance of mortality from vehicle collision.

MSHCP Implementation Structure

All proposed discretionary development projects within the WRC MSHCP Criteria Area are subject to review under the Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS) process. The HANS process is used by the County of Riverside to implement portions of the WRC MSHCP by identifying and delineating conservation areas on specific properties. A HANS application was prepared for the proposed project and submitted to the County on January 5, 2017 (HANS 2343). The County determined that no conservation is described for the project site based on the cell criteria analysis. Although no conservation is required, the project is still required to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.0 of the WRC MSHCP, including Sections 6.1.2, 6.1.3, and 6.3.2. Habitat assessments and surveys for Narrow Endemic Plant Species, Criteria Area Species, burrowing owl, and Riparian/Riverine/Vernal Pool resources were required. The HANS case was transmitted to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) for Joint Project Review (JPR) on April 6, 2017 (JPR No. 17-04-11-01). RCA provided comments regarding burrowing owl, narrow endemic plant species, criteria area plant species, and vernal pool species. As a result, the biological consultant provided several revisions based on RCA's comments and a permitted fairy shrimp biologist was hired to evaluate road ruts within the Flossie Way access road. The proposed project is currently going through JPR and was transmitted to the CDFW and USFWS on June 20, 2017 for comment.

Section 6.1.2. Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools

The project site does not contain riparian habitat, open drainages, erosional channels or other features that could contain plant species associated with riparian habitats. A blue-line channel is found on the adjoining parcel to the north of the project site. The Highway 79 Natural Environmental Study (Caltrans 2004) indicated that this blue-line channel extends into the extreme northeastern corner of the project site. However, no channel was observed in this area during the field survey. It appears that the channel has been filled in on the adjacent property and only overland flows currently occur on the project site.

Ephemeral Wetlands and Vernal Pools. Seasonal wetlands, including vernal pools, are communities that could support special status plant or animal species. No seasonal wetlands or evidence of ponding were noted within the main project site (APNs 476-010-059 or 476-010-013) during the field survey or in a review of historical aerial photos available in Google Earth. During March 2, 2017 field surveys, ponding was observed in two road rut features within the proposed Flossie Way access road. According to the project biologists, the ponding likely occurred during a rain event on February 27, 2017. During March 10, 2017 field surveys, the road ruts were dry and no ponding was observed. In order to address RCA's JPR comments, a US Fish and Wildlife Service-permitted fairy shrimp biologist was hired to evaluate the road ruts within the Flossie Way access road right-of-way. The WRC MSHCP Species Survey Requirements (Volume I, Appendix E) allows for a single-season dry or wet season survey to be conducted by a qualified biologist in accordance with accepted protocol. Therefore, only a single season dry survey was conducted. Chuck Black, 10(a)(1)(A) permit number TE835549-7, of Ecological Restoration Service and SummitWest Environmental, Inc. collected and processed dry samples for the determination of presence of fairy shrimp cysts. The project site does not contain suitable soil types to support vernal pool such as soils from the Willow Series (Wg, Wh, Wm, Wn) and there is. No Branchinecta or Streptochepalus cysts were present in any of the samples from the tire ruts. The negative dry season survey results were deemed sufficient for the County to find the project conditionally

consistent with the WRC MSHCP Section 6.1.2. The RCA, CDFW, and USFWS have the ability to comment on the survey methodology used for the project. The fairy shrimp report, dated May 29, 2017, can be found in Appendix C2.

Section 6.1.3. Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species

The main project site (APNs 476-010-059 and 476-010-013) is not within a Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area (NEPSSA). However, a portion of the proposed Flossie Way access road (APN 476-010-054) is located within a NEPSSA. A habitat assessment was completed for the following NEPSA species: Munz's onion, San Diego ambrosia, many-stemmed dudleya, spreading navarretia, California orcutt grass, and Wright's trichocoronis. The annual grassland habitat within the NEPSSA and proposed Flossie Way access road is highly disturbed and contains an abundance of ruderal, non-native species. Additionally, suitable soils are not present to support these Narrow Endemic Plant Species. According to the habitat assessment, the proposed Flossie Way access road does not contain suitable habitat to support Narrow Endemic Plant Species. The project is consistent with Section 6.1.3.

Section 6.3.2. Additional Survey Needs and Procedures

The project site and the Flossie Way access road areas are within an area required for habitat assessment for the western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*).

The main project site (APNs 476-010-059 and 476-010-013) is not within a Criteria Area Species Survey Area (CASSA). The proposed Flossie Way access road is within a CASSA for the following plant species: Davidson's saltscale, Parish's brittlescale, thread-leaved brodiaea, smooth tarplant, round-leaved filaree, Coulter's Goldfields, and little mousetail. The annual grassland habitat within the CASSA and proposed Flossie Way access road is highly disturbed and contains an abundance of ruderal, non-native species. Additionally, suitable soils are not present to support these plant species. According to the habitat assessment, the proposed Flossie Way access road does not contain suitable habitat to support Criteria Area Plant Species.

Burrowing Owl

Habitat Assessment

A habitat assessment for burrowing owls was carried out on the project site on November 5, 2016. No western burrowing owls were observed or otherwise detected onsite (i.e., sign or calls) or in adjoining areas during the survey. However, burrows constructed by California ground squirrels were found on the project site that could potentially be used by burrowing owls. Figures 5 and 6 (Biological Features and Burrowing Owl Survey Information) within Appendix C1 show the locations of the ground squirrel burrows.

Focused Survey

A focused burrowing owl survey was conducted on the project site including the proposed Flossie Way access road over four days, March 7 through 10 2017, under mild weather conditions suitable for the survey. An additional survey was conducted on March 30, 2017 to ensure the absence of burrowing owl. The entire site was walked along transects no more than 30 meters (100 feet) apart, and spaced more closely in areas where hilly terrain obscured line of site. A buffer area that extended 500 feet around the site borders was also surveyed, but parts of this were in private property and binocular surveys were used for these buffer areas.

Potential burrowing owl burrows were mapped using a GPS unit. No burrowing owls or burrowing owl sign was observed on the project site or in the buffer area during the focused surveys.

Burrowing owls could establish nests on the site or in the buffer prior to project initiation. The burrowing owl is a covered species under the WRC MSHCP that requires additional surveys. The County of Riverside has conditioned the project prior to grading permit issuance for a 30-day pre-construction burrowing owl survey. Potential impacts to the burrowing owl will be mitigated to a less than significant level with adherence to the County of Riverside condition of approval. The project is consistent with Section 6.3.2.

Section 6.1.4. Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines

Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP presents guidelines that reduce indirect impacts to MSHCP conservation areas at the Wildlands/Urban interface. The project site is not in the vicinity of a conservation area and the Urban/Wildlife Interface Guidelines are therefore not applicable.

Reserve Assembly

The project site is located in the northwestern part of Cell #5275 in an area that is not proposed for conservation (see Figure 9. *MSHCP Criteria Cells and Constrained Linkage*). The project site is not located in a designated core area and is located approximately 1,400 feet north of Constrained Linkage 18.

The objectives of Cell #5275 and an analysis of the proposed project's impacts on these are as follows:

1. Contribute to assembly of Proposed Constrained Linkage 18.

Proposed Constrained Linkage 8 is located approximately 1,400 feet south of the project site. The land between the project site and the linkage is in agricultural use and is crossed by SR-79. The proposed project would not impact the assembly or wildlife movement function of Constrained Linkage 18.

2. Focus on coastal sage scrub (CSS), grassland, riparian scrub, woodland and forest habitat.

The project site contains disturbed annual grassland, tilled agricultural fields, small areas of Riversidian sage scrub/grassland ecotone, and developed uses. The proposed project would impact 39 percent of the disturbed annual grassland on the project site, leaving the remaining 61 percent in its existing condition. The Riversidian sage scrub-grassland ecotone found on the project site would not be considered a special status community due to the very low shrub cover found in this grassland.

3. Areas conserved within this Cell will be connected to riparian scrub, woodland and forest habitat and agricultural land proposed for conservation in Cell #5376 to the south and to agricultural land proposed for conservation in Cell #5279 to the east.

Since adoption of the MSHCP, Cell #5376 has been largely developed with residential land uses. The project site occurs in the northwestern corner of Cell #5275, separated from Cell #5279 by SR-79 and the agricultural lands in the northeastern corner of Cell #5275. This cell objective is not furthered by the habitats and location of the project site.

TEMECULA VALLEY CHARTER SCHOOL INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE



Figure 9 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Constrained Linkage 3. Environmental Analysis

Base Map Source: Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority, 2016

Scale (Feet)

This page intentionally left blank.

4. Conservation within this Cell will range from 10%-20% of the Cell focusing in the southern portion of the Cell.

The project site is located in the northwestern part of the Cell. This objective is not relevant to the project site. Nonetheless, the proposed project would develop approximately 62 percent of the site, leaving the two residences and surrounding habitats (39 percent of the site) undeveloped.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Plant Communities and Land Uses

The plant communities and land use categories found on the project site include: agricultural, disturbed annual grassland, Riversidian sage scrub/grassland ecotone—that is, a transition between the two specified communities—graded, and developed. The following section describes each of these communities found on the project site, and the distribution of these communities is noted in Figure 10, *Plant Communities Map*, and total acreage of each community is noted in Table 6. A list of plant species observed during the survey of the project site is shown in the Habitat Assessment included as Appendix C1 of this Initial Study.

Plant Community	Acreage
Agricultural	7.33 acres
Disturbed annual grassland	7.23 acres
Riversidian sage scrub/Annual grassland ecotone	0.10 acres
Graded	0.36 acres
Developed	1.24 acres
Total	16.27 acres
Source: Brylski and Bramlet 2017.	

 Table 6
 Acreage of Plant Communities on the Project Site

Agricultural

The western area of the project site is characterized as agricultural, with areas that have been planted in wheat (*Triticum aestivum*), and the field had been disked at the time of the survey. The margins of the field contain pockets of a disturbed annual grassland. Characteristic species consisted of: ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), wild oat (*Avena fatua*), red brome (*Bromus madritensis* ssp. *rubens*), schismus (*Schismus barbatus*), and foxtail barley (*Hordum murinum* ssp. *leporinum*). Forbs commonly found on the margin of this field included: cheeseweed (*Malva parviflora*), Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), common fiddleneck (*Amsinckia intermedia*), hare's ear cabbage (*Sisymbrium orientale*), rattlesnake weed (*Euphorbia albomarginata*), Persian knotweed (*Polygonum argyrocoleon*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), and jimson weed (*Datura wrightii*).¹

¹ Forbs are flowering plants lacking woody stems, other than grasses.

Disturbed Annual Grassland

A disturbed annual grassland is the characteristic community in the remaining areas of the project site. Characteristic grasses in this community include: ripgut brome, red brome, wild oat, foxtail barley, rattail fescue (*Festuca myuros*), and schismus. Forbs consisted of: Russian thistle, common fiddleneck, summer mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), tocalote (*Centaurea melitensis*), London rocket (*Sisymbrium irio*), rattlesnake weed, red-stemmed filaree (*Erodium cicutarium*), dove weed (*Croton setiger*), vinegar weed (*Trichostma lanceolatum*), and jimson weed. A few shrubs including common sand aster (*Corethrogyne filaginifolia*), coastal isocoma (*Isocoma menziesii*), and interior California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum* var. *foliolosum*) were uncommonly found in these grasslands.

Rockier sites on the project site often had large, open patches dominated by Russian thistle. Other disturbed areas along SR-79 had a grassland with patches of tocalote, telegraph weed (*Heterotheca grandiflora*), annual sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*), Persian knotweed, common horseweed (*Conyza canadensis*), summer cypress (*Kochia scoparia*), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), serrate-leaved saltbush (*Atriplex suberecta*), London rocket, and summer mustard.

Riversidian Sage Scrub-Grassland Ecotone

A few of the larger patches of interior California buckwheat were mapped as a Riversidian sage scrub/grassland ecotone. These sites have only a very scattered shrub cover and were generally dominated by the annual grasses and forbs. Other shrub species occasionally found in these ecotonal areas consisted of common sand aster, coastal isocoma, and California sagebrush (*Artemisia california*). Generally, the sites were characterized by a cover of ripgut brome, wild oat, red brome, common fiddleneck, Russian thistle, tocalote, finger-leaved morning glory (*Calystegia macrostegia*), summer mustard, and dove weed.

Graded

The access road to the existing residences was mapped as graded, consisting of a hard-packed earthen road and other disturbed unvegetated areas.

Developed

The area around the existing residences and garage was mapped as developed. This area includes the graded area around these structures, a concrete basketball court, and the existing driveways. This area includes a number of ornamental species planted around or near these structures. Some of these included Aleppo pines (*Pinus halepensis*), Shamel ash (*Fraxinus udehi*), olive (*Olea europea*), silver dollar gum (*Eucalyptus polyanthemos*), pecan (*Carya illinoinensis*), queen palms (*Syagrus romanzoffiana*), and other plantings.

Figure 10 - Plant Communities Map 3. Environmental Analysis



This page intentionally left blank.

Habitat Conservation Plans

Habitat conservation plans and impacts thereto are discussed above in Section 7.a.

Special Status Plant Species and Habitats

Special status plant species include those listed by the state or federal governments as endangered, threatened, or rare and those that are candidates for future listing. They also encompass species determined by CDFW to meet the CEQA (Section 15380) criteria for "rare and endangered" even though they have not been officially listed by any agency (CDFW 2016a). Finally, the list considers species noted by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS 2016) or the County of Riverside as "rare or endangered" or of limited distribution and requiring consideration in CEQA or planning studies in the region (Riverside County 2003a), or as species of special concern by local botanists in the region (Roberts et al. 2004, 2007).

The special status plant species that could potentially occur on the property were obtained from the RareFind Data Base (CDFW 2016a), list of special status plant species (CDFW 2016b), and the CNPS online rare plant inventory (CNPS 2016). In addition, the collection records of the special status species known from the study region were used to determine the known localities of these species (Consortium 2016).

This study considered the plant species within the Western Riverside HCP planning process (Riverside County 2003a; Dudek 2003), especially the narrow endemic plant species and criteria area plant species in Survey Area 4. The known distributions of these species were carefully reviewed to determine the localities of these species near the project site.

Communities of special interest are considered to be "depleted" habitats of special interest to the CDFW (2010), the County of Riverside (2003a), or potentially regulated by the US Army Corps of Engineers, CDFW, Regional Water Quality Control Board, or other agencies. It would also include the criteria areas of the Western Riverside HCP, which are the potential reserve areas for this habitat conservation plan (Riverside County 2003a).

Special Status Plant Species

Known or expected localities of each special status plant species identified as occurring in the project region, as well as the habitat preference and the potential for each species to occur onsite, are described in Table 7. The species listed in Table 7 are described in more detail in the Habitat Assessment (see Appendix C1).

Species	Federal/ State	CNPS/ MSHCP Other	Known or Expected Localities	Comments
<i>Abronia villosa var. aurita</i> Chaparral sand verbena		CRPR 1B.1, NCS	Domenigoni-Diamond Valley, Winchester, Murrieta Creek, Temescal Valley, San Jacinto River, South of Hemet, Vail Lake, Gavilan Hills, Banning Bench, San Jacinto Mtns	Found in open sandy washes, sandy openings in coastal sage scrub. Blooms from January to September. Not anticipated on the project site.
<i>Allium munzii</i> Munz's onion	FT, SE	CRPR 1B.1, CS, NEPS	Paloma Valley, Lake Skinner, Skunk Hollow, Paloma Valley, N. Domenigoni Hills, Temescal Valley, Gavilan Hills	Generally found in dense clay soils, but also on gabbronic substrates. Blooms from March to May. Not anticipated on the project site.
<i>Ambrosia pumila</i> San Diego ambrosia	FE	CRPR 1B.1, CS, NEPS	Skunk Hollow, south of Skunk Hollow, Nichols Road (Elsinore Area), Temescal Valley	Found in annual grasslands. Blooms from April to October. Does not occur on the project site.
<i>California macrophylla</i> Large-leaf filaree		CRPR 1B.1, CS, ASNP, CAS	Bachelor Mtn, Gavilan Hills, hills between Murrieta & Menifee Valley, Murrieta, Temescal Valley, Murrieta region & the Lake Elsinore region	Found in clay soil grasslands. Blooms from March to May. Not anticipated on the project site.
<i>Calochortus weedii var. intermedius</i> Intermediate mariposa lily		CRPR 1B.2, CCS	Murrieta, French Valley, Crown Valley, Vail Lake, Corona, Santa Ana Mtns	Found in coastal sage scrub or chaparral. Blooms from May to July. Not anticipated on the project site.
<i>Centromadia pungens ssp. laevis</i> Smooth tarplant		CRPR 1B.1, CS, ASNP, CAPS, RR/VP	French-Paloma Valleys, Murrieta Creek, Temecula Creek, Warm Springs Creek, Lake Elsinore region, San Jacinto River- Perris, Lakeview, SJWA, Upper Salt Creek, Diamond Valley, Tucalota Creek, San Jacinto Valley, Santa Ana River	Found in alkali meadows or grasslands. Also found on the margin of riparian habitats in the region. Blooms from April to September. Not anticipates on the project site.
<i>Chorizanthe parryi var. parryi</i> Parry's spineflower		CRPR 1B.1, CCS	French-Paloma Valleys, Lake Skinner, Sedco Hills, Menifee region, Bundy Canyon, Crown Valley, N. Domenigoni Hills, Lake Elsinore region, W. Hemet Hills, Gavilan Hills, Box Springs Mtn, Lakeview Mtns	Found principally in alluvial fans and openings of coastal sage scrub. Blooms from April to June. Not anticipated on the project site.
<i>Chorizanthe polygonoides ssp. longispina</i> Long-spined spineflower		CRPR 1B.2, CS	Lake Skinner region, Menifee Valley, Warm Springs Creek, Murrieta region, Temecula region, Bundy Cyn, Skunk Hollow, Garner Valley, W. Hemet Area, Gavilan Hills, Temescal Cyn, Alberhill, Santa Rosa Plateau	Found on clay soils or eroded loams in annual grasslands. This species is found scattered on clayish substrates throughout the Perris Basin. Blooms from April to July. Not anticipated on the project site.
<i>Convolvulus simulans</i> Small-flowered morning glory		CRPR 4.2, CS	Paloma Valley, Lake Skinner region, French Valley, Skunk Hollow, Temescal Cyn, Gavilan Hills, Vail Lake	Found on clay soils in clay grasslands, generally on heavy clays. Blooms from March to July. Observed on Flossie Road ROW.
<i>Deinandra paniculata</i> Paniculate tar plant		CRPR 4.2, NCS	French-Paloma Valleys, Murrieta- Temecula-Lake Elsinore region, Menifee Valley, Perris Valley region, San Jacinto Valley, Moreno Valley, Gavilan Hills	Found in annual grasslands. Blooms from March to November, Observed on the project site.

Table 7 Special Status Plant Species Potentially Occurring on the Project Site

Species	Federal/ State	CNPS/ MSHCP Other	Known or Expected Localities	Comments
Harpagonella palmeri Palmer's grappling hook		CRPR 4.2, CS	French Valley, Lake Skinner, Murrieta, Menifee Valley, Bundy Cyn, Temecula, Gavilan Hills, Alberhill, Skunk Hollow, Temescal Cyn, W. Hemet Hills, Vail Lake	Found in clay soil grasslands. Blooms from March to May. Not anticipated on the project site.
<i>Juglans californica</i> California black walnut		CRPR 4.2, CS, RR/VP	French Valley, Paloma Valley Murrieta Creek, Lake Skinner region, Riverside, Santa Ana River, Moreno Valley, Jurupa Hills	Found on margins of alluvial washes, margins of riparian woodland, oak woodland, and coastal sage scrub-chaparral. Blooms form March to August. Does not occur on the project site.
<i>Lepidium virginicum var. robinsonii</i> Robinson's pepper grass		CRPR 1B.2, NCS	French Valley, Lake Skinner-Crown Valley, N. Domenigoni Hills, W.Hemet Hills, Murrieta-Menifee Valley, Vail Lake, Gavilan Hills, Perris Valley, Sedco Hills, Box Springs Mtns	Found uncommonly scattered throughout the Perris Basin, San Bernardino Basin. This peppergrass blooms from Jan. to March and can be difficult to identify after this period. Not anticipated on the project site.
<i>Microseris douglasii ssp. Platycarpha</i> Small-flowered microseris		CRPR 4.2, CCS	French Valley, Paloma Valley, Lake Skinner region, Menifee Valley, Warm Springs Creek, Gavilan Hills, Lake Elsinore region, W. Hemet Hills, Temescal Cyn, Perris Basin, Santa Rosa Plateau	Found on clay soil grasslands. Blooms from March to May. Not anticipated on the project site.

Table 7 Special Status Plant Species Potentially Occurring on the Project Site

Federal Designations:

FE = Listed by the Federal government as an endangered species.

FT = Listed by the Federal government as a threatened species.

State Designations:

CE = Listed as endangered by the State of California.

CT = Listed by the State of California as a threatened species.

California Native Plant Society (CNPS) California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR):

1A = Plants presumed extinct in California.

- 1B = Plants considered rare, threatened or endangered in California and elsewhere.
- 2 = Plants rare, threatened or endangered in California but more common elsewhere.
- 3 = Plants about which we need more information A review list.
- 4 = Plants of limited distribution A watch list.

CNPS Threat Code Extensions

- .1 = Seriously endangered in California.
- .2 = Fairly endangered in California.
- .3 = Not very endangered in California.

Western Riverside MSHCP

Cs = Plant species covered w/in the MSHCP

- Ccs = Plant species conditionally covered win the MSHCP; coverage conditional on the plan meeting species specific objectives.
- Ncs = Plant species not covered w/ in the MSHCP
- NEPS = Plant species on the list of Narrow endemic plant species.
- ASNP = Plant species on the list of Additional Survey needs and procedures list.
- RR/VP = Plant species on the Riparian/Riverine & Vernal pool list.
- CAPS = Plant species included on the list of Criteria Area Species

Special Status Habitats

The project site lacks any special status habitats known to occur in the region. Riversidian sage scrub is a special status community, due to the number of declining wildlife and plant species associated with this scrub community. However, the Riversidian sage scrub-grassland ecotone found on the property would not be considered a special status community due to the very low shrub cover found in this grassland.

