

1 Volume will be treated by two extended detention basins. In general, each building
2 with associated parking, loading docks, drive aisles, and landscaped areas would
3 drain to its respective extended detention basin. Both basins are located in fill
4 material and treat very large areas, so infiltration and bio-retention were not feasible
5 options for this Project. The Project is required to mitigate these increased flows.
6 Runoff will be dispersed to the extended detention basins as described at **RDEIR**
7 **page 3.9-32**. Landscaped areas on the north and south will be self-treating pervious
8 areas that will convey the flows generated by the respective areas directly off-site.
9 Additionally, the Project proponent shall be responsible for the detention basins as
10 well as the private area landscaping. Landscape maintenance shall include all
11 maintenance and replacement of dead vegetation, erosion rills, proper disposal of
12 green wastes, etc. Irrigation systems shall be tested regularly to ensure that all
13 systems are functioning optimally. Thus, odors will be controlled via removal of dead
14 vegetation and proper disposal of green wastes. Vectors are not anticipated to be an
15 issue because irrigation systems will be tested regularly to ensure optional function,
16 which will reduce pooling of water, thus reducing areas that have the potential to be
17 used by mosquitoes. Onsite BMPs will be maintained during operation, ensuring that
18 there are no issues associated with vectors or odors. In summary, the Project will not
19 substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff or result in flooding; either
20 on-site or off-site, and Project runoff will not exceed the capacity of existing or
21 planned stormwater drainage systems. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

22 **(RDEIR, p. 3.9-31 to 3.9-41.)**

23 ***Impact:*** *Seiche, Tsunami or Mudflow.*

24 ***Threshold:*** *The Project would not expose people or structures from inundation by seiche,*
25 *tsunami, or mudflow.*

26 6. Project Impact(s):

27 A seiche is defined as a standing wave in an enclosed or partially enclosed body of
28 water. The nearest large body of surface water is Lake Perris, which is approximately

1 10 miles southwest of the Project site. Because of the Project site's distance from
2 Lake Perris, the Project will not be subject to impacts associated with a seiche.
3 Likewise, the Project site's distance from the Pacific Ocean will preclude any
4 impacts associated with tsunamis. Existing drainage flows from off-site areas,
5 including the hilly undeveloped portions of the site to the north, would be conveyed
6 through the site and would ultimately be conveyed off-site to the west side of the
7 Project site. Setbacks will be substantial; thus, any potential of mudflow affecting
8 the Project would be less than significant. Project runoff flows will discharge to the
9 west and the southwest Project boundary and sheet flow to the west, southwest
10 approximately 2.7 miles via existing storm drain improvements to San Timoteo
11 Creek Channel, thence northwesterly approximately 15 miles to its confluence with
12 the Santa Ana River. Thus, development of the Project could change the amount of
13 surface water in the San Timoteo Creek Channel and the Santa Ana River. However,
14 the increase in amount of surface water in these water bodies is anticipated to be less
15 than significant, as the increase in 2-year storm flow caused by the Project will be
16 limited to less than 10 percent beyond existing conditions. Thus, the Project will have
17 a less than significant impact regarding changes in the amount of surface water in
18 San Timoteo Creek Channel and the Santa Ana River, and will not increase or reduce
19 the volumes of these water bodies to an extent that would cause an impact to
20 downstream habitat. Impacts will remain less than significant. (RDEIR at 3.9-44).

21 **Impact:** *Structure Placement: Flood Hazard Area.*

22 **Threshold:** *The Project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures*
23 *which would impede or redirect flood flows.*

24 7. Project Impact(s):

25 The Project is not within a 100-year flood hazard area and will not be placed within
26 an area where structures would impede flows according to the federal Flood Hazard
27 Boundary or the Flood Insurance Rate Map. The California Department of Water
28 Resources has delineated a major watercourse/floodplain as flowing westerly

1 through the southern portion of the Project site. In response to this delineation,
2 Riverside County is a participating community in the National Flood Insurance
3 Program (NFIP), which requires participating agencies to adopt floodplain
4 management ordinances. The intent of the ordinance, Ordinance No. 458, is to ensure
5 that new construction and/or substantial improvements within mapped floodplains
6 are done in a manner that reduces damage to the public and property. Any
7 development or substantial improvement within a regulatory floodplain may require
8 floodplain review by the County. This includes the submittal of a floodplain
9 application permit form to Riverside County Building and Safety along with
10 corresponding fees and attachments. Project compliance with Ordinance No. 458
11 would render any impacts to structures due to a flood hazard area less than
12 significant. (RDEIR at 3.9-42).

13 **Impact:** *Otherwise Degrade Water Quality.*

14 **Threshold:** *The Project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.*

15 8. Project Impact(s):

16 The Project has the potential to degrade local water quality. Development of the Project site
17 will introduce a number of urban pollutants into the area, most notably oil, grease,
18 rubber residue, brake shoe dust, and other vehicular fluids and materials. However,
19 the Project applicant shall prepare a SWPPP and WQMP that conforms to the
20 California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) NPDES permit. The
21 SWPPP shall identify BMPs to prevent construction related pollutants from reaching
22 stormwater and all products of erosion from being released outside of the Project
23 boundaries. Mitigation Measure HYD-1 requires that a WQMP be prepared to
24 control post-construction urban runoff from the Project. Therefore, impacts to water
25 quality will be less than significant. (RDEIR at 3.9-41).

26 **F. Land Use**

27 **Impact:** *Division of Established Community.*

28 **Threshold:** *The Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an*

1 *established community.*

2 1. Project Impact(s):

3 The Project site is surrounded by lands under the jurisdictions of Calimesa,
4 Beaumont, and Riverside County. Properties to the north and west are within the City
5 of Calimesa and have land use designations that include: RR “Residential Rural,” to
6 the north of the Project site, and RLM “Residential Low/Medium,” RL “Residential
7 Low” and CR “Commercial Regional.” To the south and east within Riverside
8 County, the land uses include “VLDR—Very Low Density Residential (Community
9 Development Foundation),” “VLDR-RC—Very Low Density Residential-Rural
10 Community Foundation” (with 1 DU/AC in both Foundations), and “Rural
11 Mountainous” (1 DU/10 AC), as well as some land that is designated “CR—
12 Commercial Retail.” The City of Calimesa designates a small portion of the Project
13 area to the west as RL, which would remain RL. The County of Riverside General
14 Plan designates the proposed Project site as Rural Mountainous (RM), Very Low
15 Density Residential (VLDR). The County’s Zoning Ordinance classifies the site as
16 (W-2), Controlled Development Area. The current land use designation and zoning
17 classification for the Project site do not allow industrial uses on the site, so
18 implementation of the Project would not be consistent with existing permitted land
19 uses on site. However, as a part of the entitlement process, a General Plan
20 Amendment from VLDR to Light Industrial (LI), Open Space Recreation (OS-R),
21 and Public Facility (PF), and a zone change from W-2 to Industrial Park (I-P) have
22 been submitted to the County. The area proposed for PF would also retain its existing
23 zoning of W-2. The land designated RM will remain RM. The General Plan
24 Amendment and zone change requests encompass the southern portion of the site,
25 south of the hillside areas that will include the two warehouse buildings and site
26 improvements. The northern portion of the Project site that is currently VLDR will
27 be re-designated Open Space-Recreation, (OS-R) north of the developable area
28 within the Project limits. The OS-R designation would occupy approximately 70.18

1 acres and be retained as open space, thereby precluding future residential
2 development. An additional 14.62 acres would be left undisturbed under the RM
3 designation. A portion of land Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 413-270-012 and
4 413-270-013) will be used for an earthen trail along the western side of the Project
5 that will lead to existing trail features in the northern portion of the Project site. This
6 land is located in the City of Calimesa. The General Plan Land Use Map for the City
7 of Calimesa designates this land Residential Low (RL), which allows for 2-4
8 dwelling units per acre. The area in which the earthen trail would be placed for the
9 Project is vacant and undeveloped. The surrounding areas contain a variety of land
10 uses, including residences to the north, east, and west of the Project site (although
11 not immediately adjacent to the Project site). Access to these residences will be
12 improved with construction of the main entrance drive into the Project between the
13 two warehouse buildings that will extend northerly to the residences. Additionally,
14 an easement is proposed in the northwest corner of the site that would provide
15 additional access to residents to the north. Furthermore, the existing neighborhoods
16 in the surrounding Project area are physically separated from each other by distance,
17 vacant lands, topography, and major roads. Therefore, the proposed Project would
18 not divide any established community. **(RDEIR at 3.10-21 to 3.10-22; Refer also
19 to Final EIR Section 03-00, Response to CVAN-13).**

20 ***Impact:*** *Consistency with General Plan Land Use Designations and Policies.*

21 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation would not conflict with any applicable*
22 *land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project*
23 *(including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or*
24 *zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental*
25 *effect.*

26 2. Project Impact(s):

27 A consistency analysis was completed to determine the Project's consistency with
28 the land use designations and policies of the County of Riverside Comprehensive

1 General Plan, applicable City of Calimesa General Plan (with respect to the portion
2 of the Project site that is located within the City of Calimesa), the Cherry Valley
3 Gateway Policy Area, and the Southern California Association of Governments
4 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

5 The rule of general plan consistency is that a project must at least be compatible with
6 the objectives and policies of the general plan. (*Naraghi Lakes Neighborhood*
7 *Preservation Association v. City of Modesto* (2016) 1 Cal.App.5th 9, citing *Sequoyah*
8 *Hills Homeowners Assn. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704). To be
9 consistent with a general plan, a project is required to be in agreement or harmony
10 with the terms of the general plan, not in rigid conformity with every detail. (*Naraghi*
11 *Lakes Neighborhood Preservation Association, supra*, 1 Cal.App.5th at p. 18, citing
12 *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco*
13 (2002) 102 Cal. App.4th 656).

14 County General Plan /Cherry Valley Gateway Policy Area Consistency

15 The proposed General Plan Amendment would not require an amendment to the
16 General Plan Community Development Foundation Component. The Project's
17 consistency with Riverside County General Plan Land Use Policies is demonstrated
18 in **RDEIR Table 3.10-3**; refer also to **Final EIR at p. 4-5 to 4-6**. The Gateway
19 Policy Area, in which the Project site is located, is distinct from the Cherry Valley
20 community area, located to the east of the Project site, because the hills located to
21 the east of the Project site provide a visual and physical community separator from
22 Cherry Valley proper. The Gateway Policy Area is also distinct in that, unlike Cherry
23 Valley proper to the east, it is largely undeveloped, although there are several
24 proposed and approved development projects within the Gateway Policy Area. In
25 addition, to a large degree the Gateway Policy Area orients to the west, including
26 direct regional access from the Cherry Valley Boulevard/I-10 Freeway interchange,
27 as well the burgeoning cities of Calimesa and Beaumont to the west and south.
28 Therefore, development of the Project at this location, which has direct regional

1 access to the I-10 Freeway, would represent a logical extension of the pattern of
2 development that is already emerging in the Gateway Policy Area. **(RDEIR at 3.10-**
3 **24)**. Because of the evolving nature of the Gateway Policy Area, the General Plan
4 acknowledges the potential for higher intensity uses for undeveloped parcels by
5 stating explicitly that “[h]igher densities may be allowed through a general plan
6 amendment . . .” This evolution can be seen in the history of higher-intensity uses
7 located on and around the Project site, and in the various higher-intensity
8 developments proposed for neighboring parcels. The Gateway Policy Area has
9 historically accommodated a variety of industrial and commercial uses. Therefore,
10 the Project is not anticipated to result in substantial alteration of the present or
11 planned land use of the area. The Project will be compatible with the several uses
12 and planned developments to be located on the properties immediately surrounding
13 the Project site, including the Sunny-Cal Egg Ranch project to the south, the
14 residential projects planned adjacent to the Project site to the east and southeast, the
15 regional commercial uses planned to the west, and the rural/open space area to the
16 north. **(RDEIR at 3.10-24)**. The Project includes extensive measures to buffer
17 potential impacts to and from nearby residents, including providing robust
18 landscaping between the Project buildings and Cherry Valley Boulevard. The
19 location, configuration and design of the Project will allow it to blend into the
20 existing landscape, despite the large size of the proposed buildings. The two
21 buildings would be set back approximately 375 to 575 feet from Cherry Valley
22 Boulevard, approximately 300 feet from the east Project boundary, and
23 approximately 400 feet from the west Project boundary, allowing for generous
24 buffers with extensive landscaping, a berm, a meandering equestrian and pedestrian
25 trail, and a 5-foot wide meandering sidewalk, separated by a three-railed fence. Given
26 the number of buffering features proposed by both the Sunny-Cal project and the
27 proposed Project, no building or structure between the two projects is expected to be
28 closer than 600 feet, providing substantial open space between the two projects, and

1 thereby ensuring minimal impacts between the two projects. Building 1 would be
2 located approximately 29.8 feet above the centerline of Cherry Valley Boulevard,
3 and Building 2 would be located approximately 48.3 feet below the centerline of
4 Cherry Valley Boulevard. Although the Project's buildings rise 41 feet in height,
5 neither building would be visible from motorists or pedestrians traveling along
6 Cherry Valley Boulevard, as their line of sight would be directed above the building.
7 A berm, water tower, barn, and landscaping would further screen views of the
8 buildings. Because of the berm and the fact that the proposed buildings would not
9 break the ridgeline silhouette of the hills behind them to the north, the Project site
10 would not be visible from the residents located north of the site. All of these factors,
11 combined with the proposed tree planting and other landscape and screening
12 elements, will make the Project visually unobtrusive and in accordance with the
13 existing visual characteristics of the surrounding areas. The property located to the
14 east of the Project, adjacent to Sunny-Cal and within unincorporated Riverside
15 County, is proposed to be developed as a 209-unit, medium density, single-family
16 home detached residential community. This development is located approximately
17 552 feet east from, and 64 to 104 feet above grade of, the closest Project building
18 (Building 2). **(RDEIR at 3.10-25)**. Further, the easterly side of Building 2 has been
19 specifically designed so as not to include any bay doors or loading areas. As a result,
20 this area of the Project site will not create significant impacts on the easterly
21 residential uses in terms of truck activity, noise, odors, visual impacts, or up-lighting.
22 Additionally, the area between Building 2 and the eastern property boundary will
23 primarily include employee parking, employee car circulation, a generously
24 landscaped slope and two 1-million-gallon water tanks, which are all lower-intensity
25 uses commonly found near residential uses. Similar to the Sunny-Cal development,
26 the substantial distance and extensive buffering between the proposed residential
27 development and the Project buildings ensures that any impacts between the two uses
28 will be minimal. Immediately west of the Project site is a large (mostly) undeveloped

1 property zoned by the City of Calimesa as “Commercial Regional,” which allows for
2 developments with FAR up to 0.75:1. As specified by the City of Calimesa’s General
3 Plan, Commercial Regional properties allow for the development of commercial uses
4 “that will cater to a wide market, including a full range of retail shops and services
5 within a shopping center environment.” Such a development is thoughtfully located
6 near a major transportation thoroughfare (along the I-10 Freeway) to ensure efficient
7 and adequate access, and to assist in attracting persons and visitors from 5 to 50 miles
8 of the site. Located about 500 feet to the west of Building 1, this Regional
9 Commercial development is both distant and screened from the Project to provide a
10 buffer between the two properties. These buffering features include a three-railed
11 equestrian fence, pedestrian/equestrian trails, flood control facilities, and a
12 generously landscaped slope/berm topped by a 14-foot block sound wall. The various
13 factors that could result in land use incompatibility (noise, aesthetics, etc.) have been
14 determined to be less than significant, or less than significant with the imposition of
15 mitigation. Specifically, compliance with various mitigation measures and
16 regulatory requirements will further reduce the Project’s impact on the surrounding
17 uses. These measures include (i) enforcement of strict truck idling time limits; (ii)
18 requirements that all fleet vehicles accessing the site during operation must have
19 cleaner burning (year 2010 or newer) engines; (iii) participation in Riverside
20 County’s Rideshare Program; (iv) amenities to encourage alternative transportation
21 options (e.g. electric vehicle charging stations, bike storage and shower/changing
22 facilities, and preferred parking for low-emitting vehicles); and (v) strict noise
23 reduction procedures and regulation specifically designed to reduce impacts on
24 neighboring properties during construction. Based on the Traffic Impact Analysis
25 prepared for the Project, 100 percent of the truck traffic and 80 percent of passenger
26 car traffic generated by the Project would access the site from the west along Cherry
27 Valley Boulevard. This underscores the importance of the Project’s connection and
28 proximity to the I-10 Freeway, versus using roadways in the community of Cherry