The Western Riverside HCP would consider drainages and riparian communities as special status habitats, due to the limited distribution of these communities and the number of special status species found in riparian habitats. In addition, the Western Riverside HCP does not cover federal or state permits for waters or wetlands within its area.

Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands

Regulatory Protections for Waters and Wetlands

- US Army Corps of Engineers' Clean Water Act Section 404 permit for dredge and fill of materials into Waters of the United States includes drainages considered waters of the US and areas meeting the threepart criteria (hydrology, hydric soils, and wetland vegetation) for wetlands that may occur within the area of Waters of the US or adjacent to these Waters:
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQB) regulates potential discharges of fill material in Waters of the State or isolated wetland, not regulated by the Army Corps, under the Porter Cologne Act (California Water Code Sections 13000 et seq.).
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife, under sections 1600 to 1616 of the California Fish and Game Code, regulates the obstruction, diversion, or alteration to any natural channel, bed, or bank of any river, stream (creek), or lake. This includes the riparian vegetation supported by these waterways, lakes, or reservoirs.

The project site does not contain any riparian habitat, open drainages, erosional channels, or other features that could contain plant species associated with riparian habitats. A blue-line channel was found on the property north of the project site. No channel was noted on the project site south of this channel during the 2016 field survey. Currently, it appears that the channel has been filled in on the adjacent property, and only overland flows occur on the project site.

An area along the southeast site boundary, approximately 0.24 acre, is mapped as a ponding area on the Environmental Constraints Sheet for the project site prepared by Diversified Engineering in 1983.

Seasonal wetlands, including vernal pools, are communities that could support special status plant or animal species. In addition, the Western Riverside HCP does not cover these wetlands or the potential permits required to disturb these habitats. No seasonal wetlands or evidence of ponding were noted on the property during the field survey or on the older Google Earth aerial photographs reviewed for this study.

Impacts

Habitat Impacts

The proposed development of the Temecula Valley Charter School would remove a total of: 7.1 acres of agricultural land, 6.04 acres of disturbed annual grassland, 0.12 acres of a Riversidian sage scrub/Annual grassland ecotone, and 0.2 acre of a graded mapping unit. In addition, the development of the Flossie Way right-of-way for campus access would result in an additional loss of 0.5 acre of disturbed annual grassland. Impacts due to the development of the campus would result in an incremental loss of grassland and agricultural habitats and would be adverse, but not significant.

Impacts on Sensitive Habitats

No impacts would occur, as no such habitats were identified onsite.

Direct Impacts on Sensitive Species

Sensitive Plant Species

There are no impacts to narrow endemic or criteria area plant species or special status plant communities, since these were not observed on the project site. The project site was determined to not contain potential habitat for six narrow endemic plant species during a habitat evaluation on March 2, 2017 due to the lack of suitable soils (deep clays); continued disturbance; and the lack of seasonal wetlands, such as vernal pools, that are the potential habitat for these species.

The proposed development would also result in the loss of some 141 individual paniculate tarplant plants on the school site and Koon Street right-of-way. Impacts would be adverse but not significant, due to the current status of this species, high abundance of these plants in the Perris Basin, and relatively low number of plants that would be removed. No mitigation is needed.

Burrowing Owl

No burrowing owl or their sign was found on the site or in a 500-foot-wide buffer area surrounding the site during a focused survey on March 7 through 10, 2017.

Burrowing owls could establish nests on the site or in the buffer prior to project initiation. The burrowing owl is a covered species under the MSHCP that requires additional surveys. The County of Riverside has conditioned the project prior to grading permit issuance for a 30-day pre-construction burrowing owl survey. Potential impacts to the burrowing owl will be mitigated to a less than significant level with adherence to the County of Riverside condition of approval.
c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Wildlife Service?

Less than Significant Impact. Impacts would be less than significant with adherence to Riverside County Conditions of Approval for a pre-construction burrowing owl surveys prior to grading permit issuance, as substantiated above in Section 7.b. No mitigation is required.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Less than Significant impact. The project site is in a rural residential and agricultural area of French Valley. The immediate neighborhood consists of rural residences and farmland. Extensive high density residential development is approximately 1,400 feet to the south. The open areas of Bachelor Mountain and the foothills around Diamond Valley Lake Reservoir are as close as one mile east of the project site. The project site is mostly vacant with two residences and plant communities dominated by grassland and agricultural lands with no riparian habitats. SR-79 borders the project site to the east.

Landscape features in rural landscapes that support important wildlife movement functions include aquatic and riparian habitats and ridgelines, particularly when they are in proximity to a known wildlife movement corridor. None of these features occur on the project site or adjoining areas. The project site probably supports local home range movement by common wildlife but does not contain a wildlife corridor or significantly contribute to wildlife movement. There are two culverts outside the eastern site border beneath SR-79 but there are no channels associated with these culverts. Medium-sized carnivores such as coyote and skunk could cross SR-79 through the culverts or on the highway surface during the night-time. The proposed project and would not impact existing paths for local wildlife movement. The proposed project would increase use of the agricultural lands on the project site and increase traffic in the vicinity. These changes would occur largely during the day-time and would not significantly impact local wildlife movement.

Birds and their nests are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Codes. Since the project site supports suitable nesting bird habitat, removal of vegetation or any other potential nesting bird habitat disturbances shall be conducted outside of the avian nesting season. Nesting bird season is February 1st through August 31st. If habitat or structures that support nesting birds must be cleared during the nesting season, a preconstruction nesting bird survey shall be conducted. The County of Riverside has conditioned the project prior to grading permit issuance for a preconstruction nesting bird survey. Impacts will be less than significant with adherence to Riverside County conditions of approval.

An important wildlife corridor occurs in the project region: the Proposed Constrained Linkage 18 is a narrow strip of riparian habitat along an unnamed drainage that links Paloma Valley (southwest of the project site) and the Bachelor Mountain area (east of the project site across SR-79). This linkage is approximately 1,400 feet south of the project site. The southern part of the linkage is adjoined by high density residential development. The planning species for this linkage area are bobcat and Los Angeles pocket mouse. The

project site is distant from proposed Constrained Linkage 18 and is separated from it by SR-79. The proposed project would not impact wildlife movement in this regional corridor. Impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the preceding, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. The project site lacks special status habitats. The Riversidian sage scrub-grassland ecotone found on the project site would not be considered a special status community due to the very low shrub cover found in this grassland. The project site does not contain riparian habitat, open drainages, erosional channels or other features that could contain plant species associated with riparian habitats.

As discussed in 7.a. herein, no seasonal wetlands or evidence of ponding were noted within the main project site (APNs 476-010-059 or 476-010-013) during the field survey or in a review of historical aerial photos available in Google Earth. During March 2, 2017 field surveys, ponding was observed in two road rut features within the Flossie Way access road right-of-way. Chuck Black, 10(a)(1)(A) permit number TE835549-7, of Ecological Restoration Service collected and processed dry samples for the determination of presence of fairy shrimp cysts. No *Branchinecta* or *Streptochepalus* cysts were present in any of the samples from the tire ruts. The fairy shrimp report, dated May 29, 2017, can be found in Appendix C2.

No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. The project site does not contain any blue line streams, seasonal wetlands, or other jurisdictional waters. The proposed project would not impact wetlands or other jurisdictional waters.

As discussed in 7.a. herein, no seasonal wetlands or evidence of ponding were noted within the main project site (APNs 476-010-059 or 476-010-013) during the field survey or in a review of historical aerial photos available in Google Earth. During March 2, 2017 field surveys, ponding was observed in two road rut features within the Flossie Way access road right-of-way. Chuck Black, 10(a)(1)(A) permit number TE835549-7, of Ecological Restoration Service collected and processed dry samples for the determination of presence of fairy shrimp cysts. No *Branchinecta* or *Streptochepalus* cysts were present in any of the samples from the tire ruts. The fairy shrimp report, dated May 29, 2017, can be found in Appendix C2. No impacts will occur. No mitigation measures are needed.

g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact. The preservation policies of the County's Multiple Open Space Element of the General Plan rely strongly on implementation of the MSHCP for achieving biological conservation objectives. The proposed project is consistent with the provisions of the Riverside County MSHCP, and is consistent with the General Plan in this respect. No oak trees are located on the project site. Therefore, the Riverside County Oak Tree Management Guidelines are not applicable. No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The information in this section is based partly on the Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation for the Temecula Valley Charter School by McKenna et al., dated November 7, 2016. This report is kept confidential and is available at the County of Riverside Planning Department to archaeologists, Native American representatives, and planners.

8. Historic Resources

a) Alter or destroy an historic site?

No Impact. The project site was not identified as a historic site in the Cultural Resources Investigation, and no impact would occur.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Section 15064.5 defines historic resources as resources listed or determined to be eligible for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission, a local register of historical resources, or the lead agency. Generally, a resource is considered "historically significant" if it meets one of the following criteria:

- i) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- ii) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- iii) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values;
- iv) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Historic Background

The Temecula Valley was within the jurisdiction of Mission San Luis Rey, and had become the principal grain producer for the mission by 1818. French Valley began to be settled in the late 1860s. The project site was part of a homestead established by Ralph Cassady in 1892. The current alignment of SR-79 was established along the eastern site boundary in the mid-1960s.

Historic Resources

No historically significant resources were identified on the site by the Cultural Resources Investigation. A single-family residential complex—consisting of a detached single-family house, a prefabricated house, and a detached three-car garage—was developed in the western part of the site beginning in 1979. A modern one-story single-family house is atop the hill in the northwest part of the site. A metal scale, thought to be post—World War II in age and of the type used to measure surface friction of cars (possibly race cars), extends vertically out of the ground in the south part of the site. A concrete cistern is in a fenced animal enclosure in the central part of the site. Aerial photographs depicted two structures on the eastern site boundary fronting SR-79, but the structures were not found during an intensive foot survey of the site.

Project Impacts

Project development would involve soil disturbance on about 8.5 acres of the site plus about 0.65 acres of off-site roadways. There is a very low potential for the presence of buried historic archaeological resources onsite, but this impact is potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Findings of Fact

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect.

Mitigation Measure

CUL-1 Before the beginning of earth-moving activities, Temecula Valley Charter School shall retain a Riverside County-certified historical archaeological consultant to be available on-call during earth-moving activities. If resources are uncovered, the remaining earth-moving activities on the property should be subjected to full-time monitoring. If resources identified as Native American in origin are uncovered, a Native American (Luiseño) monitor should be added. If resources are identified, the historic archaeological monitoring program should be initiated and continued until the earth-moving activities are completed. The historic archaeological consultant (consultant) and the Native American monitor, if applicable, shall have the authority to halt earth-moving activities within 50 feet of a discovery. The consultant shall recover, identify, and determine the significance of any resources discovered. Resources shall be curated at the facilities of the Western Science Center in Hemet, but the resources of Native American origin may be retained by the Luiseño Tribe. After the completion of all monitoring work, the consultant shall prepare a report describing the resources found for submission to the Riverside County Planning Department.

9. Archaeological Resources

a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site?

No Impact. No prehistoric archaeological resources were identified onsite during the intensive foot survey of the site. Letters inquiring about cultural resources of concern on or near the site were sent to representatives of several Native American tribes as part of the Cultural Resources Investigation; three responses were received, none of which mentioned concerns about cultural resources on or near the site.² Six prehistoric archaeological resources have been identified by previous cultural resources investigations within one mile of the project site: four isolates, one prehistoric artifact scatter, and one destroyed pictograph site.³ The site is considered low to moderately sensitive for prehistoric archaeological resources. No impact would occur.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Cultural Background

The project site borders the traditional and ethnographic boundaries of the Luiseño Native American population. The Luiseño are described as hunters and gatherers who also lived in semisedentary villages, practiced a complex form of territoriality and exploitation, and are known throughout Southern California for their rock art. The Luiseño practiced a relatively complex social organization based on lineages and clans. Individual clans occupied village sites and used individualized territories. The Luiseño subsisted on seasonal game—deer and a variety of small animals—and plants (acorns and herb and grass seeds).

A general cultural chronology for inland southern California is as follows:

- 11,000–8,000 years before present (ybp): Pleistocene/Early Holocene (Early Man) Period
- 8,000–5,500 ybp: San Dieguito Period
- 5,500–1,500 ybp: Millingstone/La Jolla-Pauma/Archaic/Encinitas Period
- 1,500–300 ybp: Late Prehistoric/Luiseño Period

No Early Man sites are known from the project region. The San Dieguito tradition is characterized by large domed scrapers, leaf-shaped knives and projectile points, stemmed projectile points, chipped stone crescentics, and hammerstones. The La Jolla Complex is recognized by the presence of millingstone assemblages and shell middens. The Late Prehistoric has been equated with the presence of cremations, bedrock mortars, millingstones, small triangular projectile points with concave bases, bone awls, stone pendants, *Olivella* shell beads, and quartz crystals.⁴

² Separate consultation letters respecting tribal cultural resources were sent by the Riverside County Planning Department.

³ An isolate is fewer than 3 isolated artifacts; and does not contain enough associated artifacts to form an archaeological site. A pictograph is rock art painted on stone (compare to *petroghph*, which is carved into stone).

⁴ Olivella is a genus of marine snails.

Archaeological Resources

No archaeological resources were identified onsite, as described in Section 9.a.

Project Impacts

Project development would involve soil disturbance on about 9.15 acres including the 8.5-acre school site and about 0.65 acres of off-site roadways. There is a low to moderate potential for the presence of buried prehistoric archaeological resources onsite. This impact is potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Findings of Fact

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect.

Mitigation Measure

CUL-2 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the developer/permit applicant shall enter into an agreement with and retain a Native American Monitor from the appropriate tribe.

The Native American Monitor shall be on-site during all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of each portion of the project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading and trenching. In conjunction with the Archaeological Monitor, the Native American Monitor shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and potential recovery of cultural resources.

The developer/permit applicant shall submit a fully executed copy of the contract to the County Archaeologist to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Archaeologist shall clear this condition.

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

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant Impact. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that in the event that human remains are discovered within the project site, disturbance of the site shall halt and remain halted until the coroner has conducted an investigation into the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes or has reason to believe the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission. The project would comply with existing law, and potential impacts to human remains would be less than significant.

d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

No Impact. No religious or sacred uses on or near the site were identified in the cultural resources investigation or in responses by Native American tribal representatives. No impact would occur.

10. Tribal Cultural Resources

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c). of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 for the purpose of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance to a California Native tribe.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Tribal Consultation

Notifications about this project were sent to Native American groups who had requested to be noticed pursuant to AB 52. These include the Pechanga Cultural Resources Department, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, Ramona Band of Cahuilla Indians, Colorado River Indian Tribes and the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians. Requests for consultation were received from Pechanga and Soboba. The remaining tribes did not request consultation on this project. Pechanga and Soboba did not identify any Tribal Cultural Resources in the project area. Pechanga and Soboba expressed concern that subsurface resources may be present and requested that a native Monitor be present during grading activities. Consultation was concluded with Soboba on April 19, 2017 and with Pechanga on April 19, 2017.

Project Impacts

Project development would involve soil disturbance on about 8.5 acres of the site plus about 0.65 acres of off-site roadways. There is a potential for the presence of buried tribal cultural resources onsite, and this impact is potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Findings of Fact

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure CUL-2 applies to this impact.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The information in this section is based partly on the following technical studies:

- Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Charter School Site. by Inland Foundation Engineering, dated September 9, 2016. A complete copy of this report is included as Appendix D of this Initial Study.
- Paleontological Technical Study: Temecula Valley Charter School Project, Riverside County, California. Paleo Solutions, February 24, 2017. A complete copy of this report is included as Appendix E of this Initial Study.

Would the project:

11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?

No impact. See the analysis in Section 11.b below.

b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

No Impact. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed to prevent construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface of active faults, in order to minimize the hazard of surface rupture of a fault to people and buildings. Before cities and counties can permit development within Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, geologic investigations are required to show that the sites are not threatened by surface rupture from future earthquakes. Active earthquake faults are faults where surface rupture has occurred within the last 11,000 years. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones in or next to the project site. In addition, the site does not lie within a fault zone established by the County of Riverside. The closest active faults are the Elsinore-Temecula Fault (7.4 miles away), the Elsinore-Glen Ivy Fault (13.8 miles away), and the San Jacinto-San Jacinto Valley and San Jacinto-Anza Faults (15.0 miles away) from the site (LGC, 2016b). Therefore, the potential for active fault rupture at the site is considered very low and no direct seismically-induced rupture impacts would occur.

Project development would not place people or structures at risk from surface rupture of a known active fault, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is needed.

12. Liquefaction Potential Zone

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Liquefaction refers to lose, saturated sand or silt deposits that behave as a liquid and lose their load-supporting capability when strongly shaken. Loose granular soils and silts that are saturated by relatively shallow groundwater are susceptible to liquefaction. The potential for liquefaction and seismically induced settlement onsite is negligible due to the presence of medium dense to dense older alluvial soils underlain by relatively shallow metamorphic bedrock. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is needed.

13. Ground-shaking Zone

a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. Seismic design parameters for the proposed project were calculated in the Geotechnical Investigation Report pursuant to 2013 California Building Code requirements.

Structures for human occupancy must be designed to meet or exceed California Building Code (CBC) standards for earthquake resistance. The CBC contains provisions for earthquake safety based on factors including occupancy type, the types of soil and rock onsite, and the strength of ground motion with a specified probability at the site. The geotechnical investigation for the project would calculate seismic design parameters, pursuant to CBC requirements, that must be used in the design of the proposed building. The CBC is updated on a three-year cycle; the 2016 CBC is scheduled to take effect on January 1 2017. Project development would not subject people or structures to substantial hazards from ground shaking, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

14. Landslide Risk

a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable due to the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Landslide and Rockfall

The potential for earthquake-induced landslides is considered very low due to the relatively low-lying topography of the site and adjacent areas. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is needed.

Lateral Spreading

Lateral spreading is the downslope movement of surface sediment due to liquefaction in a subsurface layer. Hazards from lateral spreading would be minimized by compliance with any recommendations in the geotechnical investigation report for minimizing liquefaction hazards. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is needed.

Collapse

Collapsible soils shrink upon being wetted and/or being subject to a load. One test of subsurface site soil indicated a moderate potential for soil collapse ("saturation collapse"). The Geotechnical Investigation (see Initial Study Appendix D) recommends removal of existing site soils to at least 24 inches below existing grade, or where testing indicates a relative compaction of at least 85 percent in undisturbed native soils, whichever is deeper, and replacement with compacted, moistened soils. The Geotechnical Investigation Report recommends a foundation consisting of shallow spread footings with a slab-on-grade floor. Compliance with recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation Report would reduce hazards from collapsible soils to a less than significant impact. No mitigation is required.

15. Ground Subsidence

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

Less than Significant Impact. The major cause of ground subsidence is the excessive withdrawal of groundwater. Ground subsidence does not appear to affect the site. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is needed.

16. Other Geologic Hazards

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

Less than Significant Impact.

Seiche

A seiche is a surface wave created when an inland water body is shaken, usually by an earthquake. There are no surface water bodies close enough to the project site to pose a flood hazard to the site due to a seiche, and no impact would occur.

Mudflow

A mudflow is a landslide composed of saturated rock debris and soil with a consistency of wet cement. The hill onsite is too small to generate a mudflow that would pose a substantial flood hazard to people or structures onsite. There are no other slopes close enough to the project site to pose a mudflow hazard to the site. No impact would occur.

Volcanic Hazard

No volcano hazard areas in Riverside County are mapped on the US Geological Survey's California Volcano Observatory. The two nearest such areas to the project site are the Lavic Lake Volcanic Field in San Bernardino County, about 87 miles to the northeast; and Salton Buttes Lava Dome in Imperial County about 92 miles to the east (USGS 2016). No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

17. Slopes

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

Less than Significant Impact. The hill in the west part of the site would remain. The school would be built mostly in the east half of the site which slopes very slightly to the east. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is needed.

b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?

No Impact. The project grading plan does not include cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 (horizontal:vertical), or higher than 10 feet. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?

No Impact. The proposed grading would accommodate installation of sewer laterals, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is needed.

18. Soils

a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. Project construction would disturb soil on 10 acres of the 14.6-acre site. Construction projects of one acre or more are regulated under the Statewide General Construction Permit, Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ, issued by the State Water Resources Control Board in 2012. Projects obtain coverage by developing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan estimating sediment risk from construction activities to receiving waters, and specifying best management practices (BMPs) that would be used by the project to minimize pollution of stormwater. Categories of BMPs used in Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans are described below in Table 8.

Category	Purpose	Examples
Erosion Controls and Wind Erosion Controls	Cover and/or bind soil surface, to prevent soil particles from being detached and transported by water or wind	Mulch, geotextiles, mats, hydroseeding, earth dikes, swales
Sediment Controls	Filter out soil particles that have been detached and transported in water.	Barriers such as straw bales, sandbags, fiber rolls, and gravel bag berms; desilting basin; cleaning measures such as street sweeping
Tracking Controls	Minimize the tracking of soil offsite by vehicles	Stabilized construction roadways and construction entrances/exits; entrance/outlet tire wash.

Table 8 Construction Best Management Practices

Category	Purpose	Examples
Non-storm Water Management Controls	Prohibit discharge of materials other than stormwater, such as discharges from the cleaning, maintenance, and fueling of vehicles and equipment. Conduct various construction operations, including paving, grinding, and concrete curing and finishing, in ways that minimize non- stormwater discharges and contamination of any such discharges.	BMPs specifying methods for: paving and grinding operations; cleaning, fueling, and maintenance of vehicles and equipment; concrete curing; concrete finishing.
Waste Management and Controls (i.e., good housekeeping practices)	Management of materials and wastes to avoid contamination of stormwater.	Spill prevention and control, stockpile management, and management of solid wastes and hazardous wastes.
Source: CASQA 2003.		