1 Valley to the east. Areas located directly west of the Project site are designated within
2 the City of Calimesa General Plan as Residential Low (2–4 dwelling units per acre),
3 Residential Low Medium Rural (4 to 7 dwelling units per acre), and Commercial
4 Regional (FAR 0.75:1). Separate approval is required from the City of Calimesa for
5 off-site drainage and flood improvements. Upon approval, these proposed
6 improvements would be considered consistent with the City’s land use plans.
7 **(RDEIR at 3.10-26)**. Areas northwest of the Project site along the I-10 Freeway
8 include areas designated Light Industrial and Business Park, with the nearest Light
9 Industrial-designated land located in the City of Calimesa, approximately 0.40 mile
10 northwest of the Project site. Residential uses are proposed to the immediate south
11 (Sunny-Cal Specific Plan) and north (Holbert Ranch) of the Project site within the
12 unincorporated community of Cherry Valley. Thus, the surrounding area is
13 experiencing development along the I-10 Freeway. Construction of the Project would
14 be consistent with the industrial designations within the City of Calimesa and
15 Beaumont. Construction of the Project near the I-10 Freeway would also provide a
16 strategic destination for the movement of goods within the region. The Project design
17 will include roadway improvements extending northerly through the site to the
18 existing residential units. In addition, the northerly portion of the site will remain
19 open space, providing a buffer between the existing residential units to the north and
20 the two warehouse buildings. Moreover, the Project will develop 1,823,760 square
21 feet of warehouse uses that will be designed to be eligible for Leadership in Energy
22 and Environmental Design (LEED) Certification. LEED is an internationally
23 recognized certification system that measures how well a building or community
24 performs across all the metrics that matter most: energy savings, water efficiency,
25 carbon dioxide emissions reduction, improved indoor environmental quality, and
26 stewardship of resources and sensitivity to their impacts. The Project will comply
27 with applicable requirements of LEED, and will therefore result in reduced Project
28

1 emissions, which is consistent with the County of Riverside General Plan. **(RDEIR**
2 **at 3.10-27).**

3 Although the Cherry Valley Gateway Policy Area is silent as to non-residential
4 development, the Project meets the goals and policies of the Cherry Valley Gateway
5 Policy Area in the following ways:

6 **1. Preserving Rural Character**

7 Approximately 84.8 acres of the Project site, primarily running along the
8 northern property line (in the rural mountainous and open space zone areas),
9 will be preserved as natural open space, protecting habitat and ridge-line
10 equestrian trails running through the site. The clustering of the development
11 footprint will help preserve the rural character of the area, and will provide a
12 substantial buffer for any future developments to the north. The Project will
13 preserve community uses and access to an informal equestrian and pedestrian
14 trail network running throughout the undeveloped northern section of the site.
15 The Project will also be set back from the street and landscaped in such a
16 manner as to be visually unobtrusive, thereby espousing the rural character
17 of the surrounding environment consistent with the Cherry Valley Gateway
18 Policy Area. Specifically, the two Project buildings will be located up to 48.3
19 feet below grade, and will rise only 41 feet in height, ensuring an
20 unobstructed view towards the foothills located north of the Project site.
21 Additionally, the Project's setback from the mountain ridge and the street will
22 also protect the scenic values of the ridgeline and the landscape, providing
23 continued natural visual relief to the nearby communities. Project buildings
24 would be set back approximately 300 to 575 feet from Cherry Valley
25 Boulevard; approximately 300 feet from the east Project boundary; and
26 approximately 400 feet from the west Project boundary; allowing for
27 generous buffers with extensive landscaping, a berm, a meandering
28 equestrian and pedestrian trail, and a three-railed fence. Additionally, the

1 Project's architecture is purposefully and thoughtfully designed to evoke a
2 rural character, with earth-tone colors and ranch-inspired architectural
3 features. Landscape architecture features will further soften the Project's
4 impact by shielding the site with meandering ranch-inspired fencing, shrubs
5 and trees along the site's western, southern, and eastern elevations and a
6 decorative barn and water tower in recognition of the area's long history of
7 agricultural and equestrian uses. The decorative barn and water tower
8 features would not be functional, but they would screen views of the Project
9 site and provide a focal point to viewers along local roadways, while
10 maintaining and enhancing the rural character of the area. In addition, the
11 barn will serve as a shade structure and trail head for the equestrian and
12 recreation trails. Combined with the Project's overall rural theme featuring
13 western and agricultural architectural elements, these two monuments serve
14 as a visible focal point and welcoming gateway to the Cherry Valley
15 community. The Project would feature on-site trails that connect with
16 existing trails in the northern portion of the site to contribute to the
17 development of the City of Calimesa's trail system. A trailhead would also
18 be constructed in the southwest corner of the site near the water tower and
19 barn, which ties into the trails. The trail along the western margin of the
20 Project site would consist of decomposed granite to accommodate hikers and
21 equestrians, and would connect to the existing trails in the northern portion
22 of the Project site. As a result, the Project will help enhance the County's
23 Conservation and Open Space Resource System, which seeks to preserve a
24 multi-purpose open space system for habitat protection and recreational
25 purposes. The extensive landscaping will soften the Project's look and
26 minimize the visual appearance of the buildings. Specifically, the Project will
27 feature extensive native and drought-tolerant landscaping, including shrubs
28 and trees along the project site's western, southern, and eastern elevations.

1 The landscaping is designed with pockets, rolling terrain, and irregularity to
2 mimic the site's natural setting. (RDEIR at 3.10-33 to 3.10-34).

3 **2. Community Separator**

4 The Cherry Valley Gateway Policy Area was established to serve as a buffer
5 between the communities of Beaumont and Calimesa, and to plan for the
6 development of clustered dwelling units as compared to the neighboring
7 Cherry Valley Policy Area. The large size of the Project site furthers this goal
8 by allowing for vast amounts of open space. The site is approximately 229
9 acres; 84.8 of those acres (36 percent of the site) will remain undeveloped
10 with approximately 70.14 of those acres to be dedicated as open space
11 recreation. The open space area would serve as a community separator. The
12 importance of the Project site as a community separator is especially
13 pronounced given the recent annexation of the Sunny-Cal site into the City
14 of Beaumont. In addition to preserving the natural setting and unobstructed
15 views, the large size of the Project site preserves the area's function as a
16 community separator between the cities of Calimesa and Beaumont. Thus,
17 the Project site, with its large open spaces and visual buffering, serves as a
18 transition between the hard borders of the two cities' districts terminating at
19 the proposed regional commercial center to the west in Calimesa, and the
20 Sunny-Cal development to the south in Beaumont. The location,
21 configuration and design of the Project will allow the Project to blend into
22 the existing landscape despite the large size of the proposed buildings,
23 helping to advance the vision and goals of the Cherry Valley Gateway Policy
24 Area. The natural setting and unobstructed views allow the Project site to
25 serve as a community separator between the cities of Calimesa and Beaumont
26 and as a scenic gateway or "approach" to the Cherry Valley community.
27 Additionally, foothills on the northerly portion of the site and the San
28 Bernardino Mountains serve as a natural southwest-to-northeast divide

1 between Calimesa and Beaumont. The proposed dedication of open space
2 would further enhance this already existing natural constraint and separator.
3 As discussed above, the Project buildings will be set below grade and will be
4 largely obscured by landscaping, so as not to be visible from Cherry Valley
5 Boulevard. **(RDEIR at 3.10-35).**

6 **3. Clustering**

7 The Gateway Policy Area encourages clustering of structures as a means of
8 preserving open space and maintaining the rural character of the area. The
9 Project plans to cluster Buildings 1 and 2 as close as reasonably possible to
10 increase the space that will serve as the Project's natural buffer. Additionally,
11 the 84.8-acres north of the Project's buildings that will remain undeveloped
12 will serve as a buffer between the Project and the scattered, low-density
13 housing in the hills, while also preserving the view of neighboring
14 developments and travelers along Cherry Valley Boulevard of the ridgeline
15 looking north. **(RDEIR at 3.10-35).**

16 **4. Visible Entrance**

17 The Project's architecture, buffer, and landscaping features discussed above
18 help to ensure Cherry Valley Boulevard continues to function as a community
19 separator between Calimesa and Beaumont, and as a scenic gateway or
20 "approach" to the Cherry Valley community. In summary, the Project will
21 help advance the vision of the Cherry Valley Gateway Policy Area, preserve
22 open space, and evoke the rural character of the area by ensuring that
23 buildings are clustered, set back, buffered and generously landscaped. The
24 Project will also further the goals of the Cherry Valley Gateway Policy Area
25 by preserving the natural setting, serving as a buffer and separator between
26 the communities of Calimesa and Beaumont and a "visible entrance" to the
27 Cherry Valley Community, providing architecture that is rural in character
28 and nature, and maintaining existing views of nearby undeveloped area and

1 hillsides. As discussed, the Project would also provide a barn and water tower
2 structure in the southwest corner of the site. Combined with the Project's
3 overall rural theme featuring western and agricultural architectural elements,
4 these two monuments serve as a visible focal point and visible entrance to the
5 Cherry Valley community. The Project will help advance the vision of the
6 Cherry Valley Gateway Policy Area by evoking the rural character and
7 history of the area through contextually appropriate architecture and gateway
8 features, by preserving open space, and by providing generously landscaped
9 buffers and clustering of the buildings. Further, by maintaining the natural
10 setting on this large site, the Project will advance the goal of the Cherry
11 Valley Gateway Policy Area to be separator between the communities of
12 Calimesa and Beaumont, maintaining existing views of nearby undeveloped
13 area and hillsides. **(RDEIR at 3.10-35).**

14 The Project will also be consistent with all Good Neighbor Guidelines for
15 Siting New and/or Modified Warehouse/Distribution Facilities, as discussed
16 at **RDEIR pages 3.10-36 to 3.10-3.10-39.**

17 *City of Calimesa General Plan Consistency*

18 **RDEIR Table 3.10-4** contains only those policies from the City of Calimesa General
19 Plan that are relevant to the drainage/water quality facilities that would be installed
20 on the parcels located within the City of Calimesa. As shown within **RDEIR Table**
21 **3.10-4**, the Project will be consistent with all applicable City of Calimesa General
22 Plan policies. **(RDEIR at 3.10-32).**

23 *SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan*

24 As indicated in **RDEIR Table 3.10-5**, the Project will be consistent with all
25 applicable SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan policies related to preservation of
26 open space, protection of biological and cultural resources, hydrology and water
27 quality, water efficiency, energy efficiency, air quality, and siting of developments
28 to reduce vehicle miles traveled. **(RDEIR at 3.10-39 to 3.10-41).**

1 SCAG 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

2 As shown in **RDEIR Table 3.10-6**, the Project will be consistent with all SCAG
3 policies related to the goals of sustaining mobility with the goals of fostering
4 economic development, enhancing the environment, reducing energy consumption,
5 promoting transportation-friendly development patterns, and encouraging fair and
6 equitable access to residents affected by socio-economic, geographic and
7 commercial limitations. The Project will generate jobs and will include numerous
8 building efficiency measures, and will facilitate efficient regional goods movement
9 by concentrating such goods along the I-10 Freeway, a major travel corridor. The
10 proposed Project would make various improvements to Cherry Valley Boulevard,
11 and would make financial contributions to the regional and local transportation
12 system through payment of DIF and TUMF fees, as well as fair share contributions
13 to such improvements. Combined, these actions will sustain and improve the regional
14 and local transportation system. (**RDEIR at 3.10-42 to 3.10-43**). Therefore, the
15 Project will not conflict with any applicable land use plan or policy, and impacts will
16 be less than significant. Refer also to **Final EIR Section 03-00, Responses to**
17 **CVAN-7, -9, -12, and SIERRA-33**.

18 **Impact:** *Habitat or Natural Community Conservation Plans.*

19 **Threshold:** *The Project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan*
20 *or natural community conservation plan.*

21 3. Project Impact(s):

22 As discussed in **RDEIR Section 3.4**, Biological Resources, the Project site is located
23 within the Pass Area Plan of the MSHCP; however, it is not located within any
24 Criteria Cell. A July 2015 MSHCP Consistency Analysis was conducted for the
25 Project. Based on the results of the MSHCP Consistency Analysis, the Project will
26 not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish
27 or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors,
28 or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, the Project would not conflict

1 with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation
2 plan. (RDEIR at 3.10-45).

3 **G. Mineral Resources.**

4 *Impact: Loss of Known Mineral Resource.*

5 *Threshold: The Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral*
6 *resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State.*

7 1. Project Impact(s):

8 The Project site does not contain any known mineral resources. The County of
9 Riverside 2015 General Plan's Multipurpose Open Space Element (Figure OS-6)
10 identifies most of western Riverside County, where there are no known mineral
11 resources, as being within MRZ-3. Areas with this designation are described as areas
12 where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to
13 exist; however, the significance of the deposit is undetermined. The County of
14 Riverside General Plan provides no specific policies regarding property identified as
15 "MRZ-3" and does not designate the Project site for mineral resource-related uses
16 (for example, MRZ-2b, which comprises areas where the available geologic
17 information indicates that there is a likelihood of significant mineral deposits). There
18 is no indication that the Project site contains any mineral resources that would be of
19 value to the region or residents of the State. The proposed Project site is also not
20 located adjacent to a state-classified or designated area or existing surface mine. The
21 land adjacent to the Project site to the north, south, east and west does not have an
22 Open Space-Mineral Resource (OS-MIN) land use designation, which allows for
23 mineral extraction and processing facilities. Further, in no way will either the
24 construction or operation of the Project impact any ongoing mining operations. The
25 Project does not propose any quarries or mines on-site. There are no existing quarries
26 or mines on-site that were identified in any of the technical reports prepared for the
27 Project site. Additionally, the County of Riverside does not designate the site as
28 having mineral resources in either the General Plan land use or zoning designations

1 for the Project site. The Project site does not have an Open Space-Mineral Resource
2 (OS-MIN) land use designation, which would allow for mineral extraction and
3 processing facilities. The Project would not expose people or property to hazards
4 from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines. Therefore, impacts are
5 considered less than significant. (RDEIR at 3.11-3 to 3.11-4).

6 **Impact:** *Loss of Mineral Resource Recovery Site.*

7 **Threshold:** *The Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important*
8 *mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other*
9 *land use plan.*

10 2. Project Impact(s):

11 There are no known aggregate resources within the surrounding region, nor is the
12 Project area designated as a resource recovery site. Furthermore, there is no evidence
13 that the Project site or Project area contain significant resources, which is
14 demonstrated by its MRZ-3a classification in the County of Riverside General Plan.
15 Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally
16 important mineral resource recovery site. (RDEIR at 3.11-4).