Table 8 Construction Best Management Practices

Project design and operation would be required to comply with the Municipal Stormwater Permit ("MS4 Permit") issued by the San Diego RWQCB in May 2013 (Order No. R9-2013-0001). The project would be classified as a Priority Project under the MS4 Permit because it would develop over 10,000 square feet of impervious surfaces. The project would be required to design and implement structural BMPs for minimizing stormwater pollution, including low-impact development (LID) BMPs, and could be required to design and implement hydromodification BMPs.

LID is a stormwater management and land development strategy that combines a hydrologically functional site design with pollution prevention measures to compensate for land development impacts on hydrology and water quality. LID techniques mimic the predevelopment site hydrology by using site design techniques that store, infiltrate, evapotranspire, bio-filter, or detain runoff close to its source. LID requirements for priority development projects in the portion of the Santa Margarita Watershed in Riverside County are detailed in the water quality management plan for the Santa Margarita Region of Riverside County issued by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, effective July 11, 2014.

Hydromodification is the management of post-project runoff flows and durations so that they are maintained to the levels of the pre-project condition.

After compliance with requirements of the MS4 Permit, the project would not cause substantial erosion or siltation, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is needed.

b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact. Expansive soils shrink or swell as the moisture content decreases or increases; the shrinking or swelling can shift, crack, or break structures built on such soils. Two samples of subsurface site soils yielded expansion indices of 66 and 25, indicating medium and low expansion potentials, respectively. Detailed recommendations for concrete slab-on-grade foundations on expansive soils are provided in the Geotechnical Investigation Report, in compliance with the California Building Code and

Riverside County Ordinance. Project design and construction would comply with such recommendations, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is needed.

c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No Impact. The Eastern Municipal Water District provides sewer service to the community of French Valley. Project development would include construction of sewers connecting to existing sewer mains, and the project would not involve use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

19. Erosion

a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?

Less than Significant Impact. Project development would include implementation of construction and operational BMPs described above in Section 18.a. Thus, development would not change siltation or erosion so as to change a river or stream channel or a lakebed. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?

Less than Significant Impact. Project erosion impacts would be less than significant, as substantiated above in Section 18.a.

20. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.

a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?

Less than Significant Impact. The construction BMPs that would be implemented by the project include wind erosion BMPs. At completion, the entire campus would be developed with buildings, landscaping, and paved areas including parking lots, driveways, walkways, and hardcourts. Thus, the finished campus would not contain bare soil susceptible to wind erosion. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

21. Paleontological Resources

A paleontological study of the project site was completed by Paleo Solutions on February 24, 2017; a complete copy of this report is included as Appendix E of this Initial Study.

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Paleontological Resources

Literature and Records Searches

The paleontological study included searches of several geologic maps and scientific papers, and a records search by the Western Science Center in Hemet. The Records Search did not identify fossil localities within one mile of the project site. The following is a discussion of the literature search and records search results for western Riverside County including an assessment of paleontological sensitivity of onsite rocks and soils. The project site is underlain by four types of rock, sediment, and soil:

Mesozoic Igneous and Sedimentary Rocks

Mesozoic-age igneous rocks (gabbro [Kgb], granodiorite [Kgd], and metamorphic rock (phyllite [Mzp]). The Mesozoic Era extends from about 251 to 65.5 million years before present (mybp). Phyllite is mapped within the Project area in the central, northwest corner, and southeast corner. Phyllite bedrock underlies the Quaternary alluvial sediments in the Project area between one and ten feet below the current ground surface. Additionally, gabbro (Kgb) is mapped west of the Project area, and granodiorite (Kgd) is mapped as two small slivers southwest of the Project area (Figure 3). Igneous rocks formed deep within the Earth's surface at high temperature and high pressure and lack fossil resources. Metamorphic rocks have been deformed by heat and pressure and will usually be devoid of recognizable fossil remains. Igneous and metamorphic rocks are therefore considered to have very low paleontological potential (Class 1) using the Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC) system and low sensitivity per Riverside County guidelines.

Pleistocene Very Old Alluvial Deposits

Pleistocene very old alluvial valley deposits (Qvova) comprise fluvial sediments deposited on broad canyon floors by ancient river and stream systems. The Pleistocene Epoch extends from about 2.59 mybp to approximately 11,700 years before present (ybp).

Older alluvial sediments are heavily dissected and consist of reddish-brown, clay, silt, sand and gravel. Pleistocene very old alluvial deposits are mapped on the majority of the western Project area as well as the northeast corner.

Taxonomically diverse and locally abundant Pleistocene animals and plants have been collected from older alluvial deposits similar to those mapped in the Project area throughout southern California and include mammoth, mastodon, camel, horse, bison, giant ground sloth, peccary, cheetah, lion, saber tooth cat, capybara, dire wolf, and numerous taxa of smaller mammals. Pleistocene very old alluvial deposits have moderate paleontological potential (Class 3) using the PFYC system and high (A) sensitivity per Riverside County guidelines.⁵

Pleistocene older alluvium has produced numerous Pleistocene-age vertebrate fossils in the Project vicinity as well as elsewhere in Riverside County. Most notable is the massive fossil collection recovered during excavation for Diamond Valley Lake northeast of the Project area. These sediments have yielded tens of

⁵ The Potential Fossil Yield Classification system is a five-point scale from very low potential to contain paleontological resources (Class 1) to very high potential (Class 5). Riverside County assigns four categories of paleontological sensitivity: High (with two subcategories, High A and High B); Low, and Undetermined.

thousands of fossils corresponding to the late Irvingtonian and early Rancholabrean North American Land Mammal Ages.⁶ The Diamond Valley Lake Local Fauna (DVLLF) is the largest open, non-asphaltic late Pleistocene fossil assemblage known in the southwestern United States. The assemblage comprises 2,646 localities and includes nearly 100,000 identifiable fossils representing more than 105 vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant taxa. Vertebrate fossils are generally well-preserved and relatively complete and provide important data on the relative abundance and diversity of species through time at the given geographical location. A complete list of DVLLF taxa is provided in Table 3 of the Paleontological Study included as Appendix E to this Initial Study.

Furthermore, the Pauba Formation, which is geologically correlative with Pleistocene older alluvium, has produced numerous specimens of well-preserved fossil vertebrates of late Pleistocene age during excavations for a nearby housing development project in Temecula, Riverside County. These fossils were discovered during monitoring in 2004 and included scientifically significant specimens from six different taxa: *Mammuthus columbi* (mammoth), *Equus* spp. (horse), *Bison antiquus* (bison), cf. Camelidae (camel family), Rodentia (rodent family), and Serpentes (snake).

Quaternary Young Alluvial Deposits

Quaternary young alluvial deposits (Qa, Qyaa) are Holocene-age (10,000 years ago – Recent) and are composed of gravel, sand, and clay that comprise valleys and alluvial fans. Quaternary deposits are poorly consolidated and represent sedimentation from current and former major rivers and streams. The alluvium is covered with greyish colored soil. Quaternary valley alluvium (Qa) is mapped in the northeast corner of the Project area, and alluvial channel deposits (Qyaa) are mapped southeast of the Project area.

Fossils are generally unknown from Holocene-age surficial deposits, due to their young age. Reworked fossils from older deposits may be present, but would not meet significance criteria as the fossils would lack critical contextual information. However, they may overlie older, paleontologically sensitive deposits at depth. Therefore, the Quaternary alluvium deposits are designated as having low paleontological sensitivity (Class 2) above four feet depth and are designated as having unknown paleontological potential (Class U) below four feet depth using the PFYC system. These deposits have a high (B) sensitivity per Riverside County guidelines.

Artificial Fill

Artificial fill (af) comprises recent deposits of previously disturbed sediments emplaced by construction operations and are found in areas where recent construction has taken place. Colors are highly variable and sediments are mottled in appearance. Although these materials may contain fossil resources, they have been removed from their original locations and lack significance. Artificial fill is not mapped in the Project area; however, the apparent preexisting surface disturbance in the vicinity suggests the presence of these materials comprising some of the surface of the Project area. Artificial fill (af) has low paleontological potential (Class 2) using the PFYC system and high (B) sensitivity per Riverside County guidelines.

⁶ The Irvingtonian and Rancholabrean ages are components of a chronology for fossil North American land mammals. The Irvingtonian Age extend from about 1.8 mybp to 240,000 ybp; the Rancholabrean extends from about 240,000 to 11,000 ybp.

Field Survey Results

No fossils were observed onsite during a field survey conducted February 2, 2017.

Impacts

Project development would include ground disturbance on the entire 8.5-acre school site, plus about 0.66 acres of Koon Street and Pourroy Road. Surface grading or shallow excavations entirely within Holocene young alluvial deposits in the project area are unlikely to uncover significant fossil vertebrate remains. However, older deposits may be present immediately below a thin veneer of Holocene soils or alluvium. The geotechnical boring logs show Quaternary (Holocene and Pleistocene) sediments one foot beneath the ground surface and extending to a maximum depth of ten feet. Excavations in the Project area that extend down into very old sedimentary deposits may well impact scientifically important paleontological resources. Excavations into Mesozoic phyllite, expected to be encountered starting at relatively shallow depths of one to ten feet below the current ground surface, will not impact scientifically significant fossils, although the overlying sediments may contain resources. Therefore, grading and other earthmoving activities may potentially result in significant direct impacts to paleontological resources throughout the entirety of the Project area.

Findings of Fact

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect.

Mitigation Measure

Construction excavations which disturb Pleistocene-age sediments shall be monitored by a professional paleontologist in order to reduce potential adverse impacts on scientifically important paleontological resources to a less than significant level. Prior to construction, the project applicant shall retain a professional paleontologist. The paleontologist shall prepare a paleontological resources monitoring plan (PRMP) before the beginning of ground-disturbing activities. The PRMP shall provide detailed recommended monitoring locations; a description of a worker training program; detailed procedures for monitoring, fossil recovery, laboratory analysis, and museum curation; a curation agreement with the Western Science Center or another accredited repository; and notification procedures in the event of a fossil discovery by a paleontological monitor or other project personnel. Because the Project area is nearly devoid of exposed sediments, the approximate ages (Holocene or Pleistocene) of the Quaternary deposits underlying the Project area could not be determined from the field survey. Additionally, the subterranean sediment descriptions provided in the geotechnical report are inconclusive for determining Holocene or Pleistocene ages. Therefore, it is recommended that excavations in all locations of the Project area be initially monitored for the presence of paleontologically sensitive sediments. If it is determined that only Holocene-age alluvium (PFYC Class 2) or Mesozoic-age phyllite (PFYC Class 1) is impacted, monitoring will be reduced or halted. Any potential fossils that are unearthed during construction should be evaluated by a professional paleontologist as described in the PRMP.

Unique Geological Resources

There are no unique geological features onsite. French Valley is one of the valleys in the San Jacinto Basin, a broad area of valleys interspersed with hills bounded by the San Jacinto and Santa Rosa Mountains to the northeast and the Santa Ana Mountains to the southwest. The northwest part of the project site is a hill with an elevation of about 1,470 feet above mean sea level; the remainder of the site has a slight east slope, and the elevation at the southeast corner of the site is about 1,412 feet above mean sea level. The site is underlain by very old (middle to early Pleistocene) alluvial valley deposits and Mesozoic metamorphic bedrock (phillite) (Inland Foundation Engineering 2016). No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

22. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Scientists have concluded that human activities are contributing to global climate change by adding large amounts of heat-trapping gases, known as greenhouse gases (GHGs), into the atmosphere. The primary source of these GHG is fossil fuel use. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has identified four major GHGs—water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and ozone (O₃)—that are the likely cause of an increase in global average temperatures observed within the 20th and 21st centuries. Other GHG identified by the IPCC that contribute to global warming to a lesser extent include nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), hydro fluorocarbons, per fluorocarbons, and chlorofluorocarbons.^{7, 8}

This section analyzes the project's contribution to global climate change impacts in California through an analysis of project-related GHG emissions. Information on manufacture of cement, steel, and other "life cycle" emissions that would occur as a result of the project are not applicable and are not included in the analysis.⁹ Black carbon emissions are not included in the GHG analysis because CARB does not include this pollutant in the state's AB 32 inventory and treats this short-lived climate pollutant separately (CARB 2016). ¹⁰

 $^{^{7}}$ Water vapor (H₂O) is the strongest GHG and the most variable in its phases (vapor, cloud droplets, ice crystals). However, water vapor is not considered a pollutant, but part of the feedback loop rather than a primary cause of change.

⁸ Black carbon contributes to climate change both directly, by absorbing sunlight, and indirectly, by depositing on snow (making it melt faster) and by interacting with clouds and affecting cloud formation. Black carbon is the most strongly light-absorbing component of PM emitted from burning fuels. Reducing black carbon emissions globally can have immediate economic, climate, and public health benefits. California has been an international leader in reducing emissions of black carbon, with close to 95 percent control expected by 2020 due to existing programs that target reducing PM from diesel engines and burning activities (CARB 2014). However, state and national GHG inventories do not yet include black carbon due to ongoing work resolving the precise global warming potential of black carbon. Guidance for CEQA documents does not yet include black carbon.

⁹ Life cycle emissions include indirect emissions associated with materials manufacture. However, these indirect emissions involve numerous parties, each of which is responsible for GHG emissions of their particular activity. The California Resources Agency, in adopting the CEQA Guidelines Amendments on GHG emissions found that lifecycle analyses was not warranted for project-specific CEQA analysis in most situations, for a variety of reasons, including lack of control over some sources, and the possibility of double-counting emissions (see Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action, December 2009). Because the amount of materials consumed during the operation or construction of the proposed project is not known, the origin of the raw materials purchased is not known, and manufacturing information for those raw materials are also not known, calculation of life cycle emissions would be speculative. A life-cycle analysis is not warranted (OPR 2008).

¹⁰ Particulate matter emissions, which include black carbon, are analyzed in Section 3.2, *Air Quality*. Black carbon emissions have sharply declined due to efforts to reduce on-road and off-road vehicle emissions, especially diesel particulate matter. The State's existing air quality policies will virtually eliminate black carbon emissions from on-road diesel engines within 10 years (CARB 2016).

A background discussion on the GHG regulatory setting and GHG modeling can be found in Appendix B to this Initial Study.

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Global climate change is not confined to a particular project area and is generally accepted as the consequence of global industrialization over the last 200 years. A typical project, even a very large one, does not generate enough greenhouse gas emissions on its own to influence global climate change significantly; hence, the issue of global climate change is, by definition, a cumulative environmental impact.

The proposed project would generate GHG emissions from vehicle trips generated by the project, energy use (indirectly from purchased electricity use and directly through fuel consumed for building heating) and area sources (e.g., equipment used on-site, consumer products, coatings), water/wastewater generation, and waste disposal. Annual GHG emissions were calculated for construction and operation of the project. Annual average construction emissions were amortized over 30 years and included in the emissions inventory to account for GHG emissions from the construction phase of the project. For the purpose of this GHG analysis, it has been conservatively assumed that the project would generate an increase in vehicle mile traveled (VMT), water use, and solid waste generation due to an overall increase in school facility capacity. Project-related GHG emissions are shown in Table 9. As shown in the table, the proposed project at buildout would generate 1,267 metric tons of carbon dioxide–equivalent (MTCO₂e) emissions per year. The total net increase of GHG emissions on-site from the project would not exceed the SCAQMD's bright-line threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e,¹¹ and the proposed project's cumulative contribution to GHG emissions is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

¹¹ This threshold is based on a combined threshold of 3,000 MTCO2e for all land use types, proposed by SCAQMD's Working Group based on a survey of the GHG emissions inventory of CEQA projects. Approximately 90 percent of CEQA projects' GHG emissions inventories exceed 3,000 MTCO2e, which is based on a potential threshold approach cited in CAPCOA's white paper, "CEQA and Climate Change."

Source	MTCO ₂ e/year	Percent of Project Total
Area	<1	<1%
Energy ¹	135	11%
Mobile	1,084	86%
Waste	26	2%
Water	7	1%
Amortized Construction Emissions ²	15	1%
Total Emissions	1,267	100%
SCAQMD's Bright-Line Threshold	3,000	NA
Exceeds Bright-Line Threshold	No	NA
Course CalEEMad Marshar 2012 2.2		

Table 9 **Project-Related GHG Emissions**

Source: CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2.

MTCO2e: metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent

Note: Percent changes from each source may not total to 100 percent due to rounding.

Assumes implementation of the 2013 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) and 2016 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards. The 2016 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards are 33.5 percent more energy efficient than the 2008 Standards for non-residential buildings.

² Construction emissions are amortized over a 30-year project lifetime per recommended SCAQMD methodology.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Applicable plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions include the California Air Resources Board's (CARB) Scoping Plan, the Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), and the County of Riverside's Climate Action Plan (CAP). A consistency analysis with these plans is presented below.

CARB Scoping Plan

CARB's Scoping Plan is California's GHG reduction strategy to achieve the state's GHG emissions reduction target established by Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which is to return to 1990 emission levels by year 2020. The CARB Scoping Plan is applicable to state agencies and is not directly applicable to cities/counties and individual projects. Nonetheless, the Scoping Plan has been the primary tool that is used to develop performance-based and efficiency-based CEQA criteria and GHG reduction targets for climate action planning efforts.

Since adoption of the 2008 Scoping Plan, state agencies have adopted programs identified in the plan, and the legislature has passed additional legislation to achieve the GHG reduction targets. Statewide strategies to reduce GHG emissions include the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS), California Appliance Energy Efficiency regulations, California Renewable Energy Portfolio standard, changes in the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards, and other early action measures as necessary to ensure the state is on target to achieve the GHG emissions reduction goals of AB 32. Also, new buildings are required to comply with the 2016 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards and 2013 California Green Building Code (CALGreen). The state is currently preparing the 2030 Target Scoping Plan Update to address the new 2030 interim target to achieve a 40 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2030, established by Senate Bill 32 (SB 32). While measures in the Scoping Plan apply to state agencies and not the proposed project, the project's GHG

emissions would be reduced from compliance with statewide measures that have been adopted since AB 32 was adopted.

SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

In addition to AB 32, the California legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 375 to connect regional transportation planning to land use decisions made at a local level. SB 375 requires the metropolitan planning organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plans to achieve the per capita GHG reduction targets. For the SCAG region, the SCS was adopted in April 2016 (SCAG 2016). The SCS does not require that local general plans, specific plans, or zoning be consistent with the SCS, but provides incentives for consistency for governments and developers. The proposed project would provide for the educational needs of the community to meet the existing and projected demand for school services. Additionally, the proposed project would be constructed on an infill site and would not require extension of infrastructure in greenfield areas. The proposed project would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the RTP/SCS.

Riverside County Climate Action Plan

The County of Riverside adopted a CAP in December of 2015. The CAP identifies and evaluates feasible and effective policies to reduce GHG emissions in order to meet state, federal, and international targets. The CAP's Appendix F indicates that the development review process procedures for evaluating GHG impacts and determining significance for CEQA purposes will be streamlined by: 1) applying an emissions level that is determined to be less than significant for small projects, and 2) utilizing the Screening Tables to mitigate project GHG emissions that exceed the threshold level. A threshold level above 3,000 MTCO₂e per year is used to identify projects that require the use of Screening Tables or a project-specific technical analysis to quantify and mitigate project emissions. The 3,000 MTCO₂e per year value is used by the County to define small projects that are considered less than significant, when combined with the following modest efficiency measures, and do not need to use the Screening Tables or alternative GHG mitigation analysis (Riverside 2015):

- Energy efficiency of at least 5 percent greater than 2010 Title 24 requirements: Non-residential projects constructed after January 1, 2017 are 33.5 percent more energy efficiency than the 2008 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards (which were included in the 2010 CALGreen). Therefore, the proposed project complies with this efficiency measure.
- Water conservation measures that matches the California Green Building Code in effect as of January 2011: The proposed project would comply with the county's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO) and water efficiency measures identified in the current version of CALGreen. Therefore, the proposed project would comply with this efficiency measure.

Since the proposed project would not exceed the threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year and would comply with the efficiency measures, it is considered less than significant and do not need to use the Screening Tables or alternative GHG mitigation analysis. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the CAP and the statewide GHG emissions goals of AB 32. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

23. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The information in this Section is based partly on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of 31455 Winchester Road, by EMG, dated June 6, 2016; a complete copy of this report is included as Appendix F of this Initial Study.

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less Than Significant Impact. Project construction would involve use of hazardous materials, including fuels, greases, lubricants, cleansers, paints, and pesticides. The use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials during project construction would be required to comply with existing regulations of several agencies, including the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the US Environmental Protection Agency, Occupational Safety & Health Administration, Caltrans, County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health, and Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD). Compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner and would minimize the potential for safety impacts to occur. Additionally, the proposed project would be constructed with strict adherence to all emergency response plan requirements set forth by the County of Riverside and RCFD.

Project operation would involve the use of small amounts of hazardous materials, such as cleansers, pesticides, and paints, for cleaning and maintenance purposes. Use of hazardous materials during project operation would comply with the same regulations that would pertain to use of such materials during project construction. Project construction and operation would not cause significant hazards to the public or the environment through routine use of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is needed.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. During project construction, the construction contractor would maintain equipment and supplies onsite for containing and cleaning a hazardous materials spill and would train construction workers in such containing and cleaning. The construction contractor would notify the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health immediately in the event of a hazardous material release that onsite workers could not safely contain and clean.

During project operation, hazardous materials would be used in small amounts and in conformance with regulations of agencies listed above in Section 3.8.a. The use of hazardous materials during project operation and project construction would not cause substantial hazards arising from accidental release of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The emergency response plan in effect in unincorporated Riverside County is the Emergency Operations Plan approved by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in 2006. Staging of vehicles, equipment, and construction materials during project construction would comply with requirements of the Riverside County Sheriff's Department and Riverside County Road Maintenance Division regarding maintaining emergency access on public roadways. Project construction and operation would not interfere with implementation of the Emergency Operations Plan, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. There are no existing schools within 0.25 mile of the project site, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is needed.

e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Less than Significant Impact. No hazardous materials sites were identified on or within one mile of the project site during an environmental database review conducted on May 19, 2016 as part of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the project site (EMG 2016). The ESA identified past agricultural use onsite. However, based on aerial photographs, such past use of the site is considered to have been grazing land or tended grass, not irrigated cropland. The DTSC requires environmental assessment for pesticide residues on land previously used as irrigated cropland. The past use of the site does not trigger the DTSC requirement. Project development would not create hazards arising from a listed hazardous materials site on the project site, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is needed.

24. Airports

a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?

No Impact. The project site is not within the airport land use plan or within two nautical miles of a publicuse airport. The nearest public-use airport to the site is French Valley Airport, about 3.3 miles to the southwest. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?

No Impact. The project site is not within the airport land use plan, and project development would not require review by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles or a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. The project site is not within the airport land use plan or within two nautical miles of a publicuse airport. The nearest public-use airport to the site is French Valley Airport, about 3.3 miles to the southwest. The site is not in areas surrounding French Valley Airport where land uses are regulated to minimize hazards from aircraft crashes to persons on the ground, and not in areas where heights of structures are limited to prevent obstructions to air navigation. Project development would not cause airportrelated hazards to persons onsite, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. There are no private airstrips or heliports within one nautical mile of the project site, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is needed.

25. Hazardous Fire Area

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The nearest fire hazard zone to the project site is a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone about 700 feet to the west mapped by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE 2009).¹² The RCFD provides fire protection to the community of French Valley, including the project site. The two nearest fire stations to the project site are Station 83 at French Valley Airport, about 3.3 miles to the southwest, and Station 34 in the community of Winchester, about 5.3 miles to the north. RCFD has automatic aid agreements with the cities of Hemet and Murrieta and the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, and a mutual aid agreement with March Air Force Base (Management Partners 2009).¹³ Project development would not expose people or structures to substantial wildland fire hazards, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is needed.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The information in this section is based on the preliminary Water Quality Management Plan prepared for the Proposed Project; a complete copy of this report is available for review at the County of Riverside Planning Department.

Would the project:

¹² This map—which was prepared in 2009—also shows a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone on two parcels about 150 feet north of the west end of the site; however, those two parcels consist of rural residential uses, some ornamental vegetation, and bare land, and the classification does not appear to reflect current conditions.

¹³ Automatic aid is assistance dispatched automatically by contractual agreement between two communities or fire districts. Mutual aid, by comparison, is arranged case by case.

26. Water Quality Impacts

The project site is in the Santa Margarita Watershed and the Warm Springs Valley Subwatershed, which are within the jurisdiction of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). There are two existing natural drainage channels that flow in a northwest to southeast direction that cross the site. The drainage channel to the north receives runoff from the properties to the north of Keller Road and the site; it flows into two 8-foot by 4-foot culverts in the northeast corner of the proposed school site that convey flow beneath SR-79. Proposed development of the Keller Crossing Specific Plan, which is just north of Keller Road and the school site, would include a 24-inch storm drain along Keller Road that connects to the natural drainage channel and would prevent off-site runoff from entering the school site. The other natural drainage channel cuts across the middle of the school site in a northwest to southeast direction and discharges to a 72-inch culvert beneath SR-79. This natural drainage channel would be altered with construction of the school site. After stormwater drainage flows under SR-79, it continues south and enters Warm Springs Creek, which flows south to Murrieta Creek and eventually discharges into the Santa Margarita River and the Pacific Ocean. There is currently no regional storm drain facilities in the immediate vicinity of the project site.

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Less Than Significant Impact. The majority of the potential erosion and siltation impacts would occur during the construction phase (e.g., grading, clearing, excavating, and cut and fill activities) of the proposed project. During construction, the project site would be cleared of vegetation in preparation for grading, which would expose loose soil to potential wind and water erosion. If not controlled, the transport of these materials to local waterways would temporarily increase suspended sediment concentrations and release pollutants attached to sediment particles into the waterways. As previously stated, the project would be required to submit PRDs and a SWPPP to the State Water Resources Control Board for approval prior to the commencement of construction activities. The SWPPP would describe the BMPs to be implemented during project construction to minimize the potential for erosion and siltation.

Project development would include the installation of storm drains in the building complex and parking lot that would be mostly in the eastern half of the site. The drainage pattern would remain essentially the same, with stormwater flow directed to the culverts that pass under SR-79. However, the natural drainage channel that currently bisects the site would be altered with the proposed development.

The operational phase of the project development would contain a number of features to reduce the impact of erosion and siltation, including site design, source control, and treatment control BMPs. These features would be described in the site-specific WQMP; hydromodification BMPs that mimic pre-development flow rates and volumes would also be included, if needed. Implementation of the construction and operational BMPs would minimize erosion and siltation, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Project Construction

Clearing, grading, excavation, and construction activities associated with the proposed project have the potential to impact water quality through soil erosion and increasing the amount of silt and debris carried in runoff. Additionally, the use of construction materials such as fuels, solvents, and paints may present a risk to surface water quality. Finally, the refueling and parking of construction vehicles and other equipment on-site during construction may result in oil, grease, or related pollutant leaks and spills that may discharge into the storm drain system.

To minimize these potential impacts, the project would be required to comply with the NPDES Construction General Permit (CGP) as well as prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that requires the incorporation of BMPs to control sedimentation, erosion, and hazardous materials contamination of runoff during construction. The GCP also requires that prior to the start of construction activities, the project applicant must file Permit Registration Documents (PRDs) with the State Water Resources Control Board, which includes a Notice of Intent (NOI), risk assessment, site map, annual fee, signed certification statement, SWPPP, and post-construction water balance calculations. Since the project site consists of approximately 8.5 acres, a SWPPP would be required, as described in more detail in Section 3.6.b.

With submittal of the PRDs and implementation of the SWPPP and its associated BMPs throughout the construction phase of the proposed project, anticipated and expected pollutants of concern would be minimized during construction, and construction water quality impacts would be less than significant.

Project Operation

Once the project has been constructed, urban runoff could include a variety of contaminants that could impact water quality. Runoff from buildings and parking lots typically contains oils, grease, fuel, antifreeze, byproducts of combustion (such as lead, cadmium, nickel, and other metals), fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, and other pollutants. Precipitation at the beginning of the rainy season may result in an initial stormwater runoff (first flush) with high pollutant concentrations.

As discussed in Section 3.6.b, a project-specific water quality management plan (WQMP) would be submitted to Riverside County for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading plans. The WQMP would describe site design/source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs that would be used to reduce or avoid potential water quality impacts to the maximum extent practicable, and reduce the discharge of pollutants in post-development runoff to the standards of the best available technology economically achievable and the best conventional pollutant control technology. The project would be considered a "priority development project" since it would create and/or replace 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface. Volumetric treatment control BMPs would mitigate (infiltrate and/or treat) a specific volume of runoff from the project site, based on the 85th percentile, 24-hour runoff event. Flow-based treatment control BMPs would mitigate a specific flow rate of runoff based on the 0.2 inch/hour rainfall intensity. The treatment BMPs would be

designed in accordance with the detailed design procedures and spreadsheets provided in Riverside County's Design Handbook for Low Impact Development Best Management Practices (2011).

Potential hydromodification impacts would also be analyzed in the WQMP, using the Santa Margarita Region Hydrology Manual to demonstrate compliance with the hydrologic performance standard of the Santa Margarita Region Hydromodification Plan. The hydrologic performance standard consists of matching or reducing the flow duration curve of post-development conditions to that of pre-existing, naturally occurring conditions for significant flow events (i.e., 10 percent of the 2-year runoff event up to the 10-year runoff event). The project would also need to comply with the sediment supply performance standard, which consists of maintaining the pre-project bed sediment supply to the channel receiving runoff from the project site. The WQMP would address the use of structural BMPs or hydrologic control BMPs to control the postconstruction runoff hydrograph from the site and apply site design principles or sediment supply BMPs to preserve the delivery of bed sediment load to the receiving waters. With proper design, the BMPs would reduce and possibly eliminate any potential hydromodification requirements.

The project would also need to prepare an operation and maintenance plan that specifies the maintenance requirements and inspection schedule for the treatment BMPs as well as ownership and maintenance responsibilities. With the implementation of these LID and BMP features as well as compliance with state, county, and local regulations, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on water quality during the operational phase. No mitigation is needed.

c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is within the northern portion of the Temecula Valley Groundwater Basin. Project development would increase impervious surfaces on the site, thus reducing the area available for infiltration of stormwater into soil. However, the project would implement LID BMPs mimicking the pre-development site hydrology using site design techniques that store, infiltrate, evapotranspire, bio-filter, or detain runoff. Thus, the impact on groundwater recharge would be minimal.

The project would result in an increased water demand but would not involve the extraction or installation of any groundwater wells on the property. The project would be served by the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), which purchases the majority of its water supply as imported surface water from the State Water Project and the Colorado River Aqueduct. EMWD's local supplies include groundwater, desalinated groundwater, and recycled water. Groundwater is pumped from the Hemet/San Jacinto and West San Jacinto areas of the San Jacinto Groundwater Basin. Therefore, the groundwater wells that are owned and operated by EMWD are not in the Temecula Valley Groundwater Basin, and the potentially small reduction in groundwater supply wells. In addition, EMWD's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan indicates that they have sufficient water supplies to meet demands in their service area in normal, single-dry year, and multiple-dry-year conditions through the 2020-2040 period (RMC 2016).

Therefore, the project would not impact groundwater supplies, and with the implementation of LID measures that promote infiltration, the potential groundwater impact would be less than significant.

d) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant Impact. All storm drain facilities would be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District design standards to provide protection from a 100-year storm event. County flood control policy requires that the rate of stormwater runoff discharged from a project site not be increased as a result of development. The final size and location of all the required drainage systems and water quality features would be determined and described in the site-specific WQMP and hydrology study. Although the treatment control BMPs have not yet been designed, they would most likely consist of bioretention basins that would attenuate peak flows and mimic pre-development runoff conditions so that the capacity of the channels to which runoff is discharged is not exceeded.

Storm drain design in compliance with county design standards and implementation of BMPs that minimize increases in runoff would minimize the potential for stormwater runoff from the site to exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm drainage systems. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The project would not create substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. During the construction phase, the project would be required to prepare a SWPPP, thus limiting the discharge of pollutants from the site. During operation, the project would implement LID and BMP measures that minimize the amount of stormwater runoff and associated pollutants.

e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No Impact. The northern one-third of the site is in Flood Zone X mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, that is, outside of 100-year and 500-year flood zones. Flood zones have not been mapped on the remainder of the site (FEMA 2016). The proposed project would not develop housing. No impact would occur.

f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. No 100-year or 500-year flood zones are mapped on or next to the site, and no impact would occur.

g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in detail in Section 3.6.b and Section 3.9.a, BMPs would be implemented across the project site during both construction and operation of the project. These BMPs would control and prevent the release of sediment, debris, and other pollutants into the storm drain system and downstream receiving water bodies. Implementation of BMPs during construction would be in accordance with the provisions of the SWPPP, which would minimize the release of sediment, soil, and other pollutants. Operational BMPs would meet the MS4 Permit requirements and Santa Margarita Region WQMP

requirements, which include the incorporation of site design, source control, and treatment control measures to treat and control runoff before it enters the storm drain system. With implementation of these BMPs, the potential impact on water quality would be less than significant.

h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors)?

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed in detail in Section 3.9.a, BMPs would be implemented across the project site during operation of the project. These BMPs would control and prevent the release of pollutants into the storm drain system and downstream receiving water bodies. Operational BMPs would meet the MS4 Permit requirements and Santa Margarita Region WQMP requirements, which include the incorporation of site design, source control, and treatment control measures to treat and control runoff before it enters the storm drain system. The WQMP includes an assessment of the feasibility of utilizing infiltration BMPs and BMPs that are solely reliant on retention practices. To avoid the negative effects that result from excessive ponding when an infiltration BMP is utilized, the 2014 Water Quality Management Plan for the Santa Margarita Region of Riverside County requires that the tested pre-development infiltration rates must be greater than 1.6 inches per hour. Per the Infiltration Report prepared for the project by Inland Foundation Engineering, Inc., the required minimum infiltration rate is not met. Infiltration BMPs are not proposed for this project. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

27. Floodplains

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would result in an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces as compared to existing conditions, which could result in a higher volume of stormwater exiting the site. However, TVCS would install treatment control BMPs, per the requirements of the MS4 Permit and Santa Margarita Region WQMP, which would reduce peak flows and infiltrate some of the stormwater into the ground. Volumetric treatment control BMPs would mitigate (infiltrate and/or treat) a specific volume of runoff from the site, based on the 85th percentile, 24-hour runoff event. Flow-based treatment control BMPs would mitigate a specific flow rate of runoff based on the 0.2 inch/hour rainfall intensity. The treatment BMPs would be designed in accordance with the detailed design procedures and spreadsheets provided in Riverside County's *Design Handbook for Low Impact Development Best Management Practices* (2011). Proposed hydromodification impacts would also be analyzed in the WQMP, using the Santa Margarita Region Hydromodification Plan.

Prior to the start of grading and construction activities, a project-specific WQMP would be prepared that describes in detail the existing hydrology and drainage conditions, projected peak flows, characteristics of stormwater runoff water quality, and proposed BMPs. The report would document the proper size and location of all BMPs in accordance with MS4 and county stormwater requirements. In addition, the Riverside

County Flood Control and Water Conservation District design standards require that the rate of stormwater runoff discharged from a project site not be increased as a result of development.

With proper design, the BMPs would reduce any potential for flooding and stormwater runoff hydrographs would mimic pre-development conditions. Thus, the potential for significant increases in stormwater runoff would be minimized and potential flooding impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is needed.

b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?

Less than Significant Impact. The overall area of the parcels where the project will be constructed is approximately 14.6 acres. The project will be constructed over approximately 8.6 acres. The remaining 6 acres will not be impacted by the proposed development. The project would result in an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces as compared to existing conditions, which could result in increased stormwater volume exiting the site. The project incorporates site design, source control, and treatment control BMPs to address stormwater runoff. The existing drainage patterns for the site will not be modified as a result of the project. A majority of the runoff from the site will occur over impervious surfaces that will discharge into the existing off-site storm drain system. Other flows will drain into proposed playfield areas that will mimic the existing condition and allow for onsite retention.

c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

No Impact. The project site is not in a dam inundation area or in an area protected from 100-year floods by levees. No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?

No Impact. Project development would not change the amount of surface water in any water body. No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

28. Land Use

a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

Less than Significant Impact. Project development would substantially change the land use onsite, from vacant and residential to a charter school for 600 students. The existing zoning and General Plan designations for the project site are both Rural Residential (R-R); the R-R General Plan designation permits development of single-family residences with minimum density of one dwelling unit per five acres. Schools are permitted by Riverside County in any zone with a Public Use Permit. Schools are expected and necessary community facilities within residential land use designations. Thus, the development of schools in the affected part of

French Valley was foreseen when the area was designated R-R. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is in the Sphere of Influence (SOI) of the City of Murrieta (Murrieta 2014). The City of Murrieta's General Plan Land Use Map (2011) uses Riverside County land use designations for land in the City's SOI (Murrieta 2011). The site is zoned Rural Residential (RR) by the City of Murrieta, permitting single-family residences on lot sizes of at least 2.5 acres per residence. Schools are permitted in the RR zoning district with a Conditional Use Permit. As with the proposed land use relative to the Riverside County zoning, schools are expected and necessary community facilities within residential zones; and the development of schools in the affected part of French Valley was foreseen when the area was zoned RR. Development of the proposed school would not have a substantial adverse effect on land use regulation in the City of Murrieta's SOI, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is needed.

29. Planning

a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?

No Impact. The existing zoning and General Plan designations for the project site are both Rural Residential (R-R); the R-R Zone permits development of single-family residences with a maximum density of two units per acre. Schools are permitted by Riverside County in any zone with a Public Use Permit. Project development would not conflict with zoning or General Plan designations for the site, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?

No Impact. Surrounding parcels are zoned: RR to the northeast, north, and west; C-1/C-P (General Commercial) to the south; and, southeast opposite SR-79, SP (Winchester 1800 Specific Plan; the part of the Specific Plan area opposite SR-79 is designated for Medium-High Density Residential Use in the Specific Plan).¹⁴ Development of the proposed school would be compatible with surrounding zoning, and no adverse impact would occur. No mitigation is needed.

c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?

No Impact. Existing surrounding land uses are rural residential uses to the west and north; a single-family home abuts the northern site boundary on west. The project site is surrounded by vacant land to the south and by vacant land and agricultural uses to the east across SR-79. Planned land uses as reflected in Riverside County zoning designations are described above in Section 29.b. The proposed school would be compatible with both existing and planned land use designations, and no adverse impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

¹⁴ RBF. 2007. Winchester 1800 Specific Plan Land Use Plan. http://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/splans/sp_document/sp286/sp286_lum.pdf.

d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?

No Impact. The project site is not in a Specific Plan area. The proposed school would be consistent with the Riverside County General Plan land use designation for the site, as described above in Section 29.a.

Riverside County sets forth policies pertaining to development of transportation infrastructure and to trip generation compared to roadway capacity in the Highway 79 Policy Area, an unincorporated area in southwestern Riverside County within the Southwest Area Plan of the County's General Plan.

Policy 1 states

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

Project consistency: Project development would include the following roadway improvements:

- Construct Flossie Way at its ultimate width as a local road per County of Riverside design standards with a right-of-way of 60 feet, including a sidewalk on the eastern side of the road along the school property, between the project's western boundary and the project's access driveway.
- The intersection of Flossie Way/Koon Street/Pourroy Road shall form a 4-leg intersection with Flossie Way.

Policy 2 states

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

Project consistency: the proposed project is not a residential project and therefore Policy 2 is inapplicable.

The proposed project would be consistent with applicable Highway 79 Policy Area policies. No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a lowincome or minority community)?

No Impact. The project site is surrounded by rural residential uses, vacant land, and agricultural uses. There is no residential community next to the site that would be divided by the proposed school; in addition, the site is private property and no access way linking residential areas passes through the site. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

3.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

30. Mineral Resources

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?

Less Than Significant Impact. No Mineral Land Classification mapping on the northern part of the project site has been conducted by the California Geological Survey (CGS). The southern part of the site is mapped Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3) by the CGS, indicating that the area contains mineral resources of undetermined significance (CGS 2014b, 2014c). The nearest mine to the project site mapped on the Mines Online database by the Office of Mine Reclamation is the East Benton Pit, an active sand and gravel mine about 6.5 miles to the southeast (OMR 2016). Project development would not cause a loss of availability of known mineral resources valuable to the region and the state, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. The project site is not designated as a mining site in the Riverside County General Plan. Project development would not cause a loss of availability of a mining site designated in the Riverside County General Plan, and no impact would occur.

c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?

No Impact. The project site is not adjacent to a Mineral Resource Sector – that is, is an area currently permitted for mining and where land uses are compatible with mining – designated by the California Geological Survey (CGS 2014d). The nearest mine is 6.5 miles from the site. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?

No Impact. No existing or former mines on or next to the site were identified in the Phase I ESA for the project.

3.12 NOISE

Noise is defined as unwanted sound and is known to have several adverse effects on people, including hearing loss, speech and sleep interference, physiological responses, and annoyance. Based on these known adverse effects of noise, the federal, state, and city governments have established criteria to protect public health and safety and to prevent the disruption of certain human activities, such as classroom instruction, communication, or sleep. Additional information on noise and vibration fundamentals, existing regulations, and pertinent technical standards, project-specific background information, construction effects calculation worksheets, and project-generated traffic operations noise modeling results are contained in the Appendix G of this Initial Study.

Existing Conditions

The proposed buildout of the Temecula Valley Charter School is to be located in the census-designated-place of French Valley in unincorporated Riverside County. The proposed project site is on the west side of SR-79 between Keller Road and Pourroy Road. The site encompasses approximately 15 acres and is mostly undeveloped except for residential uses in the western part of the project site. This residential area consists of two single-family residences, one garage, and two above-ground water tanks. The garage in the south-central part of the site, and the mobile home are to be demolished at commencement of the project, and the vacant single-family residence in the northwestern part of the site would be left as is.

The major existing noise source on the proposed project site is traffic along SR-79. Other noise sources include nearby airports/heliports and residences in the vicinity of the project (e.g., people talking and general property maintenance).

Sensitive Receptors

The proposed project site is on a busy thoroughfare. It is surrounded by rural residences to the west and north, vacant land to the south, and a mix of vacant and agricultural land to the east (beyond SR-79). The nearest offsite residence is a single-family home just north of the western part of the site. There are also multiple single-family residences between 200 and 500 feet north of the proposed project site and approximately 350 feet west of the proposed project site. This residential land surrounding the project site is considered rural residential—i.e., fewer than 20 residences within a 1,000-foot radius around the project site.

Would the project result in:

31. Airport Noise

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

No Impact. There are no public-use airports within two miles of the project site. The closest facility, French Valley Airport, is 4 miles southwest of proposed project site (AirNav 2016). Project development would not

expose people onsite to excessive airport-related noise levels. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. Pines Airpark Airport is a private airport that is approximately 2 miles to the northwest of the proposed project site (AirNav 2016). Operations at this private aircraft facility may at times be audible at the site, but the relatively limited and sporadic use of this airport for corporate travel or other limited uses, coupled with the distance between it and the project site, would result in negligible amounts of community noise at the campus. Therefore, development of the project would not expose people onsite to excessive noise levels from aircraft approaching or departing this airport, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

32. Railroad Noise

a) For a project within 0.25 mile of a railroad track, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The nearest railroad track to the project site is a BNSF Railway track in the City of Perris about 12 miles to the northwest (FRA 2017). Project development would not generate railroad noise, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is needed.

33. Highway Noise

a) Would project-generated traffic cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No Impact.

Applicable Standards

County of Riverside Noise Standards

The proposed project site is in the unincorporated, census-designated-place of French Valley. Since this project site is outside of the jurisdiction of any city's municipal code, this project will use the Riverside County Noise Element and County Code.