17 **H. Noise.**

18 **Impact:** *Groundborne Vibration.*

19 **Threshold:** *The Project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive*
20 *groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.*

21 1. Project Impact(s):

22 During construction, the most vibration-causing piece of equipment that will likely be used
23 on-site is the large vibratory roller. Because of the proximity of the homes located
24 adjacent to the site to the west and southeast of the Project site, construction activities
25 may result in groundborne vibration that is annoying, but is not expected to result in
26 building damage, pursuant to FTA damage criteria. The nearest residences are
27 located approximately 110 feet from the construction area footprint. At this distance,
28 operation of even the heaviest equipment that would be operating on the Project site

1 would result in maximum groundborne vibration levels of up to 0.023 PPV. This is
2 well below the FTA's damage threshold criteria of 0.12 PPV for even the most fragile
3 structures. Human perception to vibration starts at levels as low as 67 VdB.
4 Annoyance due to vibration in residential settings starts at approximately 70 VdB.
5 Residences are included under Land Use Category 2 (as defined by FTA) and
6 infrequent vibration events are considered acceptable up to 80 VdB at the receiving
7 use. Large vibratory rollers used during construction would be expected to generate
8 94 VdB within 25 feet of the equipment. The nearest residences are located
9 approximately 110 feet from the construction area footprint where the heaviest
10 construction equipment would potentially operate. At this distance, vibration levels
11 could range up to approximately 74 VdB. These levels are below the FTA's 80 VdB
12 threshold that is considered to be acceptable for infrequent events. Furthermore, any
13 annoyance would only occur during site grading and preparation activities, and
14 would therefore be intermittent and temporary in nature. Also the VdB level would
15 decrease as site grading operations move further away from the closest residences.
16 The restriction on permissible hours of construction would further ensure that
17 perceptible vibration does not occur within the most sensitive nighttime hours.
18 Therefore, construction activities would not result in exposure of persons to or
19 generation of excessive groundborne vibration levels. (RDEIR at 3.12-27). Based
20 on the data shown in RDEIR Table 3.12-2, loaded trucks are not anticipated to
21 exceed 0.076 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV) or 86 VdB at 25 feet. These
22 vibration levels are below the normal perception level and well below the possible
23 FTA damage criteria thresholds. In addition, all off-site structures are located more
24 than 25 feet from proposed Project travel ways. Therefore, Project operational
25 vibration levels would not exceed groundborne noise or groundborne vibration
26 thresholds. Impacts associated with construction and operational vibration would be
27 considered less than significant. (RDEIR at 3.12-28).

28 **Impact:** *Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.*

1 **Threshold:** *The Project would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise*
2 *levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project.*

3
4 2. Project Impact(s):

5 As shown in **RDEIR Tables 3.12-9, Table 3.12-10, Table 3.12-11, and Table 3.12-**
6 **12**, modeling results show that Project-generated vehicle noise on area-wide
7 roadways would result in a maximum increase of up to 1.6 dBA in traffic noise levels
8 with implementation of the Project, compared to traffic noise levels existing without
9 the Project. This increase would occur under Horizon (year 2040) plus Project traffic
10 conditions. The County of Riverside considers a permanent increase of 5 dBA or
11 greater to be a substantial increase. Typically, any value less than 3 dBA is
12 considered imperceptible. Therefore, an increase of 1.6 dBA is not considered
13 substantial, and Project-generated traffic noise would result in a less than significant
14 impact on off-site sensitive receptors along area-wide roadways. (**RDEIR at 3.12-**
15 **28 to 3.12-31**).

16 **I. Population and Housing.**

17 **Impact:** *Population Growth.*

18 **Threshold:** *The Project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either*
19 *directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example,*
20 *through extension of roads or other infrastructure).*

21 1. Project Impact(s):

22 The Project proposes the construction of two warehouse buildings, totaling approximately
23 1.8 million square feet of floor area. The Project would generate approximately 518
24 full-time direct equivalent employees, 116 indirect employees, and 115 induced
25 employees for a total of 748 permanent, full-time employees. Construction would
26 also generate approximately 577 short-term employees (direct, indirect, and
27 induced). Most of the new jobs would be filled by local residents, due to the current
28 economic climate of the region. The Pass Area had an 11.5 percent unemployment

1 rate in 2013. Since existing and planned residential development included in the
2 County of Riverside General Plan would be capable of accommodating growth from
3 the Project, no cumulative impacts are expected with respect to potential population
4 increases that may result from the employment generated by the Project.
5 Furthermore, the population growth from the Project's employees would be below
6 the 2020 and 2035 SCAG projections for unincorporated Riverside County of 43,500
7 and 58,100, respectively. Potential impacts would not be deemed cumulatively
8 considerable, and therefore, would be less than significant. The Project is not located
9 in a Redevelopment Area. Accordingly, the Project would not impact any County
10 Redevelopment project area. Additionally, planned operations from the site will not
11 cause off-site impacts to any Redevelopment Areas. Impacts related to population
12 growth would therefore be less than significant. (RDEIR, p. 3.13-5.)

13 ***Impact:*** *Housing Displacement/Replacement Housing.*

14 ***Threshold:*** *The Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing,*
15 *necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.*

16 1. Project Impact(s):

17 Existing housing near the Project site consists of a few residences north and west of
18 the Project site. A mobile-home park is located approximately 0.26 mile west of the
19 site, off Calimesa Boulevard. East of the Project site is a mix of properties used for
20 agriculture purposes and large-lot, rural single-family development. The Project
21 would not result in the displacement of housing because no housing exists on the
22 Project site. Additionally, the Project would not restrict access for local residents, as
23 the Project includes the construction of a public right-of-way ("A Street") that would
24 allow existing residents north of the site to access their homes. Thus, housing north
25 of the site would not be impacted. During the construction phase, the Project is
26 estimated to create approximately 577 jobs in Riverside County, including direct,
27 indirect, and induced jobs. The City of Calimesa would capture approximately 18 of
28 these construction jobs. These jobs would be temporary in nature, and primarily filled

1 by local residents; thus, the Project construction phase would not create a demand
2 for any additional housing. The Fiscal and Economic Benefits Study estimated the
3 potential range of direct, indirect, and induced (permanent) jobs that would be
4 created by the operation of the Project during operation. Job estimates are based on
5 Project square footage, local comparable industry employee-per-square-foot
6 assumptions, and fiscal analysis in the 2015 Kosmont Report prepared for this
7 Project. As shown in **RDEIR Table 3.13-3**, the Project would create a substantial
8 number of direct, permanent jobs, as well as additional indirect and induced jobs.
9 The creation of approximately 748 new jobs (including 507 permanent on-site, full-
10 time-equivalent (FTE) jobs, and 241 off-site indirect and induced jobs) is not
11 anticipated to have a significant impact regarding a demand for additional housing,
12 particularly affordable housing. Furthermore, most of the new jobs would be filled
13 by local residents, due to the current economic climate of the region. The jobs in
14 question do not require unique or special skills that would need employees to relocate
15 from other areas. According to the Economic Impact report, the Pass Area had an
16 11.5 percent unemployment rate in 2013, down from 17.6 percent in 2010.
17 Additionally, the Pass Area's jobs-to-housing ratio is approximately 0.598, which
18 reflects the availability of local jobs for each occupied home in a community. The
19 Pass Area is far below the 1.102 ratio for the Inland Empire or the 1.168 ratio for all
20 of Southern California. The Project would provide local jobs to the surrounding area
21 and would help improve the existing jobs-to-housing ratio. Thus, any local housing
22 needs would be met by existing housing stock. Therefore, it is anticipated that a large
23 portion of the permanent jobs created would be filled by persons already living in the
24 Project area, and housing would be sufficient. Thus, a less than significant impact to
25 housing demand is anticipated. (**RDEIR, p. 3.13-7.**)

26 **J. Public Services.**

27 ***Impact: Fire Protection.***

28

1 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation will not result in substantial adverse*
2 *physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government*
3 *facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction*
4 *of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable*
5 *service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection.*

6 1. Project Impact(s):

7 County Fire Station 21 (the closest fire station to the Project at 2.65 miles to the
8 northwest) currently has a response time of 7 minutes and 5 seconds. County Fire
9 Station 22, located 2.75 miles from the Project site, has a total response time of 7
10 minutes and 43 seconds. All other local fire stations are located at greater distances
11 from the site and would have longer response times. None of the engines/truck(s)
12 required would be able to reach the site in under 6 minutes and 30 seconds, and would
13 therefore not meet the suburban response time goal. This existing response time
14 deficit would exist even without development of the Project. Thus, the Project would
15 potentially contribute to existing cumulative impacts to response times within the
16 area. The Project will be required to pay its "fair share" contribution into the
17 County's development impact fee program. The current County development impact
18 fees (DIF) rates for Fire Protection Facilities within the Pass Area Plan are \$1,779
19 per acre of industrial development. Based on the Project's planned 1,823,760 square
20 feet, the Project would be assessed approximately \$291,743 in development impact
21 fees, with additional Fire Mitigation Fees set at \$0.25 per square foot of non-
22 residential development. Fire Mitigation Fees are estimated at approximately
23 \$455,940, and would ultimately be finalized during the land development review
24 process by RCFD Emergency Services Engineering and Planning Staff located at
25 TLMA Permit Assistance Centers. Total Project fees related to fire protection and
26 related infrastructure would be approximately \$747,683. The Applicant would be
27 required to submit payment of such fees prior to issuance of occupancy permits.
28 Payment of these fees is mandatory and is therefore not included as mitigation. The

1 Project would not require the provision of new or physically altered fire protection
2 facilities on its own. Based on the adopted Riverside County Fire Protection Master
3 Plan, one new fire station and/or engine company is recommended for every 2,000
4 new dwelling units and/or 3.5 million square feet of commercial/industrial
5 occupancy. The Project's square footage would not meet this threshold, and therefore
6 would not trigger the need to create new or physically altered fire protection
7 facilities, based on County standards. Although the Project would generate an
8 incremental increase for fire and emergency service, the Project's contribution to the
9 existing response time deficiency would be rendered less than cumulatively
10 considerable with the payment of development impact and mitigation fees. In
11 addition, the Project will be developed in conformance with all applicable RCFD and
12 building code standards to meet fire flow/pressure requirements and emergency
13 access requirements. The two Project buildings would include internal sprinkler
14 systems for additional fire suppression. Furthermore, the Project would indirectly
15 contribute to the RCFD's ability to improve response times by contributing to the
16 County's DIF and Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) fee programs and
17 by constructing interim improvements at the Cherry Valley Boulevard/I-10 Freeway
18 interchange. Such program contributions and improvements would aid in reducing
19 existing traffic impacts. Therefore, impacts to fire services are considered less than
20 significant and no mitigation is required. (RDEIR at 3.14-10 to 3.14-12).

21 **Impact:** *Police/Sheriff Protection.*

22 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation will not result in substantial adverse*
23 *physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental*
24 *facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of*
25 *which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable*
26 *service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police/sheriff protection.*

27 1. Project Impact(s):

28 During some of the construction period, construction fencing will be placed along

1 the perimeter of the property, and full-time security personnel will monitor the site
2 and its contents. The completed Project will include permanent fencing, and all of
3 the truck parking areas will be gated. During ongoing operations, the center and its
4 occupants may choose to use in-house or third-party security personnel to monitor
5 the perimeter and interior of the grounds. Security cameras, alarms and other systems
6 may be implemented. In addition, the deployment of high security check-in and
7 checkout procedures may be used to ensure the security of the goods kept within the
8 center. Those procedures may include screening, metal detectors and or inspections
9 of personnel and or visitors. The Riverside County Sheriff's Department (RCSD)
10 provides law enforcement services. To maintain adequate funding for law
11 enforcement facilities, the County has implemented the Development Impact Fee
12 Program. This fee can be used to pay for one-time capital improvements, such as the
13 purchase of land and equipment or the construction of new facilities. The Project will
14 be required to pay the established development mitigation fee prior to issuance of a
15 certificate of occupancy for the Project buildings. Warehouse uses typically do not
16 generate a substantial number of law enforcement service calls, compared with
17 residential or commercial uses. Based on the nature of the Project and the security
18 measures described above, the Project is not anticipated to impact service ratios or
19 response times such that additional RCSD facilities would need to be constructed.
20 RCSD was provided with a copy of the January 6, 2014 Notice of Preparation and
21 did not indicate any concerns with respect to increased service calls, service call
22 response times, or the need to construct additional RCSD facilities as a result of the
23 proposed Project. The County of Riverside requires the Project to pay Development
24 Impact Fees that will be used to obtain additional staffing and/or equipment in order
25 to offset any of the potential increases in enforcement service calls. The current
26 County DIF rate for Criminal Justice Public Facilities is \$1,925 per acre of industrial
27 development. Thus, the Project would be required to pay approximately \$315,686 to
28 offset incremental impacts to police protection services. Payment of these fees is

1 mandatory and is therefore not included as mitigation. The Project will not require
2 new construction or physical alteration of existing law enforcement facilities, and
3 impacts to Sheriff services are anticipated to be less than significant. (RDEIR at
4 3.14-12 to 3.14-13).

5 ***Impact: Schools.***

6 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation will not result in substantial adverse*
7 *physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental*
8 *facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of*
9 *which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable*
10 *service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools.*

11 1. **Project Impact(s):**

12 The Project does not propose land uses that would directly generate new student
13 enrollment at existing schools. However, the Project could indirectly add students by
14 creating new employment opportunities that may entice new residents to move into
15 the area. However, it is anticipated that the vast majority of the new positions will be
16 filled from existing residents in the area, as opposed to creating positions that require
17 a specific skill-set that necessitates the hiring of individuals from outside the region.
18 At present, there is capacity for additional students at Beaumont Unified School
19 District (BUSD) facilities; however, the BUSD anticipates that this capacity will be
20 insufficient to accommodate expected student growth over the next several years.
21 The pace of home construction in the BUSD is expected to increase significantly, as
22 several projects are in the preliminary and active planning stages and are awaiting
23 approval to begin construction. No homes are proposed as part of the Project, and as
24 detailed below, school impact fees will be paid by the Project to offset potential
25 impacts. Further, as addressed above, it is anticipated that the vast majority of the
26 new positions will be filled from existing residents in the area. Thus, it is not expected
27 that a substantial quantity of new school-aged children will relocate within the BUSD
28 boundary as a result of the Project, as a majority of future employees will already

1 reside within the area and will not have to relocate. The Project site falls within the
2 boundaries of the BUSD. The BUSD currently imposes fees of \$0.54 per square foot
3 for commercial/industrial projects. Additionally, SB 50 mandates that school-related
4 impacts are covered by lawful payment of required school impact fees. Based on the
5 Project's planned 1,823,760 square feet, the Project would be assessed
6 approximately \$984,830 in school impact fees (1,823,760 square feet multiplied by
7 \$0.54 per square foot of commercial square footage). Payment of these fees is
8 mandatory and therefore is not included as mitigation. The Project will be required
9 to pay these fees, which shall serve to reduce any impacts to school facilities to less
10 than significant. (RDEIR at 3.14-14).

11 ***Impact: Parks.***

12 ***Threshold: Project construction and implementation will not result in substantial adverse***
13 ***physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental***
14 ***facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of***
15 ***which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable***
16 ***service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks.***

17 1. **Project Impact(s):**

18 There is a potential for the Project to draw new residents to the Project area because
19 of the new employment opportunities. Although the exact number of new residents
20 is speculative, the increase is not expected to substantially increase demands on
21 existing neighborhood or regional parks, because it is not anticipated that a
22 substantial number of new residents would be drawn to the Project area for the new
23 jobs. Further, since most positions would be filled by employees already living
24 within the local region, it is assumed that these employees would already be utilizing
25 local recreational opportunities and parks. Regardless, even if all new positions
26 generated by the Project were filled with out-of-area employees, it would not be
27 sufficient to negatively impact any parks. Employees of the Project would not be
28 expected to utilize park facilities during the workday. Therefore, the Project would

1 have a less than significant impact with respect to parks. **(RDEIR at 3.14-15).**

2 ***Impact: Other Public Facilities.***

3 ***Threshold: Project construction and implementation will not result in substantial adverse***
4 ***physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental***
5 ***facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of***
6 ***which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable***
7 ***service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for other public facilities,***
8 ***such as libraries or health services.***

9 2. Project Impact(s):

10 It is anticipated that the vast majority of the new jobs generated by the Project will be filled
11 from existing residents in the area. Thus, it is not expected that a substantial quantity
12 of people will relocate within the County Library system's service area as a result of
13 the Project, as a majority of future employees will already reside within the area and
14 will not have to relocate. Furthermore, employees of the Project would not be
15 expected to utilize library services during working hours. Based on the current ratio
16 of residents to library facilities, the Project's modest increase in new residential
17 population will represent only a nominal shift in square foot of library space per
18 capita in the County. Therefore, the Project is anticipated to have a less than
19 significant impact related to library services. There are approximately 18 hospitals
20 in the overall County area. As previously addressed, it is anticipated that the vast
21 majority of the new positions will be filled from existing residents in the area. Thus,
22 it is not expected that a substantial quantity of people will relocate within these
23 hospitals' general service area as a result of the Project, as a majority of future
24 employees will already reside within the area and will not have to relocate. Based on
25 the current ratio of residents to hospitals, the Project's modest increase in new
26 residential population will represent only a nominal shift in hospital facilities per
27 capita in the County. Therefore, the Project is anticipated to have a less than
28 significant impact with regard to health services. **(RDEIR at 3.14-16).**

1 **K. Recreation.**

2 *Impact: Physical Deterioration of Recreation Facilities*

3 *Threshold: The Project would not include the use of existing neighborhood or regional*
4 *parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the*
5 *facility would occur or be accelerated.*

6 1. Project Impact(s):

7 The Project is located within the unincorporated community of Cherry Valley within
8 Riverside County. The Project is located within a Community Service Area (CSA)
9 for lighting only, and does not lie within a CSA for recreation. The Beaumont-Cherry
10 Valley Recreation and Park District operates within the Cherry Valley/Beaumont
11 area. The District does not have a Community Parks and Recreation Plan. Thus, the
12 Project will have a less than significant impact regarding a CSA for recreation, or a
13 recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan. As shown
14 in The Pass Area Plan, Figure 8, Trails and Bikeway System, there are no County
15 trails located on the Project site. However, the City of Calimesa has a Proposed
16 Multi-Use Trail System that includes several trailheads and trails categorized as
17 “Unknown” within the Project site. Once developed, the Multi-Use Trail System will
18 offer a variety of recreational options. The trails will be designed to incorporate the
19 existing historic trails while preserving sensitive open space using linear strips of
20 open space, public easements, and floodplains. Various types of trails will be
21 provided for walkers, joggers, bicyclists, and equestrians. Currently, the Project site
22 contains some informal trails that traverse the Project site. The Project would feature
23 on-site trails that connect with existing trails in the northern portion of the site to
24 contribute to the development of the City of Calimesa’s trail system. Employees
25 associated with the Project are not anticipated to have a significant impact on
26 recreational trails, because the Project is not expected to significantly increase the
27 local population, and employees would not be expected to utilize these trails during
28 the workday. Currently, the closest recreational resources to the Project site are the

1 athletic fields at Beaumont High School located approximately 2 miles east.
2 Residents in the Project area use parks, recreational facilities, and programs provided
3 by the County of Riverside and surrounding communities, including Beaumont and
4 Calimesa. The Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District does not
5 expect a significant use impact from the Project on the area's recreational facilities.
6 Furthermore, the Project would feature on-site trails that connect with existing trails
7 in the northern portion of the site, to contribute to the development of the City of
8 Calimesa's trail system. Easements for these trails would be donated/dedicated to a
9 responsible entity to be determined prior to Project approval. A Memorandum of
10 Understanding has been entered into for this purpose between the Project applicant
11 and the Rivers and Land Conservancy (formerly the Riverside Land Conservancy).
12 **(See Final EIR, Section 03-00, Response to SIERRA-46).** A 10-foot-wide
13 decomposed granite trail section would be constructed along the Project frontage on
14 the northern side of Cherry Valley Boulevard to accommodate pedestrians and
15 equestrians. A trailhead would also be constructed in the southwest corner of the site,
16 near the decorative water tower and barn features. Another decomposed granite trail
17 would be provided along the western margin of the Project site to accommodate
18 hikers and equestrians, and would connect to the existing trails in the northern portion
19 of the Project site. Development of trail access is not anticipated to have a significant
20 impact on the environment, due to the limited nature of the improvements. The
21 Project would not otherwise include the use of existing neighborhood or regional
22 parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the
23 facility would occur or be accelerated. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.
24 **(RDEIR at 3.15-5 to 3.15-6).**

25 ***Impact:*** *Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities*

26 ***Threshold:*** *The Project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction*
27 *or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the*
28 *environment.*

1 1. Project Impact(s):

2 There are ample park facilities in the vicinity of the Project site; therefore, the Project
3 would not include any recreational facilities. Because no parks or parkland are
4 proposed as part of the Project, it is not anticipated that the Project would result in
5 substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the development of new park
6 facilities. The closest park to the Project area is Noble Creek Park, which is located
7 on Oak Valley Parkway, west of Beaumont Avenue, approximately 2.2 miles
8 southeast of the Project site. There is also a small natural park (Edgar Canyon Nature
9 Park), approximately 2.4 miles east of the Project site, located northeast of the
10 intersection of Cherry Valley Boulevard and Beaumont Avenue. There is a potential
11 for the Project to draw new residents to the Project area because of the new
12 employment opportunities. Although the exact number of new residents is
13 speculative, the increase is not expected to substantially increase demands on
14 existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities, because it is
15 not anticipated that a substantial number of new residents would be drawn to the
16 Project area for the new jobs. Further, since most positions would be filled by
17 employees already living within the local region, it is assumed that these employees
18 would already be utilizing local recreational opportunities and parks. Regardless,
19 even if all new positions generated by the Project were filled with out-of-area
20 employees, it would not be sufficient to negatively impact any parks. Employees of
21 the Project would not be expected to utilize recreational facilities during the workday.
22 Therefore, the Project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational
23 facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. **(RDEIR**
24 **at 3.15-6 to 3.15-9).**

25 **L. Transportation and Circulation.**

26 ***Impact:*** *Conflict with Congestion Management Program.*

27 ***Threshold:*** *The Project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management*
28 *program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand*

1 *measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for*
2 *designated roads or highways.*

3 1. Project Impact(s):

4 According to the 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program (CMP),
5 Table 2-1, CMP System of Highways and Roadways, the roads adjacent to the
6 Project site (Cherry Valley Boulevard and Calimesa Boulevard) are not listed as part
7 of the CMP System of Highways and Roadways. The I-10 Freeway is located
8 approximately 0.35 of a mile west of the Project site. However, that portion of I-10
9 within the vicinity of the Project site is not listed as being part of the CMP System
10 of Highways in Riverside County. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the
11 Riverside County CMP, and potential impacts would be less than significant.
12 **(RDEIR at 3.16-95).**

13 ***Impact: Public Transit, Bikeways or Pedestrian Facilities.***

14 ***Threshold: The Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs***
15 ***regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially***
16 ***decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.***

17 1. Project Impact(s):

18 There are no existing public transit stops, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities at the
19 Project site or in the area. The Project will not impact any local or regional bike trail,
20 as is demonstrated by Figure C-6, Bikeways and Trails Plan, of the County of
21 Riverside General Plan, and Figure 8 in The Pass Area Plan. The Pass Transit System
22 provided by the City of Beaumont includes Routes 3, 4, 7, and 9, which come within
23 2 miles of the Project site at closest approach. As this Project and the surrounding
24 area develop, the Riverside Transit Authority (RTA) and the Pass Transit System
25 may reassess the potential demand for these facilities in the area, and may establish
26 new or extended routes near the Project area. Development coordination with RTA
27 and the Pass Transit System will determine the need for future bus turnouts. The
28 design of the Project includes curbs and sidewalks where required, thereby

1 encouraging alternate methods of transportation for future development.
2 Development of the Project will comply with the development standards for the
3 County of Riverside. These standards require sidewalks, and all access will be in
4 compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards for accessibility.
5 (RDEIR at 3.16-105). Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

6 **M. Utilities and Service Systems.**

7 *Impact: Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities.*

8 *Threshold: Project construction and implementation will not require or result in the*
9 *construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing*
10 *facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.*

11 1. Project Impact(s):

12 As determined in the WSA prepared for the Project, the Project's average daily
13 drinking water demands are estimated at 42,840 gallons per day (gpd) (61 Equivalent
14 Dwelling Units), although this calculation will be updated prior to issuing occupancy
15 permits in order to determine the exact number of fixture units constructed. Recycled
16 water for landscape irrigation was estimated to be 12.35 million gallons per year,
17 based on similar landscaped areas of commercial projects. However, it is important
18 to note that the WSA was prepared using different calculations that were based on a
19 larger project with approximately 736,240 more square feet of buildings onsite. Thus,
20 the WSA provided very conservative estimates relative to the currently proposed
21 Project. The updated Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report contained in
22 RDEIR Appendix B estimates water consumption for outdoor use of approximately
23 8.99 million gallons per year (compared to the 12.35 million gallons per year
24 estimated by the WSA), and indoor water consumption of 11.36 million gallons a
25 year, for a total of 20.35 million gallons per year. This represents a more realistic
26 estimate of water usage than is contained in the WSA, because it is based on the
27 currently proposed, smaller project size. The estimated quantity of recycled water
28 used for irrigation purposes is expected to be even further reduced, based on the

1 application of Riverside County Ordinance No. 859, which requires efficient use of
2 water for landscaped areas. The WSA determined that through buildout, YVWD can
3 provide a reliable supply to serve the community, including the proposed Project,
4 despite growing demands. In the near term, YVWD will stabilize its demands on the
5 groundwater basins, continue developing recycled water, and use surface waters for
6 direct delivery and conjunctive use programs. Based on the WSA, the proposed
7 Project and its associated fixtures will be equivalent to 61 "Equivalent Dwelling
8 Units." Based on the current General Plan designations of Rural Mountain and Very
9 Low Density Residential, up to 216 single-family residences could be constructed on
10 the Project site (based on gross acreage). Therefore, the water usage from buildout
11 of the Project site was already indirectly accounted for within the 2015 San
12 Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan (RUWMP), based on
13 current General Plan assumptions for the site, which would likely result in greater
14 water demand than the currently proposed Project. Water demand (and consequently
15 sewer demand) of warehouse uses are also usually much less than residential uses,
16 since employees in such facilities are not typically using water for household
17 applications such as cooking, bathing, laundry, dishes, etc. A 24-inch-diameter water
18 pipeline has been installed in Calimesa Boulevard from Singleton Road to
19 approximately 2,700 feet south, where the 24-inch-diameter pipe turns west crossing
20 under the I-10 Freeway. A connection is proposed at the angle point where the 24-
21 inch-diameter water pipeline turns. An 8-inch-diameter water pipeline will have
22 sufficient capacity to serve the equivalent of 61 dwelling units. However, the fire
23 flow needed for the building will exceed the water pipeline capacity. Thus, the
24 needed pipe size is 16-inch-diameter with maximum velocity of 6.38 feet per second.
25 In addition, two water storage tanks, each with a capacity of 1 million gallons are
26 proposed on the northeastern portion of the Project site. The Project would provide
27 the concrete pads and access to the future water tanks to the Water District. While it
28 is speculative if or when the YVWD would develop the water tanks, and the on-site

1 water tanks would not serve the Project directly, it would potentially serve other
2 properties within the YVWD service area, and therefore would be considered a
3 public benefit. As new development is proposed, YVWD will require capital-funding
4 contributions though impact fees, which offset development's demands for
5 groundwater and surface water supply infrastructure. Ultimately, YVWD will be able
6 to serve its customers' drinking water needs through groundwater or surface water,
7 a strategy known as conjunctive use. This allows YVWD to insulate itself from
8 periodic drought by using available surface waters in wetter years and relying more
9 on groundwater in dryer years when surface water is scarce. Surface supply
10 availability from the State Water Project, San Bernardino Basin Bunker Hill Pressure
11 Zone, Seven Oaks Dam, Mill Creek, and Santa Ana River can be used
12 interchangeably, depending upon local and statewide hydrology, to supplement a
13 stable local groundwater yield. Additionally, the YVWD will incorporate recycled
14 water delivery systems into new development to meet irrigation demands with
15 recycled water. Recycled water will give YVWD a new local source of water of high
16 reliability, thereby lessening the dependence on imported sources and increasing
17 reliability of total supply. Overall, as noted in the 2015 RUWMP, there are sufficient
18 water resources to meet YVWD's current and projected growth in demands,
19 including the proposed Project and other projected development through 2040. Based
20 on the conservative determination by the YVWD in the WSA for the larger,
21 previously considered project, the currently proposed Project's water needs will be
22 adequately met by existing and future supplies. The Project would be required to
23 comply with all requirements of the YVWD, as outlined in the Preliminary Project
24 Service Evaluation (**RDEIR Appendix G**). The proposed Project will be required to
25 connect with existing water mains currently serving the Project area; however, the
26 Project's water needs will not result in the construction of new YVWD water
27 treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. With regard to wastewater
28 treatment, the Project includes two water quality basins that are included as part of

1 the Site Specific Water Quality Management Plan. The primary function of these
2 basins is to mitigate the stormwater impacts caused by developing the Project site.
3 The Henry N. Wochholz Regional Water Recycling Facility (WRWRF) has a current
4 overall capacity of 8.0 million gallons per day, based on the 2015 RUWMP.
5 Currently, an average of approximately 4 million gallons per day of wastewater is
6 treated by the WRWRF. The estimated wastewater generation of the proposed
7 Project is 8.91 million gallons per year. According to YVWD records, there is an
8 existing 8-inch-diameter gravity sewer main and a 6- inch-diameter sewer force main
9 that turn easterly approximately 2,250 feet south of Singleton Road intersection. The
10 Project would utilize this connection point if the slope were feasible for the off-site
11 sewer main, which will be verified as development plans are finalized. There is also
12 an existing sewer within Calimesa Boulevard near the Calimesa Country Club
13 (Trailer Park). However, the size, slope, and condition of this existing sewer are
14 unknown at this time. If the existing sewer within Calimesa Boulevard has capacity,
15 the connection point may be moved southerly in front of the Trailer Park. An 8-inch-
16 diameter gravity sewer main has sufficient capacity to serve the equivalent of 61
17 dwelling units. Upon completion of further feasibility studies, either the existing 8-
18 inch-diameter connection or the existing connection near the Trailer Park within
19 Calimesa Boulevard would be utilized, and either connection would sufficiently
20 serve the site. As discussed, one (or both) of the sewer main connections has
21 sufficient capacity to serve the Project, and the Project is not anticipated to generate
22 wastewater in quantities such that a new wastewater treatment facility would need to
23 be constructed. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact.
24 **(RDEIR at 3.17-21 to 3.17-23).**

25 ***Impact:*** *New or Expanded Storm Water Drainage Facilities.*

26 ***Threshold:*** *The Project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water*
27 *drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause*
28 *significant environmental effects.*

1 2. Project Impact(s):

2 The proposed Project will include on-site stormwater drainage facilities designed to
3 convey and capture on-site surface flows, as well as those off-site flows that would
4 traverse the Project site. As included in the Off-site Hydrology Analysis for Tentative
5 Parcel Map 36564, two drainage areas exist on-site: Drainage areas “A” and “B.”
6 The proposed Project includes a number of drainage facilities designed to limit the
7 storm flow resulting from Project activities, as discussed at **RDEIR page 3.17-24**.
8 Off-site drainage improvements and on-site detention basins will be incorporated as
9 described on **RDEIR pages 3.17-24 to 3.17-25**. As designed, the detention basin in
10 conjunction with infiltration BMPs will limit the 2-year, 24-hour storm runoff,
11 reducing the potential for off-site erosion. Thus, although the proposed Project will
12 require development of new stormwater drainage facilities on the Project site, these
13 improvements will be located within the Project’s development footprint, and,
14 therefore, impacts associated with the construction and operation of these facilities
15 are analyzed as part of the environmental impact analysis contained within the
16 RDEIR. No additional off-site stormwater drainage facilities, the construction of
17 which could cause significant environmental effects, will be required to convey and
18 contain on-site and adjacent surface flows. (**RDEIR at 3.17-25**).