The County of Riverside noise regulations are implemented and enforced through the County Code and are intended to establish county-wide standards to regulate noise. Section 9.52.101 of the Riverside County Noise Regulation states, "These regulations are not intended to establish thresholds of significance for the purpose of any analysis required by the CEQA and no such thresholds are hereby established." Due to this clause, the applicable noise regulations used for this study will be taken from the County of Riverside Noise Element.

Beyond the basic noise level regulations, County Code section 15.04.020 contains standards and limits that deal with construction noise. Details of these criteria and related impacts are discussed under 3.12(d), below.

County of Riverside Noise Element

The noise element is in Chapter 7 of the Riverside County General Plan. The noise element provides a systematic approach to identifying and appraising noise problems in the community, quantifying existing and projected noise levels, addressing excessive noise exposure, and planning for the regulation of noise. It established quantified land use compatibility guidelines that coincide with the State of California Community Noise and Land Use Compatibility Guidelines and lists a number of policies related to noise compatibility. Policy N 1.3 discourages schools or residential land uses in areas in excess of 65 CNEL. Any land use that is exposed to noise levels higher than 65 CNEL will require noise attenuation measures. Policy N 2.2 requires a qualified acoustical specialist to prepare acoustical studies for proposed noise-sensitive projects in noise-impacted areas in order to mitigate existing noise.

However, it is important to note that with the recent California Supreme Court decision regarding the assessment of the environment's impacts on proposed projects (*CBLA v BAAQMD*, issued December 17, 2015),¹⁵ it is generally no longer the purview of the CEQA process to evaluate the impact of existing environmental conditions onto any given project. For noise, the application of this ruling means that the analysis of traffic, rail, and aircraft noise effects at the project site—in terms of land use compatibility—is no longer part of CEQA. Therefore, exterior noise effects from nearby roadways relative to land use compatibility of the project is no longer a topic for impact evaluation under CEQA, and no statement of impact significance is germane.

Stationary Noise Sources

Policy N 2.3 includes standards that present maximum allowable noise levels for stationary sources. Exterior and interior noise must be mitigated to the levels listed in Table 10 to the extent feasible.

Land Use (Residential)	Interior Standards (dB)	Exterior Standards (dB)	
10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.	40 Leq (10 minute)	45 L _{eq} (10 minute)	
7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.	55 L _{eq} (10 minute)	65 L _{max} (10 minute)	
Source: County of Riverside General Plan, Chapter 7, Noise Element.			

Table 10 Stationary Source Land Use Noise Standards

Note: These are only preferred standards; final decision will be made by the Riverside County Planning Department and Office of Public Health

Mobile Noise Sources

The Riverside County Noise Element contains qualitative policies and mitigation measures for vehicular noise sources. Relevant policies are:

- **N 9.3.** Require development that generates increased traffic and subsequent increases in the ambient noise level adjacent to noise-sensitive land uses to provide for appropriate mitigation measures.
- **N 9.6.** Require that all future exterior noise forecasts use Level of Service C, and be based on designed road capacity or 20-year projection of development (whichever is less) for future noise forecasts.

¹⁵ California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2015, 62 Cal. 4th 369).

N 9.7. Require that field noise monitoring be performed prior to siting to any sensitive land uses along arterial roadways. Noise level measurements should be of at least 10 minutes in duration and should include simultaneous vehicle counts so that more accurate vehicle ratios may be used in modeling ambient noise levels.

In lieu of applicable quantitative standards for mobile noise sources, the following standards were used for the purpose of this analysis. With respect to projected increases, noise impacts can be broken down into three categories. The first is "audible" impacts, which refer to increases in noise level that are perceptible to humans. Audible increases in general community noise levels generally refer to a change of 3 dB or more since this level has been found to be the threshold of perceptibility in exterior environments. The second category, "potentially audible" impacts, refers to a change in noise level between 1 and 3 dB. This range of noise levels was found to be noticeable to sensitive people in laboratory environments. The last category includes changes in noise level of less than 1 dB that are typically "inaudible" to the human ear except under quiet conditions in controlled environments. Only "audible" changes in noise levels at sensitive receptor locations (i.e., 3 dB or more) are considered potentially significant. Note that to create a 3 dB increase in traffic-generated noise levels, a doubling of traffic flows (i.e., 10,000 vehicles per day to 20,000 per day) would be needed.

Project-Related Roadway Noise

A - Generally Acceptable (project noise impacts)

The proposed project is expected to add a maximum of approximately 600 students and 40 staff to the project site at ultimate buildout. The expected increase in traffic due to new enrollment was used in the traffic study that analyzed potential impacts due to traffic increases. These expected traffic conditions were used in the traffic noise calculations shown in Table 10.

Traffic noise analysis was conducted by PlaceWorks on the major roadways in the vicinity of the project area. Based on the FHWA-RD77-108 roadway noise calculation method (FHWA 1978), noise levels at segments of SR-79, Pourroy Road, and other nearby roadways were analyzed with respect to existing traffic conditions and to traffic conditions estimated at full buildout of the project in 2018. These values were compared, and a noise level increase of 3 dB or more would signify a potential impact.

In order to assess the potential for mobile-source noise impacts, it is necessary to determine the noise currently generated by vehicles traveling through the project area. Average daily traffic volumes were based on the daily traffic volumes provided by PlaceWorks. Modeling indicated that average noise levels along arterial segments currently range from approximately 40 dBA to 73 dBA CNEL at a distance of 50 feet from the centerline of the road. Noise levels for existing conditions along analyzed roadways are presented in Table 11.
			CNEL at 50 feet	(dBA)	Project	
	• · ·		2018 With	Overall Increase	Contribution	Potential
Roadway	Segment	Existing	Project	(dB)	(dB)	Impact?
Winchester Rd (SR-79)	N of Keller Rd	/3.4	/4.5	1.1	0.0	No
Winchester Rd (SR-79)	S of Keller Rd	/3.4	/6.5	3.1	0.0	No
Keller Road	E of Winchester Rd	40.5	53.0	12.5	0.2	No
Keller Road	W of Winchester Rd	40.0	62.4	22.4	0.0	No
Winchester Rd (SR-79)	N of Pourroy Rd	73.4	76.5	3.0	0.0	No
Winchester Rd (SR-79)	S of Pourroy Rd	73.8	77.4	3.6	0.1	No
Pourroy Road	E of Winchester Rd	61.5	66.1	4.6	0.1	No
Abelia Street	W of Winchester Rd	56.8	70.3	13.5	0.2	No
Winchester Rd (SR-79)	N of Pourroy Rd	74.0	77.5	3.5	0.1	No
Winchester Rd (SR-79)	S of Pourroy Rd	74.3	76.9	2.6	0.0	No
Whisper Heights	E of Winchester Rd	58.8	63.6	4.8	0.1	No
Pourroy Road	W of Winchester Rd	58.3	59.0	0.7	0.0	No
Winchester Rd (SR-79)	N of Skyview Rd	74.1	76.9	2.8	0.0	No
Winchester Rd (SR-79)	S of Skyview Rd	74.2	76.6	2.4	0.0	No
Jean Nicholas Road	E of Winchester Rd	49.5	50.0	0.5	0.0	No
Skyview Road	W of Winchester Rd	61.1	64.4	3.3	0.0	No
Winchester Rd (SR-79)	N of Thompson Rd	74.2	76.5	2.3	0.0	No
Winchester Rd (SR-79)	S of Thompson Rd	76.0	77.2	1.3	0.0	No
Max Gillis Blvd	E of Winchester Rd	66.8	69.0	2.2	0.0	No
Thompson Road	W of Winchester Rd	69.6	71.4	1.9	0.0	No
Winchester Rd (SR-79)	N of Benton Rd	76.0	77.1	1.2	0.0	No
Winchester Rd (SR-79)	S of Benton Rd	75.9	76.7	0.8	0.0	No
Benton Road	E of Winchester Rd	69.9	71.2	1.3	0.0	No
Pat Road	S of Pourroy Rd	55.9	58.1	2.2	0.7	No
Pourroy Road	E of Pat Road Rd	54.5	67.0	12.5	0.2	No
Pourrov Road	W of Pat Road Rd	47.6	69.7	22.1	0.3	No
Elliot Road	N of Jean Nicholas Rd	57.5	59.1	1.7	0.2	No
Jean Nicholas Road	E of Elliot Rd	63.4	67.6	4.2	0.0	No
Jean Nicholas Road	W of Elliot Rd	64.6	68.4	3.8	0.0	No
Pourrov Road	N of Skyview Rd	65.2	71.1	5.9	0.1	No
Pourroy Road	S of Skyview Rd	64.7	70.3	5.6	0.1	No
Skyview Road	W of Pourroy Rd	60.5	64.0	3.5	0.0	No
Pourroy Road	N of Thompson Rd	65.6	69.1	3.5	0.1	No
Pourroy Road	S of Thompson Rd	66.3	68.9	2.6	0.0	No
Thompson Road	F of Pourrov Rd	49.0	49.8	0.9	0.0	No
Thompson Road	W of Pourroy Rd	62.6	65.1	25	0.0	No
Source: Noise and Vibration Analy	rsis, Appendix G to this Initial Study.	02.0	00.1	2.0	0.0	

Existing and Future Noise Level Estimates Table 11

Levels calculated by FHWA-RD77-108 calculation method.

Segments would experience negligible long-term traffic noise increases due to project implementation. There are major overall increases between existing conditions and future conditions, but these are due to ambient growth and the cumulative contributions of other projects in the area. Based on this traffic noise analysis, the worst-case roadway noise increase due to project implementation would result from traffic increases on Pat Road, south of Pourroy Road. Even so, this traffic increase is expected to result in a roadway noise increase of 0.7 dB. All increases in noise levels at road segments in the vicinity of the project site, including on Pat Road, would fall below the threshold of human perceptibility. Thus, it is not anticipated that implementation of the proposed project would result in audible increases in traffic-related noise along the surrounding roadways. Exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of established thresholds from project-related roadway noise would be less than significant.

Noise Compatibility

B – Conditionally Acceptable

It is also important to note that the facades of the project buildings that would face SR-79 are expected to experience traffic-generated noise levels of approximately 69 dBA CNEL.¹⁶ This predicted result is within the "conditionally acceptable" classification in the county noise element for school land uses.¹⁷ As mentioned above and per the *CBLA v BAAQMD* ruling, land use compatibility is no longer a CEQA issue. Nonetheless, this ostensible incompatibility would need to be addressed prior to the issuance of building permits for the project. No significant impact under CEQA would occur, and no mitigation is required.

34. Other Noise

a) Would the project include stationary sources of noise generating a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No Impact. The project does not propose a land use that would generate substantial noise that could affect people on and near the site, such as an industrial facility or outdoor music venue.

Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment on top of the proposed classroom buildings would be placed within appropriate sound enclosures or parapets so that their operations would not be notably different than existing conditions in and around the proposed area of improvements and would not exceed the county's exterior noise standards. Noise from such stationary sources would be regulated through the Riverside County Noise Element. No significant permanent noise increases due to project-related activities would occur, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

¹⁶ That is, the second line item in the table for Winchester Road, south of Keller Road, shows a predicted future level of 76.5 dBA CNEL. With line-source spreading loss attenuation from the 50-foot reference distance to the envisioned school buildings, this level would be reduced to approximately 69 dBA CNEL.

¹⁷ "Conditionally acceptable" means that a detailed acoustical study for sound insulation features is needed for county and state design approvals.

35. Noise Effects on or by the Project

a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant Impact. Project traffic noise impacts relative to existing ambient noise levels would be less than significant, as substantiated above in Section 33.a. Project development would not cause a considerable noise impact from stationary sources, as substantiated above in Section 34.a.

b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant Impact.

Pertinent Construction Noise Standards

To limit construction noise on sensitive receptors, the Riverside County Code includes permitted hours of construction in Section 15.04.020, General Regulations. Construction noise is exempt from county noise regulations when construction activities take place between the hours of 6 AM and 6 PM. Exceptions to these standards are allowed only with the written consent of the building official.

The Riverside County Noise Element contains qualitative policies and mitigation procedures for temporary construction. These policies are:

- N 13.1. Minimize the impacts of construction noise on adjacent uses within acceptable practices.
- N 13.2. Ensure that construction activities are regulated to establish hours of operation to prevent and/or mitigate the generation of excessive or adverse noise impacts on surrounding areas.
- N 13.3. Condition subdivision approval adjacent to developed/occupied noise-sensitive land uses by requiring the developer to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the County for review and approval prior to issuance of a grading permit. The plan must depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project, through the use of such methods as:
 - a. Temporary noise attenuation fences;
 - b. Preferential location of equipment; and
 - c. Use of current noise suppression technology and equipment.
- **N 13.4.** Require that all construction equipment utilizes noise reduction features (e.g. mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer.

Impact Analysis:

Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction: (1) mobile-source noise from transport of workers, material deliveries, and debris and soil haul and (2) stationary-source noise from use of construction equipment. Existing uses surrounding the project site would be exposed to construction noise. This school is a new development, so there would be no classes taking place at the proposed school site during the entire construction period. Therefore, there would be no onsite sensitive receptors during construction and no noise control measures are necessary.

Construction Vehicles

The transport of workers and equipment to the construction site would incrementally increase noise levels along site access roadways. Typically for this type of project, the mass grading soil haul phase would generate the highest traffic increases from construction vehicles (i.e., haul-in/haul-out truck trips, worker commuting, and other deliveries). Since the project site has been previously graded, the site is expected to be balanced, and no soil export or import is expected to be needed. Thus, any vehicle trips due to construction activities (e.g. for the aggregate of workers, vendors, deliveries, etc.) would be marginal compared to vehicle flows along SR-79 (which has average daily traffic of approximately 19,640).¹⁸ This would result in an inaudible noise increase at sensitive receptors,¹⁹ and would, therefore, have a less than significant impact on noise receptors along the truck routes.

While individual construction vehicle pass-bys may create momentary noise levels of up to approximately 85 dBA (L_{max}) at 50 feet from the vehicle, these occurrences—although potentially audible for a few seconds—would generally be infrequent. Due to the infrequency of events, their relatively short-lived durations, and their commonality with existing truck pass-bys, construction vehicle movement noise would be less than significant.

Construction Equipment

Noise generated during construction is also based on the type of equipment used, the location of the equipment relative to sensitive receptors, and the timing and duration of the noise-generating activities. Each stage of construction involves the use of different kinds of construction equipment and, therefore, has its own distinct noise characteristics. Noise levels from construction activities are dominated by the loudest piece of construction equipment. The dominant noise source is typically the engine, although work-piece noise (such as dropping of materials) can also be noticeable. Noise levels from project-related construction activities were calculated from the simultaneous use of all applicable construction equipment at spatially averaged distances (i.e., from the center of the general construction area) to the property line of the closest residences. At the time of this analysis, the specific equipment list for each construction phase was unavailable. In lieu of such details, construction equipment lists and phasing for a typical project of this size were used in the analyses.

¹⁸ Per information in the Traffic Impact Analysis for Temecula Valley Charter School prepared by PlaceWorks, 2016, in Appendix H.

¹⁹ Audible increases in general community noise levels usually refer to a change of 3 dB or more since this level has been found to be the threshold of perceptibility in exterior environments.

Construction activities would increase noise levels on and near the project site above existing levels. Noise produced from construction equipment items is commonly held to decrease at a rate of at least 6 dB per doubling of distance—conservatively ignoring other attenuation effects from air absorption, ground effects, and/or shielding/scattering effects.²⁰ For example, a dozer that generates 85 dBA at 50 feet would measure 79 dBA at 100 feet, 73 dBA at 200 feet, 67 dBA at 400 feet, and 61 dBA at 800 feet.

The area in the vicinity of the project site consists of rural-residential uses. The closest sensitive residential uses to the project site are the single-family residence approximately 380 feet to the north of the proposed project site, another single-family residence approximately 480 feet to the north, and a single-family residence approximately 900 feet to the west of the proposed project. The center of the project site was used as the best representation of spatially averaged activities throughout the construction zones. Although construction may occur across the entire site, the center of the project best represents the potential average construction-related noise levels to the various sensitive receptors during the overall construction portion of the project. Moreover, the existing building demolition and the erection of the proposed project are primarily located toward the center of the 14.6-acre site, thus providing some setback from the surrounding land uses.

Total project construction is projected to last approximately 12 months, with site preparation and grading lasting approximately 2 months. The associated, aggregate sound levels—grouped by construction activity—are summarized in Table 12.

	Sound Level at Various Distances from Construction Activities, dBA Leq				
Construction Activity Phase	Residence North of Project Site (380 ft.)	Residence North of Project Site (480 ft.)	Residence West of Project Site (800 ft.)		
Site Preparation	67	65	60		
Grading	70	68	63		
Utility Trenching	58	56	51		
Construction	65	63	59		
Paving	63	61	57		
Architectural Coating	56	54	50		

Table 12 Project-Related Construction Noise Levels

As shown in this table, the nearest off-campus receptors would be the residential uses that are approximately 380 feet to the north of the proposed project area. At this distance, composite construction noise would be reduced to a conservatively estimated level of approximately 70 dBA L_{eq} (due to distance attenuation alone). Since construction activities would be limited to relatively small equipment (i.e., bulldozers, grading tractors, dump trucks, loaders, back hoes, pavers, and a crane) and would take place during the county's allowable hours of construction, construction noise impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

²⁰ As sound energy travels outward from the source, spreading loss accounts for a 6 dB decrease in noise level. Soft ground and atmospheric absorption effects can decrease this by an additional 1.5 dB.

c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant Impact. Applicable noise standards, project roadway noise impacts, and project highway noise compatibility are all addressed above in Section 33, Highway Noise. Project stationary noise impacts are addressed above in Section 34, Other Noise. Project roadway noise and stationary noise impacts would both be less than significant with no mitigation required; noise compatibility is no longer a CEQA issue and therefore no impact determination is made.

d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact.

Applicable Standards

Pertinent Vibration Standards

The Riverside County Noise Element includes policies that restrict vibration. Policy N 16.1 restricts the placement of sensitive land uses in proximity to vibration-producing land uses. As stated in policy N 16.2, residential areas and schools are considered land uses sensitive to vibration. The project site is not exposed to perceptible groundborne vibrations because there are no notable sources of vibrational energy in the vicinity of the project site (such as industrial uses or heavy-freight railways). Note that according to Caltrans's general experience, traffic-generated vibrations are almost never associated with damage to structures near the highway (Caltrans 2002). Proposed buildings would be approximately 150 feet from the roadway and beyond the range of potential roadway vibration impacts. Construction-generated vibrations, however, can exceed the point of architectural damage.

In lieu of applicable quantitative vibration standards, the standards adopted by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to evaluate vibration from construction equipment are used. According to the FTA's Noise and Vibration Impact Guidelines (2006), vibrations generated by project-related construction activities exceeding 0.2 peak particle velocity (PPV) in inches per second (in/sec) would be strong enough to cause vibration-induced architectural damage to typical wood-framed buildings. Residents in nearby structures may experience vibration-induced annoyance when project-related construction activities exceed the FTA's daytime vibration criteria of 78 VdB (vibration decibel).

Further, the County Code includes permitted hours of construction in Section 15.04.020, General Regulations. Construction noise is exempt from county noise regulations according to the following portion of code: Whenever a construction site is within one-quarter of a mile of an occupied residence or residences, no construction activities shall be undertaken between the hours of 6 p.m. and 6 a.m. Exceptions to these standards shall be allowed only with the written consent of the building official. The generation of construction noise other than as permitted in this section, shall be a violation of this title, and the building official or his or her designee shall have the authority to undertake enforcement actions in accordance with the procedures, remedies and penalties for violations as provided for in Riverside County Ordinance No. 725 (Chapter 1.16 of this code), which is incorporated into this chapter by reference.

Impact Analysis

Operations Vibration Impacts

The operation of the proposed project would not include any long-term vibration sources. Thus, no significant vibration effects from operations sources would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

Construction Vibration Impacts

Construction operations can generate varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the construction procedures and equipment. Operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish with distance from the source. The effect on buildings in the vicinity of the construction site varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and receptor-building construction. The results from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight structural damage at the highest levels. Vibration from construction activities rarely reaches the levels that can damage structures, but can achieve the audible and perceptible ranges in buildings close to the construction site. Table 12 lists vibration levels for typical construction equipment (not all of which is expected to be used at the proposed project site).

As shown in Table 13, vibration generated by certain, vibration-intensive construction equipment has the potential to be substantial (i.e., exceeding the FTA criteria for structural damage) if those particular items are employed at any given construction site and in proximity to sensitive receptors. However, groundborne vibration is almost never annoying to people who are outdoors, so it is usually evaluated in terms of indoor receivers, along with the associated distances to receptor structures (FTA 2006).

	Equipment	Approximate Velocity Level at 25 Feet (VdB)	Approximate RMS ¹ Velocity at 25 Feet (in/sec)
Pile Driver (im	npact) Upper Range	112	1.518
Pile Driver (im	npact) Lower Range	104	0.644
Pile Driver (so	onic) Upper Range	105	0.734
Pile Driver (so	onic) Lower Range	93	0.170
Large Bulldoz	er	87	0.089
Caisson Drillir	ng	87	0.089
Jackhammer		79	0.035
Small Bulldoz	er	58	0.003
Loaded Truck	S	86	0.076
	FTA – Human Annoyance (Residential Daytime)	78	
	FTA – Human Annoyance (Residential Nighttime)	72	—
Criteria	FTA – Human Annoyance (Office)	84	
	FTA – Structural Damage (Residential)		0.20
	FTA – Structural Damage (Office)	—	0.30
Source: FTA 200	06.		

Table 13	Vibration Levels for	Typical Construction	Equipment

For the specifics of the proposed project, the construction would entail grading the existing undeveloped land and constructing new campus buildings, play fields, and parking lots. The use of high-vibration equipment, such as pile drivers or vibratory rollers, is not anticipated. The campus site has been previously graded and a balanced soil volume is expected. Thus, relatively little heavy earthwork would be required during the excavation sub-phase to create the desired pads for the new buildings. This would mean that relatively little use of vibration-inducing construction equipment such as excavators, bulldozers, graders, jackhammers, and loaders/backhoes would be needed. Following the mass excavation phase, construction equipment for the building erection phase would primarily employ items that would not generate substantial levels of vibration, such as forklifts, cranes, and haul trucks. Construction activities are proposed to commence in late summer of 2017 and would be completed in one general phase lasting 12 months. The site preparation and grading portions of the construction (most vibration intensive activities) are anticipated to take place over approximately the first 2 months of construction. This school is a new development, so no classes would be taking place at the proposed school site during the entire construction period. There would be no on-campus sensitive receptors to be affected during construction, and no vibration control measures would be necessary.