19 ***Impact: Water Supply.***

20 ***Threshold: The Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project***
21 ***from existing entitlements and resources, and new or expanded entitlements would not be***
22 ***required.***

23 3. Project Impact(s):

24 The WSA prepared for the Project concluded that YVWD can provide a reliable water
25 supply to serve the community, including the Project, despite growing demands. In
26 the near term, YVWD will stabilize its demands on the groundwater basins, continue
27 developing recycled water, and use surface waters for direct delivery and conjunctive
28 use programs. Based on the WSA, the Project and its associated fixtures will be

1 equivalent to 61 “Equivalent Dwelling Units,” far fewer than the number of dwelling
2 units that could be constructed on the Project site based on current General Plan
3 designations. Therefore, water usage for buildout of the Project site was already
4 indirectly accounted for in the RUWMP, which concluded that YVWD will have
5 adequate supplies for years 2016 to 2040 under multiple-dry-year conditions.
6 Warehouse land uses typically use less water than residential land uses. The proposed
7 Project’s average daily indoor water demands are estimated at 11.36 million gallons
8 a year, although this calculation will be updated prior to issuing occupancy permits
9 in order to determine the exact number of fixture units constructed. Recycled
10 (outdoor) water for landscape irrigation is estimated to be 8.99 million gallons per
11 year for a total of 20.35 million gallons a year of water required to serve the Project.
12 The estimated quantity of recycled water used for irrigation purposes is expected to
13 be further reduced based on the application of Riverside County Ordinance No. 859,
14 which requires efficient use of water for landscaped areas. In light of the recent
15 statewide drought conditions, the proposed Project would also be required to comply
16 with any future mandates by the YVWD pursuant to its Water Shortage Contingency
17 Plan, which serves to maintain essential public health and safety and minimize
18 adverse impacts from water shortages on economic activity, environmental resources
19 and the region’s lifestyle. The YVWD’s Water Shortage Contingency Plan consists
20 of advisory, voluntary, mandatory, and emergency curtailment stages with a variety
21 of potential water conservation restrictions, with which the Project would be required
22 to comply in order to avoid fines, surcharges, or rate increases. Based on the
23 determination by the YVWD in the WSA, the proposed Project’s water needs will
24 be met by existing and future supplies. YVWD would have sufficient water supplies
25 available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, and no new
26 or expanded entitlements will be needed. (RDEIR at 3.17-25 to 3.17-26).

27 **Impact:** *Wastewater Treatment Provider.*

28 **Threshold:** *The Project would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment*

1 *provider that serves or may service the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the*
2 *Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.*

3 4. Project Impact(s):

4 Development of the proposed Project would not generate wastewater that would
5 exceed the capacity of the YVWD in combination with the provider's existing
6 service commitments. Implementation of the proposed warehouse Project would
7 introduce building space and an employee population that does not currently exist
8 on-site. This would result in the generation and discharge of additional wastewater
9 requiring treatment by the YVWD. Currently, an average of approximately 4 million
10 gallons per day of wastewater is treated by the WRWRF, which has a current capacity
11 of 8.0 million gallons per day (RUWMP 2015). The anticipated additional estimated
12 24,410 gallons per day generated by the proposed Project can be adequately treated
13 by the YVWD. The proposed Project's contribution to the wastewater flow would
14 constitute less than 1 percent of the remaining current 8.0-million-gallon-per-day
15 capacity at the WRWRF. Thus, related impacts would be less than significant.

16 **(RDEIR at 3.17-26).**

17 ***Impact: Landfills.***

18 ***Threshold: The Project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to***
19 ***accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs.***

20 5. Project Impact(s):

21 Implementation of the Project would include the construction of approximately 1,823,760
22 square feet of warehouse land use. No demolition would occur on-site because there
23 are no existing structures on-site. Using construction debris waste generation rates
24 published by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Implementation
25 of the Project is estimated to generate approximately 3,547 tons of construction
26 debris. This tonnage would be spread out over the length of construction activities,
27 and the actual volumes of construction waste disposed of at any one time are not
28 expected to be more than several tons of debris. Regional landfill capacity would be

1 available to accommodate this amount of solid waste (each landfill has a remaining
2 capacity of over 14,000,000 cubic yards). Additionally, the Project should have no
3 substantial impact on the anticipated closure of the Lamb Canyon Landfill. Once
4 operational, the Project is estimated to generate a total of approximately 4.7 tons of
5 solid waste on a daily basis, and approximately 1,714 tons on an annual basis.
6 Regional landfill capacity would be available to accommodate this amount of solid
7 waste (each landfill has a remaining capacity of over 14,000,000 cubic yards). Thus,
8 the Project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact regarding operational
9 waste disposal because there is adequate regional landfill capacity to meet the
10 disposal needs of the Project. **(RDEIR at 3.17-27 to 3.17-28).**

11 ***Impact: Solid Waste Regulations.***

12 ***Threshold: The Project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations***
13 ***related to solid waste.***

14 6. Project Impact(s):

15 AB 939 requires that local jurisdictions divert at least 50 percent of all solid waste generated
16 by January 1, 2000. The Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP)
17 was prepared in accordance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act
18 of 1989, Chapter 1095 (AB 939). The proposed Project is not anticipated to conflict
19 with the Riverside County policies, other mandatory policies such as AB 341, or the
20 Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan because it will comply with
21 requirements regarding solid waste disposal, and the Project site will be served by a
22 solid waste disposal provider. Thus, the proposed Project will have a less than
23 significant impact. **(RDEIR at 3.17-28).**

24 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental
25 impacts associated with the EIR No. 534 are potentially significant unless otherwise indicated, but each of
26 these impacts will be avoided or substantially lessened to a level of less than significant through existing
27 regulations, Project Design Features, and/or mitigation measures specified in Attachment A (Mitigation
28 Monitoring and Reporting Program) which is incorporated herein by this reference. Accordingly, the

1 County makes the following findings as to each of the following impacts pursuant to State CEQA
2 Guidelines section 15091(a): “Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project
3 which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.”

4 **A. Aesthetics.**

5 ***Impact:*** *Visual Character.*

6 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation will not substantially degrade the*
7 *existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings with the implementation*
8 *of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring*
9 *and Reporting Program).*

10 1. **Project Impact(s):**

11 The Project site is predominantly covered by brush and low-lying vegetation, and
12 has been previously disturbed by grazing and active agricultural uses. Therefore, the
13 Project would not obstruct any outcroppings or impact any landmark features, as
14 none exist on the Project site. The Project will be constructed with high-quality
15 building design and aesthetic features such as on-site landscaping. The Project would
16 utilize neutral earth tones and architectural features to provide a rural design scheme
17 that is in keeping with the existing character of the surrounding area. The elevations
18 would generally include rural, western, and agricultural elements. For example, the
19 Project would utilize shades of brown with natural accent colors for the majority of
20 the building elevations. The Project buildings would also include decorative metal
21 canopies, appropriate signage, and barn-style façades. Ultimately, the design features
22 utilized by the proposed Project would complement the rural nature of the area. Thus,
23 the Project would not degrade the existing visual character of the site. The Project
24 area has a long history of agricultural and equestrian uses. Therefore, the Project will
25 include a rural water tower and a wooden barn structure in the Project’s southwest
26 corner that are designed to evoke a rural theme and honor the history of Cherry
27 Valley. In addition, the barn will functionally serve as a shade structure and trail head
28 for an equestrian and recreation trail proposed as part of the Project. Combined with

1 the Project's overall rural theme featuring western and agricultural architectural
2 elements, these two monuments serve as a visible focal point and welcoming
3 gateway to the Cherry Valley community. Additionally, these structures (tower and
4 barn) would screen views of the Project site and provide a focal point to viewers
5 along local roadways, while maintaining and enhancing the rural character of the
6 area. The water tower would be of a scale similar to the industrial buildings, at 40
7 feet in height. The barn would be approximately 800 square feet and approximately
8 19 feet in height at the ridge. The proposed trailhead and associated parking area
9 would enhance access to the foothills to the north of the Project site. Furthermore,
10 the proposed riparian areas along the Project frontage would provide additional
11 screening and natural views to the motorists and pedestrians along Cherry Valley
12 Boulevard. The Project would be set back from Cherry Valley Boulevard up to 575
13 feet, further removing the site from public view. Therefore, the Project would be
14 consistent with the existing rural aesthetic of the area and would also provide a
15 welcoming gateway to the Cherry Valley Community. Construction of the Project
16 will create short-term aesthetic impacts, including construction equipment and
17 machinery, and potential nighttime security lighting and fencing of the property
18 during the construction phase. However, these aesthetic impacts are anticipated to be
19 less than significant because they are limited to the short-term construction phase of
20 the Project. Development of the Project will convert vacant land into industrial land
21 uses, and the visual character of the Project site will change. Current views of the
22 site consist of disturbed vacant land, with a limited number of trees and natural
23 vegetation. The Project will remove existing vegetation and create an industrial
24 development in an area that is predominantly developed with scattered rural
25 residential lots. **(RDEIR at 3.1-19 to 3.1-20)**. Visual simulations of the Project are
26 provided in **RDEIR Exhibit 3.1-3 and Exhibits 3.1-3a through 3.1-3m**. As shown
27 in these visual simulations, implementation of the Project would substantially change
28 the existing undeveloped visual character of the site but would not degrade it. The

1 proposed logistic warehouse buildings will generally incorporate similar
2 architectural elements, including a neutral, complementary color palette and a variety
3 of building materials. The buildings have also been designed to include vertical and
4 horizontal elements and features to break up the massing of the structures and provide
5 visual interest. In addition, substantial landscaping along the site perimeter and
6 building façades will soften views into the site and further enhance the visual
7 character of the Project. The Project proposes to construct berms and landscaping
8 extending up to 18 feet along the Cherry Valley Boulevard frontage, which would
9 screen motorist and pedestrian views of the site. An additional berm would be located
10 along east side of the site, further screening views. In recognition of the fact that the
11 perimeter landscaping will take time to mature to achieve the intended screening
12 effect, Mitigation Measures AES-3 has been added to the Final EIR Section 04-00,
13 Errata, which requires landscape plantings along the Cherry Valley Boulevard
14 frontage to be installed prior to the issuance of Project building permits. This will
15 allow the plantings time to mature during the construction period, rather than waiting
16 until occupancy to install landscaping. **(Final EIR at p. 4-1 to 4-2)**. Ultimately, the
17 buildings would not be visible to viewers along the adjacent roadway. In addition to
18 the features outlined in the preceding paragraph, the placement and design of the
19 Project allows the buildings to blend with the existing landscape, despite their
20 relatively large size. As previously discussed, the two buildings would be set back
21 approximately 375 to 575 feet from Cherry Valley Boulevard, approximately 300
22 feet from the east Project boundary, and approximately 400 feet from the west Project
23 boundary, allowing for generous buffers with extensive landscaping, a berm, a
24 meandering equestrian and pedestrian trail, and a three-rail fence. In addition, the
25 Project includes substantial grade separation between the developments.
26 Specifically, Building 1 would be located approximately 29.8 feet above the
27 centerline of Cherry Valley Boulevard, and Building 2 would be located
28 approximately 48.3 feet below the centerline of Cherry Valley Boulevard. Neither of

1 the Project buildings would be visible from motorists or pedestrians traveling along
2 Cherry Valley Boulevard. As demonstrated in RDEIR Visual Simulations (**RDEIR**
3 **Exhibit 3.1-3 and Exhibits 3.1-3a through 3.1-3m**), Project buildings would not be
4 visible from any of the surrounding uses, with the exception of the I-10 Interchange
5 area. However, as designed, the proposed buildings would blend in with the foothills
6 behind the site. Although the Project's buildings rise 41 feet in height, the Project
7 would not be visible to residents of adjacent developments or motorists traveling
8 along Cherry Valley Boulevard, as their line of sight would be directed above the
9 building. The aforementioned berm, water tower, barn, and landscaping would
10 further screen views of the buildings. The Project site would not be visible from the
11 residents located north of the site, as shown in **RDEIR Exhibits 3.1-4a and 3.1-4b**.
12 As discussed, both buildings are also set back at least 375 feet from Cherry Valley
13 Boulevard, which is the main thoroughfare from which the public would view the
14 buildings. The southwest corner of Building 1 would be set back 377 feet from the
15 Cherry Valley Boulevard right-of-way. Further, the proposed landscaping would
16 reduce the prominence of the buildings and provide a more subtle transition. The
17 prominence of the buildings is further reduced by the hills immediately to the north
18 because views of the buildings from Cherry Valley Boulevard do not break the
19 silhouette of the ridgeline of these hills. These factors all combine to make the Project
20 visually unobtrusive and attractive. (**RDEIR at 3.1-29**). The Project would also
21 include the construction of two concrete pads for water tanks for potential future use
22 by the Yucaipa Valley Water District (YVWD). YVWD would be responsible for
23 obtaining necessary approvals to construct and operate the water storage tanks. The
24 water tanks would not be visible from any applicable vantage points, including
25 Cherry Valley Boulevard. However, the top portion of the tanks would likely be
26 visible from the properties west of the site. Such impacts would be generally
27 negligible. It should also be noted that the applicant would only be responsible for
28 installing the concrete pads. The proposed water tanks are not required to serve the

1 Project site. Therefore, if warranted, the YVWD would be responsible for conducting
2 necessary environmental review as CEQA lead agency, and implementing any
3 potential mitigation relating to views of the tanks from properties to the west.
4 Furthermore, the Project would conserve approximately 84.8 acres as open space,
5 thereby preventing future development from encroaching on the scenic areas north
6 of the Project area. This open space area would also generally connect with other
7 open space areas in the region, since the Project would feature on-site trails that
8 connect with existing trails in the northern portion of the site, to contribute to the
9 development of the City of Calimesa's trail system. The open space area also
10 prevents suburban sprawl within the County of Riverside and furthers the County's
11 goals to provide continuity in open space areas as well as contribute to the desired
12 "community separator." Therefore, the Project would not substantially degrade the
13 existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. **(RDEIR at 3.1-**
14 **30).**

15 2. Mitigation:

16 To minimize potential effects related to the visual character of the site, Mitigation
17 Measure AES-3 will be required. Mitigation Measure AES-3 will require
18 landscaping along the Project's Cherry Valley Boulevard frontage to be installed
19 prior to the issuance of building permits, to give the plantings ample time to become
20 established and mature during the construction period, thereby providing greater
21 screening once the Project becomes operational. With implementation of Mitigation
22 Measure AES-3, any potential for the Project to substantially degrade the existing
23 visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings will be reduced to a less
24 than significant impact level. **(Final EIR at p. 4-1 to 4-2).**

25 ***Impact:*** *Light and Glare.*

26 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation will not create a new source of*
27 *substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area,*
28 *with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment*

1 “A”, *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program*).