Vibration-Induced Architectural Damage

The threshold at which there is a risk of architectural damage to typical wood-framed buildings is 0.20 in/sec or 0.30 in/sec for engineered concrete and masonry buildings (FTA 2006). Building damage is not normally a factor unless the project requires blasting and/or pile driving. No blasting, pile driving, or hard rock ripping/crushing activities are anticipated for the proposed project. Small construction equipment generates vibration levels less than 0.1 PPV in/sec at 25 feet away (FTA 2006).

Table 14 shows the peak particle velocities of some common construction equipment and (loaded) haul trucks. Such items would be expected to be employed at the proposed project site. Since architectural damage from construction vibration sources can be a one-time event and since such damage is dependent on the soil type, ground strata, and receptor building construction, vibration damage distances are measured from the nearest likely location at the construction site to the façade of the nearest receptor building.

	Peak Particle Velocity in inches per second				
Equipment	Residence to north of project site (150 ft.) with limit of 0.20	Residence to north of project site (250 ft.) with limit of 0.20	Residence to west of project site (500 ft.) with limit of 0.20		
Vibratory Roller	0.014	0.007	0.002		
Large Bulldozer	0.006	0.003	0.001		
Excavator, Backhoe1	0.006	0.003	0.001		
Loaded Trucks	0.005	0.002	0.001		
Jackhammer	0.002	0.001	<0.001		
Small Bulldozer	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001		

Table 14	Architectural Damage Vibration Levels from Construction Equipment
----------	---

Source: FTA 2006.

Bold numbers indicate values that exceed FTA architectural damage criteria.

¹ These items are not on the original FTA list, but are conservatively taken to be comparable to a Large Bulldozer for vibration emissions.

As shown in Table 12, project-related construction activities would not result in vibration levels at nearby structures that exceed the FTA's pertinent criteria for vibration-induced architectural damage (i.e., 0.20 PPV in/sec for residential land uses or 0.30 for commercial/office land uses). Therefore, construction activities are not expected to result in vibration-induced damage and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are needed.

Vibration Annoyance

Some construction activities may be perceptible at the nearest off-site receptors due to their proximity. However, vibration-related construction activities would occur in the daytime when residential land uses are least susceptible to vibration (as many people would be away from their residences during the day).

According to the FTA, the level where vibration becomes annoying is 78 VdB for residential uses and 84 VdB for commercial/office uses (FTA 2006). Human annoyance occurs when construction vibration rises significantly above the threshold of human perception for extended periods of time. Construction activities are typically distributed throughout the project site, and the highest vibration levels would only occur for a very limited duration when equipment is working in close proximity. Therefore, distances to the nearest receptors are measured from the center of the construction site to represent the average vibration level.

The nearest sensitive receptors are the single-family residences to the north (approximately 380 feet and 480 feet from the center of construction) and the single-family residence to the west (approximately 900 feet from the center of construction). Table 15 shows the vibration levels from typical earthmoving construction equipment at the nearest receptors.

Equipment	Residence to north of project site (380 ft.) with limit of 78 VdB	Residence to north of project site (480 ft.) with limit of 78 VdB	Residence to west of project site (900 ft.) with limit of 78 VdB
Vibratory Roller	59	56	49
Large Bulldozer	52	49	42
Caisson Drilling	52	49	42
Excavator, Backhoe ¹	52	49	42
Loaded Trucks	51	48	41
Jackhammer	44	41	34
Small Bulldozer	23	20	13

Table 15	Average Annoyance Vibration Levels from Construction Equipment
----------	--

Source: FTA 2006.

Bold numbers indicate values that exceed Newport Beach annoyance criteria (per the 2006 General Plan EIR methodology).

1 These items are not on the original FTA list, but are conservatively taken to be comparable to a Large Bulldozer regarding vibration emissions

Construction-generated vibration levels would not exceed 78 VdB at any nearby sensitive residential receptors, and therefore would not exceed the threshold for human annoyance. Construction-generated vibration levels would not exceed the 84 VdB threshold for annoyance at any nearby commercial/office receptors. Generally, heavy equipment would only operate at the project boundary for brief periods.²¹ As

²¹ Estimated to be approximately 10 to 20 percent of the overall construction duration.

heavy construction equipment moves around the project site, average vibration levels at the nearest structures would diminish with increasing distance between structures. Impacts related to construction vibration annoyance would not be significant and mitigation is not necessary.

3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

36. Housing

a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Less Than Significant Impact. A mobile home in the western half of the site would be removed by project development. A vacant single-family house is atop the small hill in the northwest part of the site; the small hill is not part of the school site, and project development would not displace the house. There were an estimated 7,514 housing units, consisting of 7,115 occupied units and 399 vacant units (the vacancy rate was 5.3 percent), in 2014 in the community of French Valley based on US Census Bureau American Community Survey 5-year estimates (USCB 2016). The average household size in French Valley in the aforesaid estimate was 3.9 persons. Thus, project development is estimated to displace four persons. There is sufficient housing in the region to absorb one household that would be displaced by project development, and development would not require construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is needed.

b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?

Less than Significant Impact. Project development would displace one household from the mobile home onsite. There is sufficient housing in the region to absorb one household, and project development would not require construction of replacement housing.

The project would not develop housing and thus would not directly add residents to the community of French Valley. Project operation would generate about 40 jobs. The unemployment rate in Riverside County in June 2016 was estimated at 6.7 percent (EDD 2016). Thus, project-generated employment is expected to be absorbed from the regional labor force and is not anticipated to attract substantial numbers of workers from out of the region. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is needed.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Less than Significant Impact. One mobile home in the western half of the site would be displaced by project development. (USCB 2016). The average household size in French Valley in the aforesaid American Community Survey estimate was 3.9 persons (USCB 2016). Thus, project development is estimated to displace four persons. There is sufficient housing in the region to absorb one household that would be

displaced by project development, and development would not require construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is needed.

d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?

No Impact. The project site is not in or next to a County Redevelopment Area. The Riverside County Redevelopment Agency was dissolved by the County Board of Supervisors in 2012, pursuant to State law; and designated the Riverside County Economic Development Agency as successor agency. the Riverside County (Riverside County 2017). No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

Less than Significant Impact. The 2018 Cumulative Plus Project conditions analyzed in the Traffic Impact Analysis for the proposed project considered four cumulative projects consisting of two commercial projects, one mixed use, and one residential project. No future-year population estimate for the Community of French Valley is available. The Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) forecasts that the population of western Riverside County – that is, from the San Jacinto and Santa Rosa mountains west to the County boundary – will increase by about 608,000, or 28 percent – from approximately 2,140,500 in 2020 to 2,749,200 in 2035 (WRCOG 2013). Population growth by the four cumulative projects would be a very small fraction of all forecast population growth in western Riverside County. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would not develop housing and thus would not directly add residents to the community of French Valley. Project operation would generate about 40 jobs. The unemployment rate in Riverside County in June 2016 was estimated at 6.7 percent (EDD 2016). Thus, project-generated employment is expected to be absorbed from the regional labor force and is not anticipated to attract substantial numbers of workers from out of the region. Impacts would be less than significant.

3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

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

37. Fire Services

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Riverside County Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency medical service to the community of French Valley, including the project site. The two nearest fire

stations to the project site are Station 83 at French Valley Airport, about 3.3 miles to the southwest, and Station 34 in the community of Winchester, about 5.3 miles to the north (RCFD 2016). RCFD has automatic aid agreements with the cities of Hemet and Murrieta and the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, and a mutual aid agreement with March Air Force Base (Management Partners 2009).²²

Project construction and operation would generate a very slight increase in demands for fire protection and emergency medical services. Such a slight increase would not require RCFD to build new or expanded fire stations. Projects developed in unincorporated Riverside County pay development impact fees, including fees for development of fire stations, to Riverside County; such fees would help offset impacts of the proposed project.

It is expected that RCFD will add future fire stations in southwest Riverside County as required to serve planned growth. The RCFD Strategic Planning Division plans future fire stations. RCFD is funded mostly through the county general fund and development impact fees. The population of all unincorporated areas of Riverside County is forecast to increase from about 359,000 to 499,200, or about 39 percent, between 2012 and 2040. The total population of the cities of Murrieta and Menifee, which are contiguous with the community of French Valley, and Temecula, about 1.2 miles south of French Valley, is forecast to increase from about 33 percent, over the same period (SCAG 2016). Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is needed.

38. Sheriff Services

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Riverside County Sheriff's Department (RCSD) provides police protection to the community of French Valley. The nearest RCSD station to the project site is the Southwest Station at 30755-A Auld Road in the City of Murrieta, about 3.3 miles to the south. Project development would cause a very slight increase in demands for police protection. RCSD is funded mostly through the county general fund and development impact fees. Projects developed in unincorporated Riverside County pay development impact fees to Riverside County, including fees for development of criminal justice public facilities; such fees would help offset impacts of the proposed project. Project development would not require construction of new or expanded police facilities, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is needed.

39. Schools

c) Schools?

No Impact. Project development would have a favorable impact on school facilities, and no adverse impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

²² Automatic aid is assistance dispatched automatically by contractual agreement between two communities or fire districts. Mutual aid, by contrast, is arranged case by case.

40. Libraries

No Impact. The two nearest libraries to the project site are the Murrieta Public Library in the City of Murrieta and the Paloma Valley Library in the City of Menifee; the latter facility is part of the Riverside County Library System (CPL 2017). The proposed school would include a library and thus would not require students use off-campus libraries. Demand for libraries is generated by the population within the libraries' service areas. Project development would not add residents to the community of French Valley and would not generate demand for libraries. No adverse impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

41. Health Services

No Impact. The nearest health facility to the project site mapped on the Healthcare Atlas maintained by the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) is the Loma Linda University Medical Center-Murrieta in the City of Murrieta (OSHPD 2017). Project development would not adversely affect health services in the project region, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is needed.

3.15 RECREATION

42. Parks and Recreation

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

No Impact. The project proposes development of on-site athletic facilities; impacts of development of such facilities would be part of impacts of the whole project analyzed throughout Chapter 3 of this Initial Study. No additional impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

No Impact. The proposed school would include athletic facilities—a multipurpose room with indoor basketball/volleyball court and a soccer field—for use of students. Project development would not require students to use off-campus recreational facilities, and no impact would occur.

c) Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?

No Impact. The project site is in the Valley-Wide Recreation and Parks District (VWRPD). The nearest VWRPD facility to the project site is Abelia Sports Park about 0.3 mile to the south. The VWRPD requires dedication of parkland by development projects. The school would be required to pay fees in lieu of parkland dedication to the VWRPD (Domenigoni 2017). Project development would not adversely affect VWRPD facilities or services, or conflict with requirements for parkland dedication and/or fees under the Quimby Act (California Government Code Section 66477). No mitigation is required.

43. Recreational Trails

a) Would the project adversely affect a recreational trail or bikeway included in the Riverside County Southwest Area Plan Trails and Bikeway System?

No Impact. The two nearest trails to the project site mapped in the Riverside County General Plan Southwest Area Plan are a Regional Trail [Urban/Suburban] on a segment of SR-79 including the site frontage; and a Community Trail on Pourroy Road (RCPD 2015). Project development would not interfere with either of those trails, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is needed.

3.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

The information in this section is based in part on the Transportation Impact Analysis for Temecula Valley Charter School completed by PlaceWorks in April 2017; a complete copy of this report is included as Appendix H to this Initial Study.

44. Circulation

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Existing Conditions

Roadways

The study area was determined based on the anticipated attendance area, a review of the circulation network, the number of trips generated by the project, and consultation with County transportation staff. All roadway classifications are from the County of Riverside General Plan Circulation Element.

Winchester Road (State Route 79): This north-south roadway currently is four lanes in the study area and is classified as an Expressway. The posted speed limit varies from 55 to 65 miles per hour in the study area.

Keller Road: This east-west roadway is currently unpaved in the study area and is classified as a Secondary Roadway.

Pourroy Road/Abelia Street: This roadway is Pourroy Road to the west of SR-79 and Abelia Street to the east of SR-79. This roadway is classified as a Secondary Roadway and is currently two lanes for Pourroy Road and four lanes for Abelia Street. The posted speed limit on Abelia Street is 45 mph.

Whisper Heights Parkway/Pourroy Road: This roadway is Whisper Heights Parkway to the west of SR-79 and Pourroy Road to the east of SR-79. Pourroy Road is classified as a Secondary Roadway. Whisper

Heights Parkway is currently two lanes and Pourroy Road is currently four lanes in the study area. The posted speed limit on Whisper Heights Parkway is 25 mph.

Jean Nicholas Road/Skyview Road: This roadway is Jean Nicholas Road to the west of SR-79 and Skyview Road to the east of SR-79. It is classified as a Secondary Roadway. Jean Nicholas Road currently has two eastbound lanes and one westbound lane while Skyview Road currently has four lanes.

Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road: This Roadway is Max Gillis Boulevard to the west of SR-79 and Thompson Road to the east of SR-79. Max Gillis Boulevard and Thompson Road currently have four lanes. Max Gillis Boulevard is classified as a Major Roadway and Thompson Road is classified as a Secondary Roadway. Max Gillis Boulevard and Thompson Road have a posted speed limit of 45 mph.

Benton Road: This east-west roadway currently is two lanes in the project area and is classified as an Urban Arterial Roadway.

Pat Road: This roadway is a two-lane local street.

Elliot Road: This north-south roadway is a two-lane local street.

Intersections

The intersections listed in Table 16 were analyzed based on Riverside County guidelines requiring intersections at streets with a minimum classification of collector or higher to be studied where the project adds 50 or more peak hour trips.

Intersection	Traffic Control	Jurisdiction	
SR-79 at Keller Road	Signalized	Caltrans	
SR-79 at Pourroy Road/Abelia Street	Signalized	Caltrans	
SR-79 at Whisper Heights Parkway/Pourroy Road	Signalized	Caltrans	
SR-79 at Jean Nicholas Road/Skyview Road	Signalized	Caltrans	
SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road	Signalized	Caltrans	
SR-79 at Benton Road	Signalized	Caltrans	
Pat Road at Pourroy Road	Side-street stop	Riverside County	
Jean Nicholas Road at Elliot Road	Side-street stop	Riverside County	
Pourroy Road at Skyview Road	All-way stop	Riverside County	
Pourroy Road at Thompson Road	All-way stop	Riverside County	
Source: PlaceWorks 2016.		-	

Table 16 Study Area Intersections

Pedestrian Facilities

There are currently no paved sidewalks on Keller Road or the section of SR-79 along the project site frontage.

Bicycle Facilities

There are no bicycle facilities on Keller Road or SR-79 near the project site.

Public Transit

Riverside Transit Agency Route 79 operates on SR-79, extending from Hemet in the northeast to Temecula in the southwest. Route 79 operates six days per week, Monday through Saturday, with a frequency of about one hour (RTA 2016). Project development would not interfere with operation of Route 79.

Methodology

Levels of Service

Roadway capacity is generally limited by the ability to move vehicles through intersections. A level of service (LOS) is a standard performance measurement to describe the operating characteristics of a street system in terms of the level of congestion or delay experienced by motorists. Service levels range from A through F, which relate to traffic conditions from best (uncongested, free-flowing conditions) to worst (total breakdown with stop-and-go operation).

The methodology used to assess the operation of a signalized intersection is based on the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). The intersection LOS analysis is based on the traffic volumes observed during the peak hour conditions. The peak hours selected for analysis are the highest volumes that occur in four consecutive 15-minute periods from 7 to 9 AM and from 4 to 6 PM on weekdays. The HCM 2010 signalized intersection methodology presents LOS in terms of control delay (in seconds per vehicle). Per the HCM methodology, overall average intersection delays at signalized intersections were calculated, and the worst-case approach delays were calculated at unsignalized intersections. The level of service corresponds to the delay calculated. Table 17 describes the level of service concept and the operating conditions expected under each level of service for signalized and unsignalized intersections. The software PTV Vistro 4 was used to determine the LOS at the study area intersections.

		Average Delay Per	· Vehicle (seconds)
LOS	Description	Signalized	Unsignalized
А	Level of Service A occurs when progression is extremely favorable and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay.	0 to 10.00	0 to 10.00
В	Level of Service B generally occurs with good progression and/or short cycle lengths. More vehicles stop than for Level of Service A, causing higher levels of average total delay.	10.01 to 20.00	10.01 to 15.00
С	Level of Service C generally results when there is fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear in this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, although many still pass through the intersection without stopping.	20.01 to 35.00	15.01 to 25.00

 Table 17
 Intersection Level of Service Descriptions

		Average Delay Per	Vehicle (seconds)
LOS	Description	Signalized	Unsignalized
D	Level of Service D generally results in noticeable congestion. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high volume to capacity ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable.	35.01 to 55.00	25.01 to 35.00
E	Level of Service E is considered to be the limit of acceptable delay. These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high volume to capacity ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.	55.01 to 80.00	35.01 to 50.00
F	Level of Service F is considered to be unacceptable to most drivers. This condition often occurs with oversaturation, i.e., when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. It may also occur at high volume to capacity ratios below 1.00 with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing causes to such delay levels.	80.01 and up	50.01 and up
Source: Highway C	apacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, 2000.		•

 Table 17
 Intersection Level of Service Descriptions

Acceptable LOS and Thresholds of Significance

The project site is in the Southwest Area Plan. Policy C 2.1 of the County of Riverside General Plan has established LOS "D" as the minimum level of service in community development areas for intersections of any combination of Secondary Highways, Major Highways, Arterials, Urban Arterials, Expressways, and conventional state highways. Based on the Route Concept Report Fact Sheet for State Route 79 (SR-79; Caltrans 1999), in accordance with Riverside County's Congestion Management Plan (CMP; RCTC 2011) and, LOS "E" is considered the limit of acceptable traffic operations along SR-79 through the year 2020.

Potential traffic impacts would occur if, during the weekday peak hours:

- At intersections currently operating at acceptable LOS, the addition of project trips would change the LOS to an unacceptable LOS.
- At intersections currently operating at unacceptable LOS, the project would increase the delay by more than 5 seconds.

Existing Intersections Operations

Existing Traffic Volumes

Weekday AM and PM peak hour turn movement volumes were collected at the study-area intersections. The counts were collected on Wednesday, September 14, 2016. The existing AM and PM peak hour count worksheets and figures showing turn-movement volumes are provided in the Traffic Impact Analysis (provided as Appendix H to this Initial Study).

Existing Conditions Intersection Operations Analysis

The intersection operations analysis results are summarized in Table 18. As shown in the table, all study area intersections currently operate at acceptable LOS during the peak hours for Existing traffic conditions, except for SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road in the AM and PM peak hour, and SR-79 at Benton Road in the PM peak hour.

			AM Peak H	lour	PM Peak Hour	
Intersection	Traffic Control	Jurisdiction	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS
1. SR-79 at Keller Road	Signalized	Caltrans	2.8	А	5.5	А
2. SR-79 at Pourroy Road/Abelia Street	Signalized	Caltrans	17.2	В	12.5	В
3. SR-79 at Whisper Heights Parkway/Pourroy Road	Signalized	Caltrans	15.2	В	15.6	В
4. SR-79 at Jean Nicholas Road/Skyview Road	Signalized	Caltrans	15.7	В	13.0	В
5. SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road	Signalized	Caltrans	180.4	F	144.6	F
6. SR-79 at Benton Road	Signalized	Caltrans	21.0	С	86.8	F
7. Pourroy Road at Pat Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	10.7	В	9.5	А
8. Elliot Road at Jean Nicholas Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	19.0	С	13.2	В
9. Pourroy Road at Skyview Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	11.2	В	10.0	А
10. Pourroy Road at Thompson Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	13.9	В	16.1	С

Table 18	Existing Peak F	-lour Intersection	Levels of Service
	LAIStilly I Can I		Levels of dervic

Intersections with unacceptable LOS are shown in **bold**

Project Traffic

The project would have a capacity of 600 students from grades K to 8. The trip generation was calculated based on rates in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) manual, *Trip Generation* (9th edition), for Land Use 534, Private School (K-8) and supplemented by rates from Land Use 536, Private School (K-12). Table 19 shows the trip generation rates and project trip generation for the daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour volumes. The project is expected to generate up to1,488 daily trips, 540 trips (297 inbound and 243 outbound) during the AM peak hour, and 102 trips (44 inbound and 58 outbound) during the PM peak hour.

Table 19 Project Trip Gener	ation
-----------------------------	-------

			Trip Generation							
			AM Peak Hour ¹				PM Peak Hour ²			
Land Use	Unit	Daily ²	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total		
Private School (K-8)	Students	2.48	0.50	0.41	0.90	0.07	0.10	0.17		
Project Trip Generation	600	1,488	297	243	540	44	58	102		
1 Used the trip deportation rates o	f ITE Codo 534 E	Privato School (K. 8) fr	om tha ITE Tr	in Concration M	Janual Oth Edition					

¹ Used the trip generation rates of ITE Code 534 Private School (K-8) from the ITE Trip Generation Manual 9th Edition.
 ² Used the trip generation rates of ITE Code 536 Private School (K-12) from the ITE Trip Generation Manual 9th Edition.

Temecula Valley Charter School exists 1.4 miles southeast of the project site at 35755 Abelia Street in the community of French Valley and had 516 students in the 2015-16 school year (CDE 2016). The charter school proposes to relocate to the proposed school site. Thus, trips generated by about 85 percent of the 600-student capacity of the proposed school would be already-existing trips on roadways in and near French Valley and would not be new trips added to area roadways. Therefore, this analysis overestimates project trip generation.