2 1. Project Impact(s):

3 The Project area currently contains minimal lighting around its perimeter, and no lighting
4 within its interior. Implementation of the Project would result in a new light source
5 for the area at night, and the windows of the structures may create a glare during the
6 day. The lighting for Buildings 1 and 2, nearby streets, and outdoor parking lots
7 would be a potential source of glare if not properly designed, creating a new source
8 of light and glare to residences in the Project vicinity. This overall increase in lighting
9 is referred to as “sky glow,” and would incrementally degrade existing “dark sky”
10 conditions in the Project area. The Project does not propose any new roadways, and
11 all Project traffic would utilize existing roadways in the area. **(RDEIR at 3.1-30)**.
12 These existing roadways currently facilitate nighttime traffic with associated light
13 from vehicle headlights. Therefore, intermittent headlights from nighttime Project
14 traffic on area roadways would not represent a significant increase beyond existing
15 conditions. Headlights from trucks pulling into the Project site at night would not
16 shine into nearby sensitive uses, and would be shielded by intervening Project
17 structures and features when accessing internal loading docks. The Project is
18 approximately 43 miles northwest of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, within Zone B.
19 The Project site is currently regulated by Riverside County Lighting Ordinance No.
20 655 regarding the appropriate lighting methods to be used to reduce light and glare
21 within 45 miles of the Mt. Palomar Observatory as areas develop. The Project will
22 comply with Ordinance No. 655, which includes regulations for the type of lighting,
23 lamp source, and shielding of light emissions for outdoor light fixtures intended to
24 minimize effects of lighting on the viability of the observatory, as demonstrated in
25 the Project-specific Photometric Plans **(RDEIR Exhibit 3.1-5a and 3.1-5b)**. County
26 policy requires that lighting associated with new development projects be designed
27 in a manner that prevents the direction or reflection of annoying light and glare onto
28 nearby uses, including residential uses. Development of the Project would require

1 new lighting fixtures to be installed on-site, including on the building exterior, in
2 parking areas, and in the loading areas. As demonstrated in the Project-specific
3 Photometric Plans (**RDEIR Exhibit 3.1-5a and 3.1-5b**), the Project would not cause
4 light spillage onto adjacent properties, including the Cherry Valley Boulevard right-
5 of-way or the residential properties to the north and west. Nonetheless, mitigation is
6 proposed that would require the Project applicant to submit the photometric plan to
7 the County for review and approval. With the implementation of this mitigation, the
8 Project would minimize the amount of light it would add to the ambient environment.
9 The implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-4 will ensure that a photometric
10 plan that details the type of lighting fixtures and their location will be provided to the
11 County for their review prior to building permit approval. Furthermore, the
12 mitigation measure will ensure that sources of lighting are designed in order to
13 prevent light spillage onto adjoining properties. Therefore, with mitigation
14 incorporated, impacts related to light sources would be less than significant. Potential
15 sources of glare from the Project include windows, exterior light fixtures, and solar
16 panels. All building windows will be glazed in order to reduce heat and energy use
17 from cooling, which would also reduce the incidence of glare. In relation to the
18 overall size of the buildings, there are very few windows; therefore, the Project would
19 create only minimal amounts of glare producing features. In addition, the proposed
20 fencing and landscaping, including trees, would act as a visual barrier for much of
21 the building features, including that of windows and light fixtures. These additional
22 design features would help soften the visual impact of the buildings and reduce the
23 incidence of glare within the surrounding area. The proposed solar panels would be
24 predominately oriented south, creating a low visibility from both Cherry Valley Road
25 and adjacent properties. Further, the roof of the buildings would be flat, providing an
26 added decrease in the visibility of the solar panels and any potential glare they may
27 emit. Glare from solar panels for airplane and airport operation is typically a
28 consideration on or adjacent to airports, or near the landing approach for airplanes.

1 Since the closest airport is the Banning Municipal Airport, which is over 10 miles
2 southeast of the Project site, glare from solar panels would not be a consideration for
3 airport or airplane operation. In addition, Chapter 17.296, Solar Energy Systems of
4 the County Municipal Code requires that applications to install these types of systems
5 must be approved by the Director of the Department of Building and Safety, or if
6 found to have a specific adverse effect, be subject to a plot plan approval. Therefore,
7 the proposed solar panels would be subject to further review. Based on the above
8 considerations, impacts related to glare would be less than significant. **(RDEIR at**
9 **3.1-31 to 3.1-32).**

10 2. Mitigation:

11 To minimize potential effects related to light and glare, Mitigation Measure AES-4
12 will be required. Mitigation Measure AES-4 will require approval of a photometric
13 plan prior to issuance of building permits, which will ensure compliance with County
14 Ordinance No. 655 and ensure that light spillage onto adjacent properties does not
15 occur. With implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-4, any potential for the
16 Project to result in light or glare impacts due to new sources of lighting will be
17 reduced to a less than significant impact level.

18 **B. Biological Resources.**

19 ***Impact:** Endangered or Threatened Species and Sensitive or Special Status Species.*

20 ***Threshold:** Project construction and implementation will not have a substantial adverse*
21 *effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a*
22 *candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or*
23 *regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife*
24 *Service, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution*
25 *Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

26 1. Project Impact(s):

27 Sensitive or listed animal species with potential to occur within the Project site are
28 listed in **RDEIR Table 3.4-4**, and impacts to vegetation communities within the

1 Project site are listed in **RDEIR Table 3.4-5**. The Project would not result in impacts
2 to NEPSSA, listed or sensitive plant species. (**RDEIR at 3.4-29**). No impacts to
3 federal or state listed animal species will result from Project implementation. Three
4 MSHCP covered sensitive animal species (orange-throated whiptail, northern
5 harrier, and Bell's sage sparrow) were observed or detected on-site and would be
6 directly impacted by the Project because their habitats would be adversely affected.
7 Impacts to these species are not considered significant, as they are covered under the
8 MSHCP. The other species with the potential to occur noted in **RDEIR Table 3.4-4**
9 either have low potential to occur on-site because of the lack of appropriate habitat,
10 or if they have a moderate potential to occur, their presence on the site would not
11 result in significant impacts because they are generally wide-ranging species, most
12 are covered species under the MSHCP, and they have a low sensitivity rating. The
13 Project will not result in any "edge effects," which are defined by the MSHCP as
14 "adverse direct and indirect effects to species, Habitats and Vegetation Communities
15 along the natural urban/wildlands interface. May include predation by mesopredators
16 (including native and nonnative predators), invasion by exotic species, noise,
17 lighting, urban runoff and other anthropogenic impacts (trampling of vegetation,
18 trash and toxic materials dumping, etc.)." The development footprint does not abut
19 MSHCP conserved lands, nor lands that are targeted for conservation under the
20 MSHCP, and adherence to Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP is therefore not required.
21 The Project will not introduce any new species of predators or exotic species. The
22 Project area is already developed with roadway infrastructure, as well as residential
23 and commercial development, which result in existing vehicular noise and sources
24 of light. Lighting and noise impacts of the Project are discussed in **RDEIR Sections**
25 **3.1 and 3.12**, respectively, and mitigation measures are proposed to ensure that all
26 associated impacts are mitigated to a less than significant level. The Project will be
27 required to comply with all regulations related to stormwater and wastewater, trash
28 disposal, and safe handling of hazardous materials. Implementation of the Project

1 would directly impact raptor foraging habitat. Additionally, if Burrowing Owl are
2 observed during pre-construction surveys, Mitigation Measure BIO-1a would be
3 required to reduce impacts in this regard to a level of less than significant.
4 Furthermore, the eucalyptus trees on-site have potential to support nesting raptor
5 species such as the red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), red-shouldered hawk (*B.*
6 *lineatus*), or great-horned owl (*Bubo virginicus*), and there is potential to directly or
7 indirectly impact raptor nests during construction. These impacts are considered
8 potentially adverse, but will be reduced to less than significant with Mitigation
9 Measure BIO-1b. Direct impacts to an active raptor nest are not allowed under the
10 federal MBTA, and direct take of active raptor nests would be considered significant.
11 Therefore, surveys shall be required prior to any disturbance of the Project site by
12 construction activities. Mitigation Measures BIO-1a and BIO-1b were refined based
13 on written communication from CDFW dated January 18, 2017. **(RDEIR at 3.4-30**
14 **to 3.4-33).**

15 2. Mitigation:

16 To minimize potential effects to burrowing owl and nesting birds, Mitigation
17 Measures BIO-1a and BIO-1b will require pre-construction surveys and relocation,
18 if necessary. Impacts to breeding birds (including noise impacts) shall be avoided
19 through clearing of habitat outside the breeding season and conducting surveys, and,
20 if so required, relocation of burrowing owls (if present) prior to any disturbance of
21 the Project site by construction activities. With implementation of Mitigation
22 Measures BIO-1a and BIO-1b, any potential for the Project to result in impacts to
23 nesting birds and burrowing owls will be reduced to a less than significant impact
24 level.

25 ***Impact:*** *Riparian Habitat and Wetlands.*

26 ***Threshold:*** *The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or*
27 *other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations*
28 *or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and*

1 *would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by*
2 *Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool,*
3 *coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, with*
4 *the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A",*
5 *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

6 1. Project Impact(s):

7 The Project site encompasses 1.25 acres of unvegetated, ephemeral drainage courses
8 that are considered riverine under MSHCP Section 6.1.2. An additional 0.04 acre of
9 disturbed wetland occurs on-site and is considered riparian under Section 6.1.2. An
10 additional 0.12 acre of ephemeral drainage occurs in the off-site study area. The
11 functions of the unvegetated riverine streams and disturbed wetland on the property
12 are primarily water conveyance, sediment transport, and energy dissipation
13 (hydrologic regime and flood attenuation). The Project would impact approximately
14 1.07 acres of streambed habitat considered riverine, and 0.04 acre of disturbed
15 wetland that is considered riparian. The Project avoids impacts to the riverine
16 resources in the northwestern portion of the site. Impacts to 0.30 acre (23 percent) of
17 the riverine resources have been avoided to the maximum extent practicable. Impacts
18 to United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdictional areas total 0.40
19 acre, all of which are ephemeral drainage (**RDEIR Table 3.4-6**). No impacts to
20 USACE jurisdictional wetlands would occur. The impacts to the non-wetland
21 ephemeral drainages are considered potentially significant. In order to reduce
22 impacts to the non-wetland ephemeral drainages to less than significant, mitigation
23 is proposed that would result in preservation of the functions and values of
24 Riparian/Riverine sources impacted by the Project. The Project has been designed to
25 avoid impacts to 0.30 acre of Riparian/Riverine resources in the northwestern portion
26 of the site. In addition, the Project will replace Riparian/Riverine habitat at a 2:1 ratio
27 for the 1.11 acres of impacts to Riparian/Riverine sources, resulting in 2.22 acres of
28 Riparian/Riverine habitat creation/restoration. (**RDEIR at 3.4-34**). A Determination

1 of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) was prepared for the
2 Project and was approved by the County May 2016. The goal of the DBESP process
3 is to determine if an alternative project configuration would result in biologically
4 equivalent or superior preservation. The first priority for sensitive habitats under
5 CEQA and the MSHCP is avoidance of direct impacts; however, the proposed land
6 use requires large pads that cannot be effectively reshaped to avoid Riparian/Riverine
7 resources. Complete avoidance of Riparian/Riverine resources would eliminate the
8 viability of development on the site because of the distribution of the drainages across
9 the site. Total avoidance can be achieved only by minimal or no development, which
10 would render the Project infeasible. The Project does avoid impacts to 0.30 acre of
11 Riparian/Riverine resources in the northwestern portion of the site. Impacts to 0.30
12 acre (23 percent) of the riverine resources have been avoided to the maximum extent
13 practicable. Mitigation Measures BIO-2a and BIO-2b would result in equivalent or
14 superior preservation of the functions and values of Riparian/Riverine resources
15 impacted by the Project. Minimization measures for the Project will include the use
16 of standard BMPs to minimize the impacts during construction. Equipment will be
17 stored in upland areas, outside drainages except as required by Project design
18 (restoration, trash removal, etc.). Removal of trash located throughout the property
19 will decrease the potential of pollutants entering the Riparian/Riverine areas
20 downstream. The removal of the pollutants will increase the functions and values of
21 the Riparian/Riverine areas proposed to be restored, thus replacing a portion of
22 functions and values that will be lost within the Project footprint. Source control and
23 treatment control BMPs will be implemented to minimize the potential contaminants
24 generated during construction and operations. Source control BMPs include
25 landscape planning, roof runoff controls, trash storage areas, use of alternative
26 building materials, and education of future tenants. Treatment control BMPs include
27 detention basins, vegetated swales (bio-swales), drain inlets, and vegetated buffers.
28 Water quality BMPs will be implemented throughout the Project to capture and treat

1 contaminants. **(RDEIR at 3.4-35)**. Mitigation for impacts to Riparian/Riverine
2 resources will occur through on-site creation at a 2:1 ratio for the 1.11 acres of
3 impacts to Riparian/Riverine resources. In total, the proposed mitigation will result
4 in 2.22 acres of Riparian/Riverine habitat creation/restoration. The on-site creation
5 of 2.22 acres of Riparian/Riverine habitat will occur at two locations on-site along
6 the southern boundary **(RDEIR Exhibit 3.4-5)**. Combined, these areas will offset
7 losses of Riparian/Riverine functions and values by providing high-quality
8 Riparian/Riverine habitat, as well as other functions and services such as water
9 quality benefits, groundwater recharge, and nutrient cycling. A detailed restoration
10 plan for the on-site mitigation sites will be prepared and submitted to the County for
11 review and approval prior to implementation of the restoration effort. The amount of
12 mitigation required by the regulatory agencies for impacts to 0.40 acre of USACE
13 jurisdictional areas **(RDEIR Exhibit 3.4-6)** and 1.11 acres of CDFW jurisdictional
14 area **(RDEIR Exhibit 3.4-7)** will be determined during the permitting process, as
15 required by Mitigation Measure BIO-2b. The Applicant will be required to comply
16 with all requirements set forth by the USACE and CDFW during the permitting
17 process. **(RDEIR at 3.4-36 to 3.4-37)**.

18 2. Mitigation:

19 To avoid impacts to riparian habitat and wetlands, Mitigation Measure BIO-2a will
20 require payment of the MSHCP LDMF of \$6,645 per acre, which will mitigate
21 impacts to sensitive habitats. Impacts to USACE and CDFW jurisdictional habitats,
22 along with impacts to MSHCP riverine areas, will be mitigated to below a level of
23 significance by Mitigation Measure BIO-2b, which requires on-site creation or
24 restoration at a 2:1 ratio (2.22 acres); and impacts to riparian habitat and federally
25 protected wetlands will be mitigated through the Section 1602 Streambed Alteration
26 Agreement Permit and Clean Water Act Sections 401 and 404 permitting processes,
27 which will require mitigation and habitat replacement at levels deemed acceptable
28 by the permitting agencies. With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2a and

1 BIO-2b, any potential for the Project's impacts to riparian habitat and wetlands will
2 be reduced to a less than significant impact level.

3 ***Impact:*** *Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Conservation Community Plan.*

4 ***Threshold:*** *The Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat*
5 *Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local,*
6 *regional, or state conservation plan, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer*
7 *to Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

8 1. Project Impact(s):

9 The San Geronio Crossing property lies outside any Criteria Cells; therefore, the
10 Project is not required to conserve habitat on-site with respect to Criteria Cells, and
11 is not required to be reviewed through the Habitat Acquisition and Negotiation
12 Strategy (HANS) process or the RCA's Joint Project Review to demonstrate MSHCP
13 compliance. MSHCP Section 6.1.2 focuses on protection of Riparian/Riverine and
14 Vernal Pool habitat types. The Project will comply with the policies of Section 6.1.2
15 that protect species associated with vernal pools and Riparian/Riverine habitats.
16 Vernal pools do not exist on the Project site; therefore, vernal pool species do not
17 occur. The definition of Riparian/Riverine habitats is based on the potential for the
18 habitat to support Riparian/Riverine covered species (least Bell's vireo, southwestern
19 willow flycatcher, and western yellow-billed cuckoo). The ephemeral
20 drainages/streambed on-site are not suitable for any of these species; however, the
21 drainages have potential to support downstream Riparian/Riverine habitats, and are
22 therefore considered Riparian/Riverine habitats under the MSHCP. Twenty-four
23 plant species are identified in the MSHCP as potentially occurring in
24 Riparian/Riverine and vernal pool habitats, and are described at **RDEIR page 3.4-**
25 **45**. As discussed on **RDEIR page 3.4-46**, on-site conditions are not appropriate to
26 support most of these species. Consistency with Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP as well
27 as mitigation measures to replace the function and values of the riverine area on-site
28 are detailed in the DBESP analysis. The Project is within an area designated as a

1 NEPSSA area for two plant species: Yucaipa onion and many-stemmed dudleya. A
2 total of 20 bulb clusters of Yucaipa onion with 91 flowering heads were observed
3 on-site. The entire population of Yucaipa onion observed on the property is within
4 an approximately 200-square-foot area in the northeast corner of the site, outside the
5 proposed impact area. Other sensitive plant surveys were conducted and were
6 negative; therefore, the Project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.1.3. MSHCP
7 Section 6.1.4 addresses potential indirect impacts to MSHCP preserve lands such as
8 the Criteria Cells located 0.5 mile north of the Project site. The proposed
9 development is designed to leave open space between the development and the
10 northern property border; as a result, the development will occur more than 0.5 mile
11 from MSHCP Conservation Areas and is therefore not subject to Section 6.1.4. Since
12 the Project does border open space, it will implement the best management practices
13 listed on **RDEIR page 3.4-47** to minimize potential indirect impacts. In addition,
14 Mitigation Measures BIO-5a and BIO-5b, which were refined and developed based
15 on written communication from CDFW dated January 18, 2017, will reduce impacts
16 to Riparian/Riverine resources to less than significant.

17 2. Mitigation:

18 To ensure consistency with the MSHCP, Mitigation Measures BIO-5a and BIO-5b
19 will require impacts to MSHCP riverine areas to be mitigated to below a level of
20 significance by on-site creation or restoration at a 2:1 ratio. With implementation of
21 Mitigation Measures BIO-5a and BIO-5b, any potential for the Project's impacts to
22 riparian or riverine resources to result in inconsistency with the MSHCP will be
23 reduced to a less than significant impact level.

24 C. Cultural Resources.

25 *Impact: Historic Resources.*

26 *Threshold: Project construction and implementation would not cause a substantial adverse*
27 *change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5, with the*
28 *implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A",*

1 *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

2 1. Project Impact(s):

3 There are no historic resources located within the Project site. **(RDEIR at 3.5-8).**
4 Although there are no observable historic cultural resources within the Project area,
5 the potential exists for encountering unknown buried historic resources during
6 Project construction. As such, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 and CUL-1b are proposed
7 to reduce impacts related to potential inadvertent discovery of historic resources to a
8 level of less than significant. **(RDEIR at 3.5-9).**

9 2. Mitigation:

10 Mitigation Measure CUL-1a and CUL-1b will ensure that any previously unknown
11 cultural resources inadvertently discovered during construction are subject to proper
12 evaluation by a qualified archaeologist to determine appropriate mitigation as
13 necessary. With implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1a and CUL-1b, any
14 potential impacts to historic resources will be reduced to a less than significant
15 impact level.

16 ***Impact: Archaeological Resources.***

17 ***Threshold: Project construction and implementation would not alter or destroy an***
18 ***archaeological site or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an***
19 ***archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5, with***
20 ***the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A",***
21 ***Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).***

22 3. Project Impact(s):

23 Research on the Project area shows that the flatter portions of the Project area were
24 plowed in the 1920s or 1930s for dryland farming. Examination of topsoil during the
25 field survey of the Project area suggested that plowing had not taken place for at least
26 20 years in any part of the Project site. The primary drainage has been heavily eroded
27 to points about 20 feet deep in the southeast quadrant and vegetation that appears on
28 the ridges in the period from 1940 to 1960 has declined. Exposures of Pleistocene

1 alluvial fan soils crop out at the western edge of the property in the low ridges
2 between the Holocene alluvium. This material has the potential for fossils.
3 Prehistoric deposits were expected on the unplowed finger ridges and unexpected on
4 the flats due to historical plowing in the 1920s or 1930s. However, no cultural
5 resources were observed during the survey on the finger ridges or on the flat areas.
6 The Cultural Resource Assessment prepared for the Project indicates the Project
7 would have no impact regarding alteration or destruction of an archaeological site
8 because no prehistoric-era resources were found in the Project area during the field
9 survey and the potential for impacts to such resources is considered "low." However,
10 to ensure that the Project has a less than significant impact on archaeological sites,
11 Mitigation Measures CUL-1a and CUL-1b shall be implemented in the event that
12 any resources are found on-site. (RDEIR at 3.5-10 to 3.5-11).

13 4. Mitigation:

14 Mitigation Measure CUL-1a and CUL-1b will ensure that any previously unknown
15 archaeological resources inadvertently discovered during construction are subject to
16 proper evaluation by a qualified archaeologist to determine appropriate mitigation as
17 necessary. With implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1a and CUL-1b, any
18 potential impacts to archaeological resources will be reduced to a less than significant
19 impact level.

20 ***Impact:*** *Paleontological Resources.*

21 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation would not alter or destroy*
22 *paleontological site or unique geologic feature, with the implementation of mitigation*
23 *measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and*
24 *Reporting Program).*

25 5. Project Impact(s):

26 The Project area has a determination of high paleontologic sensitivity at or slightly
27 below the modern ground surface. Therefore, a monitoring program is recommended
28 to mitigate impacts to potentially significant paleontological resources beginning at

1 the modern ground surface in areas that have not been subjected to plowing in the
2 past, such as the finger ridges within the Project area. If detailed geologic borings are
3 available, the specific depths of the highly sensitive areas could be refined. The
4 Project area has a high probability of containing paleontological resources potentially
5 at the surface along the ridge margins of the Project site. Therefore, a monitoring
6 program to mitigate impacts to paleontologic resources is warranted, as set forth in
7 Mitigation Measures CUL-3a through CUL-3d. (RDEIR at 3.5-11).

8 6. Mitigation:

9 Mitigation Measures CUL-3a to CUL-3d will ensure monitoring for paleontological
10 resources during construction, as well as procedures to be followed in the event that
11 any such resources are discovered. With implementation of Mitigation Measures
12 CUL-3a to CUL-3d, any potential impacts to paleontologic resources will be reduced
13 to a less than significant impact level.

14 *Impact: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains.*

15 *Threshold: The Project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred*
16 *outside of formal cemeteries, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to*
17 *Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

18 7. Project Impact(s):

19 Based on a Sacred Lands Search, no human remains are known to exist within the
20 Project area. The Project site is not currently utilized for cemetery uses and, based
21 on a records search, is not known to contain human remains. No archaeological
22 resources, including human remains or burial plots, were located as part of the
23 detailed pedestrian survey conducted for the Project site. However, there is always
24 the possibility that subsurface construction activities associated with the Project,
25 such as trenching and grading, could potentially damage or destroy previously
26 undiscovered human remains. Accordingly, this is a potentially significant impact.
27 However, if human remains are discovered, implementation of Mitigation Measure
28 CUL-4 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. (RDEIR

1 at 3.5-13).

2 8. Mitigation:

3 Mitigation Measure CUL-4 will ensure that any human remains discovered during
4 the construction process will be handled in accordance with state law. With
5 implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-4, any potential impacts to
6 undiscovered human remains will be reduced to a less than significant impact level.

7 *Impact: Tribal Cultural Resources.*

8 *Threshold: The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance*
9 *of a tribal cultural resources, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to*
10 *Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

11 9. Project Impact(s):

12 No cultural resources, including existing religious or sacred sites, were located as
13 part of this detailed survey, and none of the tribal representatives contacted identified
14 the existence of such sites within the Project area. (RDEIR at 3.5-14). The Project
15 would have no impact regarding alteration or destruction of an archaeological site
16 because no prehistoric-era resources were found in the Project area during the field
17 survey and the potential for impacts to such resources is considered "low." A review
18 of the California Register of Historical Resources, local registers of historic
19 resources, and the NACH sacred lands file failed to identify any listed tribal cultural
20 resources (TCRs) that may be adversely affected by the proposed Project. As such,
21 no recorded TCRs will be adversely affected by the proposed Project. Therefore, the
22 Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of TCR
23 listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a
24 local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section
25 5020.1(k). In addition, Tribal consultation efforts conducted by the County of
26 Riverside pursuant to AB-52 failed to identify significant TCRs meeting the criteria
27 set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. As such, no
28 significant TCRs will be adversely affected by the proposed Project. Therefore, the

1 Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR
2 determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial
3 evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public
4 Resources Code Section 5024.1. Furthermore, on November 29, 2016, the County of
5 Riverside circulated a Draft EIR evaluating the San Gorgonio Crossing Project for
6 public review. Various comments were submitted during the public review period
7 relative to the Draft EIR, including a comment letter from the Soboba Band of
8 Luiseno Indians dated January 18, 2017. According to their response, the Project area
9 falls within the bounds of their Tribal Traditional Use Areas, and although the area
10 is considered culturally sensitive by the people of Soboba, no Tribal Cultural
11 Resources were identified in the letter. However, to ensure that the Project has a less
12 than significant impact on archaeological sites, Mitigation Measures CUL-1a and
13 CUL-1b shall be implemented in the event that any TCRs are found on-site. **(RDEIR**
14 **at 3.5-15)**. Mitigation Measure CUL-1b was further revised at the request of the
15 Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians **(see Final EIR at p. 4-2)**.

16 10. Mitigation:

17 Mitigation Measures CUL-1a and CUL-1b will ensure that any previously unknown
18 TCRs inadvertently discovered during construction are subject to proper evaluation
19 by a qualified archaeologist to determine appropriate mitigation as necessary. With
20 implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1a and CUL-1b, any potential impacts
21 to TCRs will be reduced to a less than significant impact level.

22 **D. Geology and Soils.**

23 ***Impact:*** *Seismic-Related Ground Failure and Liquefaction.*

24 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation would not expose people or structures*
25 *to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving*
26 *rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground*
27 *failure, including liquefaction or landslides, with the implementation of mitigation measures*

1 (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting
2 Program).

3 1. Project Impact(s):

4 The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. However, the
5 northern portion of the site is located within a County of Riverside designated
6 Earthquake Fault Zone, based on the Riverside County GIS Fault Zone Map.
7 **(RDEIR at 3.6-15)**. The North Branch of the Cherry Valley Fault runs through the
8 Project site; however, this fault is located over 200 feet north of the development
9 footprint of the proposed Project. The Project site plan shows Buildings 1 and 2
10 located south of the South Branch of the Cherry Valley Fault. However, this branch
11 of the Cherry Valley Fault runs through the parking lot area north of Building 2. As
12 typically recommended for structures within or near an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake
13 Fault Zone, on-site structures for human occupancy are not placed upon the fault and
14 are set back from the trace by at least 50 feet or more. Thus, the proposed buildings
15 would not be constructed across a fault line. **(RDEIR at 3.6-16)**. To ensure that
16 proposed development is adequately set back from existing fault lines, Mitigation
17 Measure GEO-1a shall be implemented. The Project will be designed in conformance
18 with applicable building standards, such as the Uniform Building Code, and County
19 of Riverside standards regarding structure design such that the Project will not
20 expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects including the risk
21 of loss, injury, or death. **(RDEIR at 3.6-17)**. Mitigation Measure GEO-1b, regarding
22 reassessment of the structural setback and Restricted Use Zone (RUZ), would reduce
23 impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking to a less than significant level.
24 **(RDEIR at 3.6-18)**. Because of the absence of groundwater less than 50 feet below
25 ground surface and the 200- to 300-foot depth of the regional groundwater, the
26 potential for liquefaction is considered low. Although settlement may occur on-site
27 because of ground shaking from earthquakes, a less than significant impact after
28 mitigation is anticipated, because settlement monuments will be placed at key

1 locations on-site in the deep fill areas, and monitoring will occur until primary
2 settlement has stabilized. The Project would not create cut or fill slopes greater than
3 2:1. Although the Project will result in slopes that are higher than 10 feet, less than
4 significant impacts are anticipated because the Project will be designed in
5 conformance with recommendations made in the Grading Plan Review, which
6 include design and construction measures that will stabilize the on-site soils and
7 reduce the Project's exposure to landslide risk. Additionally, compliance with the
8 Grading Development Standards of the County of Riverside would be assured
9 through County review of grading plans. The Project would be required to conform
10 to County design standards for grading and site design, which would result in a safe
11 design of stable slopes for the Project. Mitigation Measure GEO-1c will further
12 reduce impacts from landslides to a less than significant level. **(RDEIR at 3.6-19)**.
13 The Project site has a mild to high potential of hydroconsolidation. Therefore,
14 impacts from hydroconsolidation are considered potentially significant. Mitigation
15 Measures GEO-1c to GEO-1e would reduce potential impacts from soil collapse to
16 a less than significant level, by ensuring that all recommendations related to grading,
17 engineered fill, and cut slope are implemented prior to issuance of grading and/or
18 building permits. The Project site is within an area with low to locally moderate
19 susceptibility to seismically induced landslides and rockfalls. The Project would
20 have a less than significant impact regarding rockfall hazards because the proposed
21 warehouse buildings are sited away from the steep terrain located in the northern
22 portion of the Project site. **(RDEIR at 3.6-20)**.

23 2. Mitigation:

24 Implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1a to GEO-1e would ensure that
25 habitable structures are adequately set back from fault lines and restrictions are in
26 place to create a restricted use zone to limit the creation of habitable facilities in
27 inappropriate locations. As with other similar development projects within the
28 Southern California region and the State as a whole, the Project would be designed

1 and constructed to meet the specifications contained within the 2013 California
2 Building Code (CBC), Chapter 16, Section 1613—Earthquake Loads. The building
3 and safety standards set forth by the CBC have been established to address structural
4 integrity and to prevent substantial loss and injury during a seismic event. Mitigation
5 Measure GEO-1c will ensure that potential landslide impacts are reduced to less than
6 significant. Mitigation Measures GEO-1d and GEO-1e will ensure the
7 implementation of design and construction measures that will stabilize the on-site
8 soils and reduce the Project’s exposure to hydroconsolidation and landslide risk.
9 With implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1a to GEO-1e, any potential
10 impacts related to geologic hazards will be reduced to a less than significant impact
11 level.

12 ***Impact:*** *Erosion or Loss of Topsoil.*

13 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation would not result in substantial soil*
14 *erosion or the loss of topsoil with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to*
15 *Project Resolution Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

16 1. Project Impact(s):

17 As detailed in the County’s General Plan, the Project area has a moderate wind
18 erodibility rating. On-site soils are subject to erosion by wind and water. The
19 potential for erosion is greatest during grading and construction of the site. Project
20 development will require extensive grading operations including excavation and fill
21 throughout the Project site in order to provide adequate support for the Project. Since
22 erosion is greatest during construction, the Project is anticipated to have a short-term
23 impact related to soil erosion. **(RDEIR at 3.6-21)**. Installation of the Project’s
24 drainage features would control surface drainage and help mitigate the potential
25 erosion and debris flows during storm events. The slopes should be planted as soon
26 as possible upon completion of grading with drought-resistant plants to help mitigate
27 surficial erosion. With incorporation of mitigation, potential impacts from soil
28 erosion are anticipated to be reduced to a less than significant level. The on-site slope

1 safety factors will conform to the County of Riverside standards and are acceptable
2 as planned. Similarly, the factors for safety for the surficial stability conditions also
3 meet the required minimum safety factor or 1:5. (RDEIR at 3.6-22). With regard to
4 water erosion, the rate of runoff from the Project site would not increase by more
5 than 10 percent above pre-development conditions, and the drainage improvements
6 installed by the Project will ensure that the Project does not result in an increase in
7 water erosion on-site or off-site. (RDEIR at 3.6-23 to 3.6-24). Construction
8 activities including but not limited to grading and soil transport have the potential to
9 result in short-term, construction-related impacts associated with wind erosion, and,
10 thus, the Project could have a potentially significant related short-term impact. A
11 Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan is required to be prepared for the Project that
12 would reduce impacts from soil erosion during construction that could potentially
13 cause an increase in blowsand or mineral erosion. During Project implementation,
14 potential impacts from wind erosion and blowsand would be less than significant
15 because the Project would be developed with landscaping and impervious surfaces
16 (e.g., parking lots and buildings) such that soils or sand would not be exposed and
17 subject to blowing off-site. Further, the proposed operation of the Project as a
18 warehouse will not involve the exposure of land that would increase this potential
19 impact. Thus, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact related
20 to an increase in wind erosion or blowsand during construction or operations.
21 (RDEIR at 3.6-25).