The general approach for conducting traffic impact analyses is to evaluate weekday peak hour traffic during the commute peak traffic conditions that generally occur from 7 to 9 AM and 4 to 6 PM. The performance of the project access during school drop-off and pick-up times is evaluated in detail under *Site Access and Internal Circulation* below.

Trip Distribution and Assignment

The traffic that would be generated by the school was geographically distributed onto the street network by evaluating the layout of the study area roadway network and reviewing land uses designated as residential in the area. Figure 11, *Project Trip Distribution*, presents the anticipated trip distribution for the school. The trip distribution percentages are applied to the project trip generation to determine the traffic volumes forecast to be added at each intersection (i.e., trip assignment).

Existing Plus Project Traffic Conditions

To assess Existing Plus Project traffic conditions, existing traffic is combined with project traffic. The intersection operations for the Existing Plus Project traffic conditions are shown in Table 20.

			AM Peak Hour		PM Pea	(Hour	
Intersection	Traffic Control	Jurisdiction	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	
1. SR-79 at Keller Road	Signalized	Caltrans	4.2	А	7.4	А	
2. SR-79 at Pourroy Road/Abelia Street	Signalized	Caltrans	33.3	С	14.7	В	
3. SR-79 at Whisper Heights Parkway/Pourroy Road	Signalized	Caltrans	18.0	В	16.9	В	
4. SR-79 at Jean Nicholas Road/Skyview Road	Signalized	Caltrans	16.1	В	14.4	В	
5. SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road	Signalized	Caltrans	180.4	F	165.2	F	
6. SR-79 at Benton Road	Signalized	Caltrans	24.6	С	87.0	F	
7. Pourroy Road at Pat Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	23.8	С	10.3	В	
8. Elliot Road at Jean Nicholas Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	22.4	С	14.5	В	
9. Pourroy Road at Skyview Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	12.7	В	11.2	В	
10. Pourroy Road at Thompson Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	15.5	С	17.3	С	
Notes: LOS calculation worksheets included in the Traffic Intersections with unacceptable LOS are shown in bold .	Impact Analysis ir	ncluded as Append	dix H of this Initial Stud	dy.			

Table 20 Intersection Delay and LOS, Existing Plus Project Condition	Table 20	Intersection Delay	y and LOS, Existing	a Plus Project Conditions
--	----------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------------



Figure 11 - Project Trip Distribution 3. Environmental Analysis

PlaceWorks

This page intentionally left blank.

Under Existing Plus Project conditions, the intersections of SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road would operate at LOS F in the AM and PM peak hour, and SR-79 at Benton Road would operate at LOS F in the PM peak hour. The remaining study intersections would operate at acceptable LOS.

Future Traffic Conditions

Ambient growth has been added to daily and peak hour traffic volumes on surrounding roadways as well as traffic generated by future cumulative projects that have been approved but not yet built and/or for which development applications have been filed and are under consideration by governing agencies. The ambient growth rate is added to existing traffic volumes to account for area-wide growth not reflected by cumulative development projects. Future year traffic forecasts for 2018 traffic conditions are based upon two years of ambient growth at 2 percent per year. The total ambient growth is the compounded growth of 2 percent per year over two years, which results in a total growth of 4 percent.

Cumulative projects are closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. A total of 18 projects in the County of Riverside and City of Murrieta have been screened. Based on a review of the circulation system, the trip generation, location, and land use type, the cumulative projects shown on Figure 12, *Cumulative Developments Location Map*, would have the potential for directly adding measurable traffic to the area street system. The cumulative development projects assumed in this traffic analysis are estimated to generate 40,633 trip-ends per day during a typical weekday, with approximately 1,488 vehicle trips during the AM peak hour and 3,357 vehicle trips during the PM peak hour. The trip generation calculations for the cumulative projects are in the Traffic Impact Analysis included as Appendix H to this Initial Study.

The following describes each future scenario evaluated and identifies the intersections that are forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS for each scenario.

Existing Plus Ambient Plus Project Traffic Conditions

A scenario for existing + ambient growth + project (EAP) was evaluated, corresponding to a scenario for project opening year 2018 with the project but without the development of cumulative projects. The intersection operations for the EAP traffic conditions have been calculated and are given in Table 21.

As shown in the table, under EAP conditions, the intersections of SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road would operate at unacceptable LOS F in the AM and PM peak hour, and SR-79 at Benton Road would operate at unacceptable LOS F in the PM peak hour. The remaining study intersections would operate at acceptable LOS.

			AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
Intersection	Traffic Control	Jurisdiction	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS
1. SR-79 at Keller Road	Signalized	Caltrans	4.3	Α	8.9	Α
2. SR-79 at Pourroy Road/Abelia Street	Signalized	Caltrans	38.0	D	15.2	В
3. SR-79 at Whisper Heights Parkway/Pourroy Road	Signalized	Caltrans	18.7	В	17.8	В
4. SR-79 at Jean Nicholas Road/Skyview Road	Signalized	Caltrans	17.2	В	14.9	В
5. SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road	Signalized	Caltrans	196.6	F	184.7	F
6. SR-79 at Benton Road	Signalized	Caltrans	27.6	С	98.3	F
7. Pourroy Road at Pat Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	24.3	С	10.3	В
8. Elliot Road at Jean Nicholas Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	24.0	С	14.9	В
9. Pourroy Road at Skyview Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	13.1	В	11.4	В
10. Pourroy Road at Thompson Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	16.5	С	18.8	С
Notes: LOS calculation worksheets included in the Traffic Impact Analy	sis included as Appen	dix H of this Initial	Study.			

Table 21 Intersection Delay and LOS, EAP Conditions

2018 Without Project Traffic Conditions

To assess project completion traffic conditions at the time of project opening year, existing traffic is combined with the anticipated ambient growth and cumulative projects to reflect 2018 No Project traffic conditions (existing + ambient growth + cumulative projects). The intersection operations for the 2018 No Project traffic conditions have been calculated and are given in Table 22.

Table 22 Intersection Delay and LOS, 2018 No Project Conditions

			AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
Intersection	Traffic Control	Jurisdiction	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS
1. SR-79 at Keller Road	Signalized	Caltrans	20.5	С	219.2	F
2. SR-79 at Pourroy Road/Abelia Street	Signalized	Caltrans	71.5	E	208.1	F
3. SR-79 at Whisper Heights Parkway/Pourroy Road	Signalized	Caltrans	32.3	С	152.0	F
4. SR-79 at Jean Nicholas Road/Skyview Road	Signalized	Caltrans	19.6	В	39.6	D
5. SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road	Signalized	Caltrans	214.6	F	258.7	F
6. SR-79 at Benton Road	Signalized	Caltrans	40.5	D	175.4	F
7. Pourroy Road at Pat Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	27.7	D	61.5	F
8. Elliot Road at Jean Nicholas Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	25.4	D	24.4	С
9. Pourroy Road at Skyview Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	17.0	С	63.3	F
10. Pourroy Road at Thompson Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	22.9	С	81.5	F
Notes: LOS calculation worksheets included in in the Traffic Impact An Intersections with unaccentable LOS are shown in bold	alysis included as A	ppendix H of this I	nitial Study.			



Figure 12 - Cumulative Developments Location Map 3. Environmental Analysis

PlaceWorks

This page intentionally left blank.

Under 2018 No Project conditions, the following intersections would operate at unacceptable LOS:

- SR-79 at Keller Road (PM peak hour)
- SR-79 at Pourroy Road/Abelia Street (PM peak hour)
- SR-79 at Whisper Heights Parkway/Pourroy Road (PM peak hour)
- SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road (AM and PM peak hours)
- SR-79 at Benton Road (PM peak hour)
- Pourroy Road at Pat Road (PM peak hour)
- Pourroy Road at Skyview Road (PM peak hour)
- Pourroy Road at Thompson Road (PM peak hour)

2018 With Project and Cumulative Projects Traffic Conditions

To assess future cumulative traffic conditions, traffic generated by cumulative projects is added to the EAP conditions discussed above. The intersection operations for the 2018 Cumulative traffic conditions have been calculated and are listed in Table 23.

			AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		
Intersection	Traffic Control	Jurisdiction	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	
1. SR-79 at Keller Road	Signalized	Caltrans	15.9	В	221.5	F	
2. SR-79 at Pourroy Road/Abelia Street	Signalized	Caltrans	132.5	F	236.2	F	
3. SR-79 at Whisper Heights Parkway/Pourroy Road	Signalized	Caltrans	49.5	D	143.1	F	
4. SR-79 at Jean Nicholas Road/Skyview Road	Signalized	Caltrans	21.0	С	43.0	D	
5. SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road	Signalized	Caltrans	218.7	F	261.2	F	
6. SR-79 at Benton Road	Signalized	Caltrans	47.3	D	176.8	F	
7. Pourroy Road at Pat Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	357.4	F	86.7	F	
8. Elliot Road at Jean Nicholas Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	31.9	D	25.4	D	
9. Pourroy Road at Skyview Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	21.6	С	68.5	F	
10. Pourroy Road at Thompson Road	Unsignalized	Riverside	28.9	D	85.1	F	
Notes: LOS calculation worksheets included in the Traffic Impact Analysis included as Appendix H of this Initial Study. Intersections with unacceptable LOS are shown in bold.							

Table 23 Intersection Delay and LOS, 2018 with Project and Cumulative Projects Traffic Conditions

As shown in the table, under 2018 With Project With Cumulative Project conditions, the following intersections would operate at unacceptable LOS:

- SR-79 at Keller Road (PM peak hour)
- SR-79 at Pourroy Road/Abelia Street (AM and PM peak hours)
- SR-79 at Whisper Heights Parkway/Pourroy Road (PM peak hour)
- SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road (AM and PM peak hours)
- SR-79 at Benton Road (PM peak hour)

- Pourroy Road at Pat Road (AM and PM peak hour)
- Pourroy Road at Skyview Road (PM peak hour)
- Pourroy Road at Thompson Road (PM peak hour)

Impacts

Significant impacts are determined by comparing with- and without-project scenarios for each traffic condition. As discussed above, potential traffic impacts would occur if, during the weekday peak hours:

- At intersections currently operating at acceptable LOS (A to D), the addition of project trips would change the LOS to an unacceptable LOS E or F.
- At intersections currently operating at unacceptable LOS E or F, the project would increase the delay by more than 5 seconds.

According to this criterion, potential impacts would occur at the following locations:

Existing Plus Project Conditions

- 5. SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road (PM peak hour)
- 6. SR-79 at Benton Road (PM peak hour)

2018 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

- 2. SR-79 at Pourroy Road/Abelia Street (AM and PM peak hours)
- 5. SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road (AM peak hour)
- 6. SR-79 at Benton Road (AM peak hour)
- 7. Pourroy Road at Pat Road (AM and PM peak hour)
- 9. Pourroy Road at Skyview Road (PM peak hour)

To address intersection operational deficiencies, the following road improvements would be necessary:

- 2. SR-79 at Pourroy Road/Abelia Street
- Construct a southbound through lane
- Construct a northbound through lane
- Construct a northbound left turn lane
- Construct an eastbound right turn lane

- 5. SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road
- Construct an eastbound right turn lane
- Construct a westbound left turn lane
- Construct a northbound left turn lane
- Construct a southbound through lane

6. SR-79 at Benton Road

- Construct a southbound left turn lane
- Construct a westbound right turn lane

7. Pourroy Road at Pat Road

Install a traffic signal

9. Pourroy Road at Skyview Road

Install a traffic signal

None of the intersections above were identified in the Western Riverside Council of Governments Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program, the Riverside County Development Impact Fee program, or the Road and Bridge Benefit Districts. These programs are discussed below.

Applicable Funding Mechanisms

Several funding mechanisms for transportation improvements in Riverside County are discussed in the Traffic Impact Analysis included as Appendix H to this Initial Study. The proposed non-profit K-8 school would be exempt from payments of such fees.

Signal Warrants

Signal warrants are a set of criteria used to evaluate the potential need for the installation of a traffic signal at an unsignalized or stop-controlled intersection. The methodology for the signal warrant analysis is included in the 2014 California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. The manual states that if one or more of the criteria for signal warrants is met, an engineering study would be required to evaluate other factors to determine if an intersection must be signalized. The traffic analysis in this study uses Warrant 3 criteria, which are based on traffic volumes entering the intersections during the peak hour. The signal warrant calculations are in the Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix H to this Initial Study). The signal warrant criteria would not be met at any intersection under existing and 2018 scenarios.

Site Access and Internal Circulation

Site access would be via two 1-way driveways at the southeast corner of the site from the extension of Koon Street, which would begin at the existing Pourroy Road intersection and end in a cul-de-sac at SR-79. Koon Street would link to Pourroy Road and form a 4-leg intersection. The intersection would be approximately 1,200 feet from SR-79. The segment of Pourroy Road north of Pat Road is currently unpaved (starting

approximately 200 feet south of Flossie Way and is mostly flat and clear of visual obstructions for at least 200 feet north and south of Flossie Way.

The proposed internal circulation would consist of a flow-through drop-off loop that would be 30 feet wide and extend around the periphery of the parking lot. The total length of the loop would be approximately 1,400 feet. The parking lot would include 100 parking spaces, extending the length of the site boundary along SR-79. The student drop-off and pick-up area (loading) would be along the western portion of the parking lot adjacent to the school buildings. It would have a lane for loading/unloading and at least one passing lane. Preliminary plans show one passing lane and one loading lane. Given a length of approximately 700 feet from the beginning of the loading area to the driveway entrance plus the length of Flossie Way of approximately 800 feet, there would be a total of approximately 1,500 feet of driveway length to queue cars during student drop-off and pick-up times. Assuming an average length of 25 feet per vehicle, the internal driveways could accommodate up to 60 vehicles before the student loading area. In addition, there would be 100 parking spaces and additional space in the loading area. It is anticipated that queues would be limited to Flossie Way, and some queueing may occur on Pourroy Road in the proximity of Flossie Way as vehicles slow down to turn into Flossie Way. The highest turn movement volumes at the access driveway would occur during the AM peak hour with student drop-off. The typical morning peak drop-off and afternoon pick-up activity lasts about 20 minutes, and any possible queue would dissipate immediately afterward.

Project Improvements

The following roadway improvements are necessary to ensure that adequate site access is provided. Figure 13, *Project Site Access Improvements*, presents the project's site access and recommendations.

- Construct Flossie Way at its ultimate width as a local road per County of Riverside design standards with a right-of-way of 60 feet between the project's western boundary and the project's access driveway. A sidewalk shall be provided on the eastern side of the road along the school property with an adequate connection to allow pedestrian connections to the school buildings without walking on driveways.
- The intersection of Flossie Way/Koon Street/Pourroy Road shall form a 4-leg intersection with Flossie Way.
- Parking and student loading/unloading shall be prohibited on Flossie Way to reduce friction and maneuvers on Flossie Way, especially during student drop-off and pick-up times.
- Prior to the opening of the project, TVCS shall work with Riverside County to identify on-site traffic signing and striping to be implemented in conjunction with detailed construction plans for the project. These shall be in conformance with design standards from the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways and Riverside County standards.
- TVCS and Riverside County should periodically review traffic operations in the vicinity of the project once the project is constructed to ensure that traffic operations are satisfactory.

Figure 13 - Project Site Access Improvements 3. Environmental Analysis



Source: Google Earth Pro, 2016; Site Plan: WLC Architects, 2016

This page intentionally left blank.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Congestion Management Program in effect in Riverside County was approved by the Riverside County Transportation Commission in 2011. All freeways and selected arterial roadways in the county are designated elements of the CMP system of highways and roadways. SR-79 is a part of the CMP roadway system. According to the County CMP, when a deficiency is identified, a deficiency plan must be prepared by the local agency (in this case Caltrans). Other agencies identified as contributors to the deficiency, which include the County of Riverside, are also required to coordinate with the development of the plan. The plan must contain mitigation measures, including consideration of Transportation Demand Management strategies and transit alternatives, and a schedule for mitigating deficiency.

Western Riverside County local agencies and the County of Riverside have adopted Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee programs. If, during the annual LOS monitoring process, an intersection within the TUMF area falls below LOS E, planned improvements necessary to mitigate the deficiency would be implemented through TUMF projects.

The project would generate 540 AM peak hour trips and 102 PM peak hour trips. The trip distribution map shows that up to 55 percent of these trips would be on segments of SR-79. Therefore, up to 297 trips would be added to segments of SR-79. The project would contribute to trips that would cause intersections along SR-79 to operate at unacceptable LOS. These deficiencies would occur without and with the project. The project would cause a cumulative impact at three study intersections along SR-79 at the intersections of SR-79 at Pourroy Road/Abelia Street, SR-79 at Max Gillis Boulevard/Thompson Road, and SR-79 at Benton Road.

Approximately 85 percent of project trip generation would consist of trips already generated by the existing Temecula Valley Charter School campus on Abelia Street that would be relocated to the proposed school site. Trips to and from the existing campus use SR-79. Thus, project trip generation in this Initial Study overestimates new trips that would be added to study area roadways.

In addition, the TUMF program recognizes that schools accommodate residential growth and don't generate trips in the absence of such growth and therefore exempts schools from TUMF fees. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No Impact. The nearest public-use airport to the site is French Valley Airport about 3.3 miles to the southwest. The site is not in areas surrounding French Valley Airport where heights of structures are limited to prevent obstructions to air navigation. Project development would require relocation of air traffic patterns, and no impact would occur. No mitigation is needed.

d) Alter waterborne, rail, or air traffic?

No Impact. One navigable waterway in Riverside County – the Colorado River on the east County boundary, 138 miles east of the project site - is listed on the US Army Corps of Engineers Los Angeles District's list of *Navigable Waters in Los Angeles District* (Corps 2017). Project development would not alter waterborne traffic.

The nearest railroad track to the project site is a BNSF Railway track in the City of Perris about 12 miles to the northwest (FRA 2017). Project development would not alter rail traffic.

The project site is not within the airport land use plan or within two nautical miles of a public-use airport. The nearest public-use airport to the site is French Valley Airport, about 3.3 miles to the southwest. The site is not in areas surrounding French Valley Airport where land uses are regulated to minimize hazards from aircraft crashes to persons on the ground, and not in areas where heights of structures are limited to prevent obstructions to air navigation. Project development would not alter air traffic. No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less Than Significant Impact. Proposed site access is described above in Section 44.a. The designs of roadways and intersections that would be built as part of the project would not create conflicting turning movements or place queues for driveways on highways or arterial roadways. The proposed site access connecting the Koon Street cul-de-sac with SR-79 would be emergency-only and thus would not create turning movements or queues conflicting with traffic on SR-79. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is needed.

f) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?

Less than Significant Impact. Project traffic impacts would be less than significant, as substantiated above in Section 44.a. Therefore, any increase in roadway maintenance required due to project development would be within the scale of increase caused by existing traffic and traffic resulting from planned growth in the project region. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

g) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?

Less than Significant Impact. Site grading would be balanced, that is, is not expected to require soil import or export. All staging of construction equipment and materials would be done onsite and would not block surrounding roadways. Construction would be phased so that only part of the total construction workforce would be onsite at any time. Project construction trip generation would be far lower than the 1,488 daily trips estimated for project operation. Project construction traffic impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

h) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. The school site plan provides one access route from SR-79 via Pourroy Road and Flossie Way. The site plan provides access roads to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls of each building, conforming with Section 503 of the California Fire Code (California Code of Regulations Title 24 Part 9). The project would provide adequate emergency access, and no adverse impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

i) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

No Impact. Riverside Transit Agency Route 79 operates on Winchester Road, extending from Hemet in the northeast to Temecula in the southwest. Route 79 operates six days per week, Monday through Saturday, with a frequency of about one hour (RTA 2016). Project development would not interfere with operation of Route 79. There are no paved sidewalks or bicycle facilities near the project site that would be interfered with by project development. No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

45. Bike Trails

a) Would the project adversely affect a bikeway included in the Riverside County Southwest Area Plan Trails and Bikeway System?

No Impact. Project development would not impact County bikeways, as substantiated above in Section 43.a.

3.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

46. Water

a) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact. Water treatment facilities filter and/or disinfect water before it is delivered to customers. The Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) provides water to the community of French Valley and would serve the proposed school. The project site is in EMWD's Skinner Service Area, whose water supplies consist of imported water from northern California and the Colorado River treated at the Metropolitan Water District's Skinner Filtration Plant (EMWD 2016). The Skinner Filtration Plant has capacity of 630 million gallons per day (mgd) (MWDSC 2016). Elementary and middle schools are estimated to use 10 gallons of water per student per day, that is, 125 percent of the wastewater generation factor of 8 gallons per day (gpd) per student (Los Angeles 2006). Thus, the 600-student school is estimated to use about 6,000 gallons of water per day. There is sufficient water treatment capacity in the region for estimated project water demands, and project development would not require construction of new or expanded water treatment facilities. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is in a portion of EMWD's service area supplied with water imported from northern California and the Colorado River. EMWD retails water to customers in parts of its service area including the project site and wholesales imported water to six water purveyors in its service area. Both retail and wholesale supplies and demands are listed in Table 24.

	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
Retail Supplies and Demands					
Imported Water ¹	81,197	89,097	100,497	111,597	122,097
Groundwater2	19,303	22,403	22,403	22,403	22,403
Subtotal, Potable Water	100,500	111,500	122,900	134,000	144,500
Recycled Water	45,245	48,334	50,017	51,800	53,300
Total Supplies	145,745	159,834	172,917	185,800	197,800
Demands	145,745	159,834	172,917	185,800	197,800
Difference	0	0	0	0	0
Wholesale Supplies and Demands					
Imported Water	50,500	54,100	57,700	61,200	64,800
Recycled Water	1,656	4,766	5,183	5,600	5,600
Total Supplies	52,156	58,866	62,883	66,800	70,400
Demands	52,156	58,866	62,883	66,800	70,400
Difference	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2/ EMWD Exercise Water Supplies and Demande, save fast new year

¹ Imported water includes treated imported water delivered directly to customers; raw imported water treated at EMWD filtration plants before delivery to customers; and imported water used to replenish groundwater for the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians and others pursuant to a court settlement.

² Groundwater includes potable groundwater and groundwater from the western part of the San Jacinto Groundwater Basin desalinated at EMWD desalters.

The proposed school is estimated to use about 6,000 gpd based on 125 percent of the wastewater generation factor for elementary and middle schools (Los Angeles 2006). There are sufficient existing and planned water supplies in the region to meet estimated project water demands, and project development would not require EMWD to obtain new or expanded water supplies. Impacts would be less than significant.

47. Sewer

a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact. EMWD provides wastewater treatment for parts of western Riverside County including the project site. The project site is in the service area of EMWD's Temecula Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility, which has capacity of 18 mgd and treated average flows of about 13.5 mgd in 2015 (RMC 2016). Expansion of this facility to 23 mgd capacity is expected to be complete by 2017 (EMWD 2014). The proposed school is estimated to generate about 4,800 gallons of wastewater per day, based on the

generation factor of 8 gpd per student. There is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity in the region to treat project-generated wastewater, and project development would not require EMWD to build new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities.

The project would include installation of sewer laterals connecting to nearby sewer mains, and would not build or use septic systems. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is needed.

b) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Less Than Significant Impact. Project impacts on wastewater treatment capacity would be less than significant, as substantiated in Section 47.a.

48. Solid Waste

a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Less Than Significant Impact. In 2015 about 99 percent of solid waste landfilled from the two cities closest to the project site, Murrieta and Menifee, was disposed of at two landfills—Badlands Sanitary Landfill near the City of Moreno Valley and El Sobrante Landfill near the City of Corona (CalRecycle 2016a). Capacities and disposal amounts for the two facilities are listed in Table 25.

Landfill and Nearest City	Permitted Throughput Capacity, Tons per Day	Average Disposal, Tons per Day, 2014	Residual Capacity, Tons per Day	Remaining Capacity, Tons	Estimated Closing Date		
Badlands Sanitary Moreno Valley	4,800	2,812	2,988	11,811,599	2022		
El Sobrante Corona	16,054	6,793	9,261	145,530,000	2045		
Total	20,854	9,605	12,249	157,341,599	_		
Sources: CalRecycle 2016b, 2016c, 2016d.							

Table 25	Landfills	Serving	Murrieta	and	Menifee
----------	-----------	---------	----------	-----	---------

The proposed school is estimated to generate about 0.007 pound of solid waste per square foot per day, or about 385 pounds per day for the approximately 55,000 total square feet of building area. There is sufficient landfill capacity in the region for estimated project solid waste generation, and project development would not require new or expanded landfills. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Does the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?

No Impact. Assembly Bill 939 (Integrated Solid Waste Management Act of 1989; Public Resources Code 40050 et seq.) established an integrated waste-management system that focused on source reduction,
3. Environmental Analysis

recycling, composting, and land disposal of waste. AB 939 required every California city and county to divert 50 percent of its waste from landfills by the year 2000. Compliance with AB 939 is measured in part by comparing solid waste disposal rates for a jurisdiction with target disposal rates; actual rates at or below target rates are consistent with AB 939. AB 939 also requires California counties to show 15 years disposal capacity for all jurisdictions within the county or show a plan to transform or divert its waste.

Assembly Bill 341 (2011) increased the statewide waste diversion goal to 75 percent by 2020, and mandated recycling for commercial and multifamily residential land uses.

Assembly Bill 1826 (California Public Resources Code, Sections 42649.8 et seq.), which took effect in 2016, requires recycling of organic matter by businesses, and multifamily residences of five of more units, generating such wastes in amounts over certain thresholds.

Section 5.408 (Construction Waste Reduction, Disposal, and Recycling) of the 2013 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen; Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 11) requires that at least 50 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste from nonresidential construction operations be recycled and/or salvaged for reuse.

The proposed school would include collection areas for recyclable materials, including organic matter. Disposition of demolition and construction debris would comply with AB 341, AB 1826, and CALGreen Section 5.408. No impact would occur and no mitigation is needed.

49. Utilities

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

a. Electricity?

b. Natural Gas?

c. Communications Systems?

Less than Significant Impact. Electricity, natural gas, and communications systems are already available in French Valley. The project would relocate an existing charter school to the proposed campus. The proposed school would serve students already living in the region or already forecast to live in the region due to planned growth; project development would not increase population or total student enrollment in or near French Valley. Development of the project would not require construction or expansion of new utility facilities that could cause significant environmental effects, and no mitigation is needed.

d. Storm Water Drainage

Less than Significant Impact. A majority of the runoff from the site will occur over impervious surfaces that will discharge into the existing off-site storm drain system. Other flows will drain into proposed playfield

3. Environmental Analysis

areas that will mimic the existing condition and allow for onsite retention. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is needed.

e. Street Lighting

Less than Significant Impact. Project development would include installation of street lights on the segments of Flossie Way and Pourroy Road that would be improved by the project. The street lights would conform to all applicable Riverside County standards, including standards regulating nighttime lighting related to the Mt. Palomar Observatory. Street light installation would not cause significant impacts.

f. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

Less than Significant Impact. Project traffic impacts would be less than significant, as substantiated above in Section 44.a. Thus, Project development would not create a need for roadway maintenance exceeding that caused by existing and planned developments in the region. Impacts would be less than significant.

g. Other Governmental Services?

Less than Significant Impact. Project development would not require the construction or expansion of fire or police stations, schools, libraries, or health care facilities, as substantiated above in Sections 37 through 42. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

3.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As demonstrated in Section 3.4, *Biological Resources*, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the reduction of the habitat of fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Additionally, as demonstrated in Section 3.5, *Cultural Resources*, no historic resources were identified onsite, and therefore the project does not have the potential to eliminate important examples of California history or prehistory

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Less Than Significant Impact. No significant cumulative impacts are identified in this Initial Study, and impacts would be less than significant.

3. Environmental Analysis

c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact. As demonstrated in the respective topical sections of this Initial Study, project development would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. All such impacts were deemed to be less than significant.

- Airnav.com. 2016, November 22. Airport Information. http://www.airnav.com/airports/.
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). 2011, Revised. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines.
- Beranek, Leo. 1988. Noise and Vibration Control. Revised edition. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Noise Control Engineering.
- Bies, David A. and Colin H. Hansen. 2009. Engineering Noise Control: Theory and Practice. 4th edition. New York: Spon Press.
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2008, October. Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan, a Framework for Change.
 - ———. 2013, October 23. Proposed 2013 Amendments to Area Designations for State Ambient Air Quality Standards. http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2013/area13/area13isor.pdf.
 - ———. 2014, May 15. Proposed First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan: Building on the Framework, http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scopingplan.htm.
- -------. 2015, December. Area Designations Maps: State and National. http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm.

——. 2016, April. Proposed Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Reduction Strategy. https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/shortlived/meetings/04112016/proposedstrategy.pdf

- California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention (CAL FIRE). 2009, December 24. Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA: Western Riverside County. http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/riverside_west/fhszl_map.60.pdf.
- California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). 2016a, July 28. Jurisdiction Disposal by Facility. http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentral/Reports/DRS/Destination/JurDspFa.aspx.
- ———. 2016b, July 28. Facility/Site Summary Details: El Sobrante Landfill: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/33-AA-0217/Detail/.
- ———. 2016c, July 28. Facility/Site Summary Details: Badlands Sanitary Landfill. http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/33-AA-0006/Detail/.

- —. 2016d, July 28. Landfill Tonnage Reports. http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Landfills/Tonnages/.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 1999, November. State Route 79. Route Concept Fact Sheet. http://sr79project.info/uploads/media_items/route-concept-report-november -1999.original.pdf.
- . 2006, August. Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol.
- _____. 2009, November. Technical Noise Supplement ("TeNS"). Prepared by ICF International.
- ——, Department of Transportation, Noise, Vibration, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. 2004, June. Transportation- and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual. Prepared by ICF International.
- —, Division of Environmental Analysis. 2002, February. Transportation Related Earthborne Vibration (Caltrans Experiences). Technical Advisory, Vibration. TAV-02-01-R9601. Prepared by Rudy Hendricks. California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2013. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). Version 2013.2.2. Prepared by: ENVIRON International Corporation and the California Air Districts.
- ------. 2011, September 7. California Scenic Highway Mapping System. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/.
- California Geological Survey (CGS). 1990, January 1. Special Studies Zones Map, Murrieta Quadrangle. http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/quad/MURRIETA/maps/MRIETA.PDF.
- ———. 2014a, October 21. Ground Motion Interpolator. http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/PSHA/psha_interpolator.html.
- 2014b, November 4. Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the Temescal Valley Production Area, Riverside County, California. ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/sr_231/Temescal_Valley_Rpt%20Final_11-04-14-a.pdf.
- ——. 2014c, November 5. Updated Mineral Land Classification Map for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the Temescal Valley Production Area, Riverside County, California. Special Report 231, Plate 1. ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/sr_231/TemescalValley_MRZ_Plate1.pdf.
- 2014d, November 5. Updated Mineral Land Classification Map for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the Temescal Valley Production Area, Riverside County, California. Special Report 231, Plate 2.

ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/sr_231/TemescalValley_MRZ_Plate1.pdf.

- California State Library (CSL). 2017, April 11. California Public Library Outlets. http://www.batchgeo.com/map/capublibs.
- Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2014, November. Public Update for Drought Response. http://water.ca.gov/waterconditions/docs/DWR_PublicUpdateforDroughtResponse_Groundwater Basins.pdf.
- ------. 2016, July 26. Groundwater Information Center Map Interactive Map Application. https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/gicima/.
- Diversified Engineering. 1983, August. Environmental Constraints Sheet, Parcel Map No. 19448.
- Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP). 2016a, July 22. California Important Farmland Finder. http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html.
- ------. 2016b, June 29. Riverside County Williamson Act Lands FY 2015/2016 Sheet 1 of 3.
- Domenigoni, Loretta (Parks Planner). 2017, April 11. Phone conversation. Valley-Wide Recreation and Parks District.
- EMG. 2016, June 6. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of 34155 Winchester Road, Winchester, California 92596. Prepared for Hansburger & Klein.
- Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD). 2014, March 27. Temecula Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility. http://www.emwd.org/home/showdocument?id=1426.
- ------. 2016, July. 2015 Water Quality Consumer Confidence Report. http://www.emwd.org/home/showdocument?id=14761.
- Employment Development Department (EDD). 2016, November 21. Labor Force and Unemployment Rate for California Counties. https://data.edd.ca.gov/Labor-Force-and-Unemployment-Rates/Labor-Force-and-Unemployment-Rate-for-California-C/r8rw-9pxx.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2016, July 27. Flood Map Service Center. https://msc.fema.gov/portal.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 1978, December. Federal Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model. Report No. FHWA-RD77-108. US Department of Transportation.
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA). 2006, May. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. FTA-VA-90-1003-06. US Department of Transportation.
- Governor's Office of Planning and Research. 2003, October. State of California General Plan Guidelines.
- ------. 2008, June. Technical Advisory, CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through CEQA Review. http://www.opr.ca.gov/ceqa/pdfs/june08-ceqa.pdf.

- Harris, Cyril M. 1998. Handbook of Acoustical Measurements and Noise Control. 3rd edition. Woodbury, NY: Acoustical Society of America.
- Management Partners Incorporated. 2009, November 10. Riverside County Strategic Plan 2009-2029. http://www.rvcfire.org/stationsAndFunctions/AdminSppt/StrategicPlanning/Documents/Strategic Plan2009.pdf.
- Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWDSC). 2016, July 27. Skinner Treatment Plant. http://www.mwdh2o.com/AboutYourWater/Water-Quality/Robert-Skinner.
- Nationwide Environmental Title Research (NETR). 2016, July 22. Historical aerial photographs. Historicaerials.com.
- Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2015, February. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines. Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. http://oehha.ca.gov/air/hot_spots/2015/2015GuidanceManual.pdf.
- Office of Mine Reclamation (OMR). 2016, November 22. Mines Online. http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/mol/mol-app.html.
- Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD). 2017, January 3. Primary Care Clinics Licensed as of December 31, 2016. https://www.oshpd.ca.gov/documents/HID/FacilityList/PCListing_Dec2016.xlsx.
- Phillip Brylski, Ph.D and David Bramlet (Brylski and Bramlet). 2017, May 24. Habitat Assessment.
- Riverside County. 2015, December. County of Riverside Climate Action Plan. http://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general_plan_2016/climate_action_plan/CAP_1208 15.pdf?ver=2016-04-01-101221-240.
- Riverside County. 2017, April 10. Successor Agency. http://countyofriverside.us/AbouttheCounty/SuccessorAgency.aspx.
- Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD). 2016, July 26. Station Locator. http://www.rvcfire.org/stationsAndFunctions/FireStations/Pages/Fire-Station-Map.aspx.
- Riverside County Planning Department (RCPD). 2015, December 15. Safety Element. Chapter 6 of Riverside County General Plan. http://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general_plan_2016 /elements/Ch06_Safety-120815.pdf?ver=2016-04-01-100802-943.
- Riverside County Planning Department (RCPD). 2015, December 8. Circulation Element. Chapter 4 of Riverside County General Plan. http://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general_plan_2016/elements/Ch04_Circulation_120 815.pdf?ver=2016-04-01-100756-397.

- Riverside County Planning Department (RCPD). 2015, December 15. Southwest Area Community Plan. http://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general_plan_2016/area_plans/SWAP_121515m.pdf ?ver=2016-04-01-101033-273.
- Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC). 2011, December 14. 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program. http://rctc.org/uploads/media_items/congestionmanagementprogram.original.pdf.
- Riverside Transit Agency (RTA). 2016, May 8. Route 79 Schedule. http://www.riversidetransit.com/images/stories/DOWNLOADS/ROUTES/079.pdf.
- RMC Water and Environment. 2016, June. Eastern Municipal Water District 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. http://www.emwd.org/home/showdocument?id=1506.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 1993. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Handbook.
- 2008, July. Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology.
 http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significance-thresholds/finallst-methodology-document.pdf.
- ——. 2011. Fact Sheet for Applying CalEEMod to Localized Significance Thresholds. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significancethresholds/caleemod-guidance.pdf.
- ———. 2013, February. Final 2012 Air Quality Management Plan. http://www.aqmd.gov/home/library/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan.
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2016, April. The 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS): A Plan for Mobility, Accessibility, Sustainability, and a High Quality of Life. http://scagrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS.pdf.

Summitwest Environmental, Inc. 2017, May 29. Fairy Shrimp Survey.

US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). 2017, April 11. Navigable Waters in Los Angeles District.

- US Census Bureau (USCB). 2016, November 23. American Factfinder: Table DP04: Selected Housing Characteristics: 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. French Valley CDP, California. https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk.
- US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 1985, March. The Noise Guidebook: A Reference Document for Implementing the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Noise Policy. Washington, DC: The Division.

- US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1971, December. Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances. Prepared by Bolt, Beranek & Newman (Cambridge, MA) for the U.S. EPA Office of Noise Abatement and Control. Washington, D.C.
- ———. 1974, March. Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety. Washington, D.C.: U.S. EPA Office of Noise Abatement and Control.
- US Geological Survey (USGS). 2016, April 7. The Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale. http://earthquake.usgs.gov/learn/topics/mercalli.php.
- US Geological Survey (USGS). 2016, June 2. California Volcano Observatory. https://volcanoes.usgs.gov/observatories/calvo/.
- Wald, David J., et al. 1999, August. "Relationships between Peak Ground Acceleration, Peak Ground Velocity, and Modified Mercalli Intensity in California." Earthquake Spectra 15 No. 3.
- Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG). 2013, February 4. 2010-2035 Western Riverside County Growth Forecasts. http://www.wrcog.cog.ca.us/uploads/media_items/wrcog-growthforecast-2010-2035.original.pdf.

5. List of Preparers

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

Larry Ross, Principal Planner Heather Thomson, County Archeologist Savannah Jones, Ecological Resources Specialist II

TEMECULA VALLEY CHARTER SCHOOL

Mark Horn, Board President

PLACEWORKS

Dwayne Mears, AICP, Principal, Environmental Services Michael Milroy, Associate Fernando Sotelo, P. E., Senior Associate, Transportation Stephanie Chen, Project Engineer Natalie Foley, Project Engineer Cary Nakama, Graphic Artist

5. List of Preparers

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix

Appendix A Health Risk Assessment

Health Risk Assessment | October 2016

Temecula Valley Charter School

Prepared for:

Temecula Valley Charter School Contact: Mark Horn, Board President 35755 Abelia Street Winchester, California 92596 951.294.6780

Prepared by:

PlaceWorks

Contact: Steve Bush, PE 1625 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 300 Berkeley, California 94709 510.848.3815 510.848.4315(f) www.placeworks.com

TVCS-02.2

Table of Contents

<u>Secti</u>	ion	Page			
1.	INTF	RODUCTION	1		
2.	PRO	DJECT DESCRIPTION	3		
3.	SOU	7			
4.	SOURCE CHARACTERIZATION				
5.	AIR	DISPERSION MODELING	11		
6.	RIS	K CHARACTERIZATIONS	13		
	6.1	CARCINOGENIC CHEMICAL RISK			
	6.2	NON-CARCINOGENIC HAZARDS			
	6.3	CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS			
	6.4	ACCIDENTAL RELEASES			
7.	CON	NCLUSIONS	19		
8.	REFERENCES				

Table of Contents

List of Figures

Figure	Pa	ge
Figure 1	Site Location	5

List of Tables

Table		Page
Table 1	Emission Sources	
Table 2	Vehicle Fleet Mix Profile	
Table 3	Compounds Emitted from Mobile Sources	
Table 4	California Ambient Air Quality Standards	
Table 5	Localized Significance Thresholds	
Table 6	Lake Elsinore Monitoring Station Summary	
Table 7	Health Risk Assessment Results	

List of Appendices

- Appendix A. Emission Rate Calculations
- Appendix B. Graphical Representations of Emitting Sources
- Appendix C. Air Dispersion Modeling Output
- Appendix D. Risk Calculation Worksheets

1. Introduction

The Temecula Valley Charter School Board of Directors is seeking approval from Riverside County for development of a public charter school for 600 kindergarten through 8th grade (K-8) students in the Community of French Valley in unincorporated Riverside County on two parcels on the west side of Winchester Road (State Route 79) between Keller Road and Pourroy Road.

Regulations pertaining to the siting of new schools or modernization of existing schools in California require compliance with the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 5 standards. For new schools, Title 5 studies must demonstrate that facilities with the potential to emit hazardous air pollutants within a quarter-mile radius of the school site will not constitute an actual or potential public health risk to students and staff that will attend the school. This health risk assessment (HRA) involved conducting the following tasks:

- Emissions associated with vehicles and trucks traveling on State Route 79 (SR-79), which is approximately 60 feet southeast of the project boundary, and were evaluated. Because the site is within 500 feet of the edge of a freeway traffic lane or busy traffic corridor, criteria air pollutants as well as toxic air contaminants (TACs) were also evaluated to determine if air quality at the proposed site poses a short-term or long-term exposure risk to students and staff.
- Facilities within a quarter-mile (1,320-foot) radius of the proposed site that might reasonably emit hazardous or acutely hazardous air emissions were identified and evaluated.
- Air dispersion modeling, using the AERMOD computer model, was conducted to quantify maximum ground-level concentrations for receptors at the project site. Meteorological data from the nearest South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) monitoring station with similar meteorological conditions were used to represent local weather conditions and prevailing winds.
- Cancer and non-cancer risks to students and staff attending the school site were determined, based on the results of the AERMOD modeling. The assessment considered exposure through the inhalation pathway. Unit Risk Factors (URFs) and Cancer Potency Factors (CPFs) were used to determine carcinogenic risk and Recommended Exposure Limits (RELs) were used to determine non-carcinogenic risk.
- A health risk assessment report has been prepared that compares the calculated risks with thresholds established by the SCAQMD and California Air Resources Board's (CARB) Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program (AB2588).

1. Introduction

The assessment and dispersion modeling methodologies used in the preparation of this report included all relevant and appropriate procedures developed by the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). These methodologies and assumptions were used to ensure that the assessment effectively quantified school-based impacts associated with emission sources.

It should be noted that these health impacts were based on conservative (i.e., health protective) assumptions. The USEPA (2005) and OEHHA (2015) note that conservative assumptions used in a risk assessment are intended to ensure that the estimated risks do not underestimate the actual risks. Therefore, the estimated risks do not necessarily represent actual risks experienced by populations at or near a site. The use of conservative assumptions tends to produce upper-bound estimates of risk and usually overestimate exposure and thus risk. For this school-based risk assessment, the following conservative assumptions were used:

- It was assumed that maximum exposed children and adults stood outside at the site for 8 hours per day, 180 days per year for 9 years (K-8 students) or 250 days per year for 25 years (staff). In reality, students and staff are exposed to outdoor pollutant concentration levels only during nutrition, lunch, and PE class and are exposed to reduced indoor pollutant concentrations for the remaining school hours. This would result in lower estimated risk values.
- The calculated risk for children from 2-16 years is multiplied by a factor of 3 to account for early life exposure and uncertainty in child versus adult exposure impacts.

Thus, the estimated risks provided in this HRA are conservative.

2. Project Description

The project consists of construction and operation of a K-8 charter school for 600 students. Several onestory school buildings, totaling about 45,000 square feet of building area, would be clustered in the eastcentral part of the site around a quad. Facilities would include 31 classrooms, a multipurpose room, administrative space, and a library/media center. The multipurpose building, which would be built in the south-central part of the site, would be about 30 feet high, and the remainder of the buildings would be about 15 feet high. The charter school could open as early as 2017.

The project site is surrounded by rural residential uses to the west and north; a single-family home on one of the rural residential properties abuts the west part of the north site boundary. The project site is surrounded by vacant land to the south; and by vacant land and agricultural uses to the east opposite SR-79. Lake Skinner Recreation Area is about 1.7 miles to the southeast, and Diamond Valley Lake is about three miles to the northeast. The Interstate 215 freeway is about 4.1 miles to the west. Two concrete culverts pass under SR-79 east of the project site, carrying storm water southeastward under the roadway.

The project site and vicinity are depicted in Figure 1.

2. Project Description

This page intentionally left blank.