22 1. Mitigation:

23 Mitigation Measures GEO-2a and GEO-2b will ensure the implementation of design
24 and operational measures will stabilize the on-site soils and reduce the opportunity
25 for erosion impact. With implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-2a to GEO-
26 2b, any potential impacts related to erosion or loss of topsoil will be reduced to a less
27 than significant impact level.

28 **Impact:** *Unstable Geologic Units.*

1 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not be located on a geologic*
2 *unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and*
3 *potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or*
4 *collapse, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution*
5 *Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

6 2. Project Impact(s):

7 Impacts from subsidence are considered potentially significant, and Mitigation
8 Measures GEO-1b and GEO-1d, and GEO-3 are required to mitigate this potential
9 impact. The site, as with all of southern California, is within a zone of seismic
10 activity. Strong ground motion from an earthquake generated along active faults
11 should therefore be anticipated at this site. The Project will be built in conformance
12 to applicable California Building Code and Uniform building code standards, which
13 will reduce potential impacts from ground subsidence and unstable soils. **(RDEIR**
14 **at 3.6-25 to 3.6-26).**

15 2. Mitigation:

16 Implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1b, GEO-1d and GEO-3 would ensure
17 the Project site would contain suitable soils and compaction, as well as appropriate
18 controls related to landscaping and irrigation management, to reduce impacts from
19 subsidence and unstable soils to less than significant.

20 **Impact:** *Expansive Soil.*

21 **Threshold:** *The Project could be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of*
22 *the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property, with the*
23 *implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A",*
24 *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

25 3. Project Impact(s):

26 The site sub-grade soils are granular with very low soil expansion potential and
27 specialized construction procedures to resist expansive soil forces are not anticipated
28 at this time. Further, the Grading Plan Review document did not identify the Project

1 site as susceptible to expansive soils impacts; however, to ensure that expansive soils
2 are absent from the Project and would otherwise not affect the Project, incorporation
3 of Mitigation Measure GEO-1b will require preparation of a design-level
4 geotechnical study that complies with the applicable requirements of the latest
5 adopted edition of the California Building Standards Code. A design-level
6 geotechnical study would identify grading and soil engineering practices to ensure
7 that expansive soil conditions are abated. As such, after implementation of
8 mitigation, impacts related to expansive soils would be reduced to a level of less than
9 significant. (RDEIR at 3.6-26 to 3.6-27).

10 3. Mitigation:

11 Mitigation Measure GEO-1b will ensure that the Project site's soil expansion
12 potential is thoroughly evaluated and addressed prior to operation of the Project.
13 With implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1b, any potential impacts related
14 to expansive soils will be reduced to a less than significant impact level.

15 **E. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.**

16 As directed by the State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, the EIR evaluated whether the
17 Project would: (a) generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a
18 significant impact on the environment; or (b) conflict with an applicable plan, policy or
19 regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG. In order to
20 determine this, and consistent with the considerations identified in the State CEQA
21 Guidelines section 15064.4 and the California Supreme Court decision in *Center for*
22 *Biological Diversity v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife*, the EIR evaluated the
23 Project against the two thresholds to determine the significance of impacts from GHG.
24 The County has further determined that each one of these thresholds is a separate and
25 independent basis upon which to substantiate the significance of the Project's GHG
26 impact. (RDEIR, p. 3.7-29 to 3.7-32.)

27 **Impact:** *Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHGs)*
28

1 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation would not generate greenhouse gas*
2 *emissions (“GHGs”), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the*
3 *environment, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution*
4 *Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

5 1. Project Impact(s):

6 The RDEIR analyzed the Project’s compliance with the County of Riverside’s CAP.
7 The CAP is a geographically specific plan adopted by the County of Riverside for
8 reducing GHG emissions under the control or influence of the County consistent with
9 AB 32 and subsequent state legislation and state agency action to address climate
10 change. This threshold is also consistent with the SCAQMD’s draft interim
11 threshold Tier 2, which consists of determining whether a project is consistent with
12 a qualified GHG reduction plan. The Scoping Plan GHG reduction goal is to reduce
13 statewide emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The Riverside County CAP includes
14 strategies that will achieve this target. The CAP target is to reduce County emissions
15 by the amount recommended in the Scoping Plan for local government of 15 percent
16 below 2008 levels by 2020. This was roughly equivalent to the 28.4 percent overall
17 reduction in statewide emissions from BAU in 2020. **(RDEIR at 3.7-36)**. The
18 County’s CAP meets the requirements for a climate action plan as set forth in the
19 State CEQA Guidelines section 15183.5(b). **(RDEIR at 3.7-37 to 3.7-38)**. As
20 summarized in Table 2, in Appendix A: Methodology for The Development and
21 Application of the Screening Tables of the Riverside County GHG Plan, 1,302,569
22 MT CO₂e will be reduced from new development as a result of the County strategies.
23 Within the 1,302,569 MT CO₂e of new development reductions afforded County
24 strategies, 619,336 MT CO₂e of emissions reduced is accomplished through new
25 Commercial and Industrial Projects, and 683,233 MT CO₂e of emissions reduced is
26 accomplished through new residential projects. The next step in allocating point
27 values is to determine the number of new homes and commercial buildings that are
28 anticipated by year 2020. The County predicts that a total of approximately

1 195,547,000 square feet of new commercial and industrial buildings within the
2 unincorporated County area is needed to accommodate anticipated job growth. This
3 estimate is based on the relationship between past growth in employment to the
4 average growth in commercial/industrial building area for Riverside County.
5 **(RDEIR at 3.7-39)**. Because commercial/industrial land uses are typically described
6 in thousand square feet of building space, the point value was calculated as 0.031
7 MT CO₂e per 1,000 square feet of gross Commercial/Industrial building area.
8 **RDEIR Table 3.7-4** shows the requisite points afforded each measure. Pursuant to
9 the CAP, projects that achieve at least 100 points based on the County's screening
10 tables are determined to be consistent with the reduction quantities anticipated in the
11 County's GHG Technical Report. As such, further project-specific GHG
12 quantification is not required. Consistent with CEQA guidelines, such projects are
13 determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG
14 emissions. **RDEIR Table 3.7-4** displays the points (as in the March 2015 Riverside
15 County GHG Emissions Screening Tables for Commercial Development and Public
16 Facilities, Table 2) that are anticipated to be achieved by the Project. Since the
17 Project will incorporate at least 100 points from the screening tables as required by
18 Mitigation Measure GHG-1, the Project's impact related to greenhouse gas
19 emissions would be less than significant. **(RDEIR at 3.7-40 to 3.7-45)**.

20 2. Mitigation:

21 Mitigation Measure GHG-1 will ensure that the Project is consistent with the County
22 of Riverside's CAP; since the Project will incorporate at least 100 points from the
23 screening tables, the Project's impact on greenhouse gas emissions would be less
24 than significant.

25 ***Impact:*** *Conflict with Greenhouse Gas Plan, Policy or Regulation.*

26 ***Threshold:*** *The Project would not conflict with the ARB Scoping Plan and regulations*
27 *adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.*

28 2. Project Impact(s):

1 The RDEIR conducted a qualitative analysis of the project's consistency with the
2 ARB's Scoping Plan and GHG emission reducing regulations. The Scoping Plan
3 (and its adopted regulations) is a statewide plan, policy, or regulation adopted by a
4 public agency to reduce GHG emissions that may be used to assess consistency with
5 AB 32 under CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines §§ 15064.4(a)(2), (b)(3), 15064(h)(3)).
6 The RDEIR demonstrates that the Project is consistent with AB 32 and the Scoping
7 Plan designed to achieve the AB 32 target by 2020. Specifically, the RDEIR assessed
8 the Project's consistency with applicable plans, policies and regulations adopted for
9 the purpose of reducing GHG emissions for each of the Project's emission sectors:
10 transportation (approximately 90% of Project emissions), energy consumption from
11 electricity and natural gas (approximately 7% of Project emissions), water
12 consumption (less than 1% of Project emissions) and waste diversion (approximately
13 3% of Project emissions). Under each emission sector, the RDEIR analyzed the
14 Project's compliance with the State Scoping Plan and adopted regulations as well as
15 with regional and local measures. Finally, the EIR evaluated the Project's design
16 features and mitigation measures that go beyond the Scoping Plan requirements and
17 would further minimize GHG emissions. With respect to the Transportation sector,
18 the RDEIR determined that the project is consistent with State transportation
19 regulations to reduce GHG emissions, including light-duty vehicle standards, low-
20 carbon fuel standards, and heavy-duty vehicle and tractor-trailer regulations that will
21 apply to all vehicles accessing the Project site. **(RDEIR at 3.7-48 to 3.7-49)**. Further,
22 the Project's mobile source GHG emissions, including with respect to the vehicle
23 miles traveled, are covered under the Cap-and-Trade Program, which assures that
24 such emissions will not exceed the AB 32's 2020 statewide emission limit. **(RDEIR**
25 **at 3.7-17 to 3.7-19, 3.7-48 to 3.7-49)**. Finally, the Project is also consistent with the
26 Riverside County Climate Action Plan (CAP) and County General Plan Policies that
27 reduce automobile use and consequently GHG emissions; these measures go above
28 and beyond the regulatory requirements of AB 32. Specifically, the Project is

1 consistent with *CAP Measure R2-T1: Employment Based Trip and VMT Reduction*,
2 which implements General Plan Policies AQ 3.3, AQ 10.1, AQ 10.3, and AQ 10.4
3 through the adoption of a voluntary trip reduction program for new commercial and
4 industrial development that promotes commuter choices, employer transportation
5 management, guaranteed ride home programs and commuter assistance and outreach
6 type programs intended to reduce commuter vehicle miles traveled. *CAP Measure*
7 *R2-T4: Preferential Parking* implements General Plan Policies AQ 3.3 and AQ 10.3
8 by encouraging proposed development projects to incorporate a comprehensive
9 parking program to facilitate carpooling and alternate transportation. The Project
10 will be required to participate in Riverside County's Rideshare Program pursuant to
11 MM AQ-1h(a); it is therefore consistent with *CAP Measure R2-T4*. The Project will
12 be required, pursuant to MM AQ-1h(a) and MM AQ-1h(b), to install a minimum of
13 two electric-vehicle charging stations per building, and each building shall provide
14 preferred parking for low-emitting and fuel-efficient vehicles equivalent to 5 percent
15 of the required number of parking spaces. *CAP Measure R2-T5: Roadway*
16 *Improvements Including Signal Synchronization and Transportation Flow*
17 *Management* implements General Plan Policies AQ 12.1 and AQ 12.3. The Project
18 is consistent with this measure as it will implement any required traffic signal
19 synchronization or construction of new traffic signals as identified in the Project's
20 traffic impact analysis. The Project will also comply with *CAP Measures R2-E5:*
21 *Commercial/Industrial Energy Efficiency Program and Commercial/Industrial*
22 *Renewable Energy Program*, because it will exceed the Title 24 Standards by a
23 minimum of 5 percent pursuant to the Riverside County CAP Checklist, and will use
24 solar panels to provide approximately 23 percent of the Project's power needs.
25 **(RDEIR at 3.7-53 to 3.7-54)**. Lastly, the Project will incorporate several design
26 features and mitigation measures that will further reduce the Project's GHG
27 emissions from transportation (MM AQ-1b, MM AQ-1g, and MM AQ-1h). These
28 measures further support the AB 32/Scoping Plan reduction goals. With respect to

1 the Energy sector, the RDEIR describes that the Project is consistent with State
2 energy efficiency standards and renewable energy requirements, including Title
3 24/CalGreen, California's Renewable Portfolio Standard and the Million Solar Roofs
4 Program. The Project is also consistent with the Riverside County Climate Action
5 Plan (CAP) and County General Plan Policies that reduce energy use beyond the
6 regulatory requirements of AB 32. Finally, the Project will construct buildings that
7 will also be designed to provide CalGreen Standards with Leadership in Energy and
8 Environmental Design (LEED) to be eligible for a Silver Certification level. This
9 includes design considerations related to the building envelope, HVAC, lighting, and
10 power systems. A complete description of the Project's energy efficiency features
11 and other measures to reduce GHG emissions is contained in **RDEIR Table 3.7-4**;
12 refer also to **Final EIR at p. 4-4**. With respect to the water consumption and waste
13 diversion sectors, the RDEIR describes that the Project is consistent with Scoping
14 Plan Measures/ State regulations and regional and local measures to reduce GHG
15 emissions. In addition, the Project will incorporate design features and mitigation
16 measures that will further reduce the Project's GHG emissions from these sectors,
17 which support the AB 32/Scoping Plan reduction goals. Finally, regarding goals for
18 2050 under Executive Order S-3-05, it is not possible at this time to quantify the
19 emissions savings from future regulatory measures, as they have not yet been
20 developed. However, the Project will comply with future regulatory measures
21 enacted by state lawmakers that would lead to an 80-percent reduction below 1990
22 levels by 2050. Note again that the Project already includes several Project design
23 features that exceed regulatory requirements and reduce vehicle miles traveled.
24 Thus, based on the proposed Project's emission reductions, Project design features,
25 standard mitigation measures and the progress being made by the State towards
26 reducing emissions in key sectors (such as transportation, industry, and electricity
27 generation), the Project furthers the State's goals of reducing greenhouse gas
28 emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The Project also obtains an 80-percent reduction

1 below 1990 levels by 2050, and does not obstruct the attainment of these GHG levels.
2 Therefore, the Project does not conflict with any plans to reduce GHG emissions and
3 furthers the State's goals relative to this impact. **(RDEIR, p. 3.7-45 to 3.7-60; Refer**
4 **also to Final EIR, Section 03-00, Responses to SIERRA 24-27.)**

5 **F. Hydrology and Water Quality.**

6 ***Impact: Water Quality Standards.***

7 ***Threshold: Project construction and implementation would not violate water quality***
8 ***standards or waste discharge requirements, with the implementation of mitigation measures***
9 ***(refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting***
10 ***Program).***

11 1. **Project Impact(s):**

12 Implementation of the Project would result in construction activities that could have
13 the potential to contribute to pollutants in off-site surface waters, potentially
14 impacting the water quality of the Santa Ana Watershed. Generally, construction-
15 phase activities could generate pollutants such as increased silts, debris, chemicals,
16 and dissolved solids during grading, construction, painting and vehicle maintenance
17 activities. Indirect impacts associated with water quality shall be mitigated to below
18 a level of significance through compliance with NPDES requirements. **(RDEIR at**
19 **3.9-17).** Prior to the issuance of grading or construction permits, the Project applicant
20 will prepare a SWPPP that conforms to the SWRCB NPDES permit. The SWPPP
21 shall identify BMPs to prevent construction-related pollutants from reaching
22 stormwater and all products of erosion from moving off-site. Therefore, temporary
23 construction impacts would be considered less than significant. **(RDEIR at 3.9-18).**
24 The Project is designated as a Priority Project. Therefore, treatment control BMPs
25 are required to remove pollutants typically associated with urban runoff. In addition
26 to the drainage and water quality features that will be installed by the Project, the
27 final WQMP shall provide detailed descriptions and instructions for implementing
28 the various BMPs for the Project. Long-term stormwater quality concerns will be

1 managed pursuant to a County-approved WQMP and SWPPP. Conformance with
2 the mandatory requirements of a SWPPP and a WQMP for the Project would ensure
3 that no substantial degradation of water quality associated with long-term activities
4 would occur. In addition, the Project will need to apply for an Industrial Storm Water
5 General Permit 2014-0057- DWQ (Industrial General Permit), which is an NPDES
6 permit that regulates discharges associated with 10 broad categories of industrial
7 activities. (RDEIR at 3.9-20). Industrial General Permit 2014-0057-DWQ became
8 effective July 1, 2015 and shall expire June 30, 2020, and the Project would be
9 subject to this new permit. The General Industrial Permit requires implementation of
10 management measures to achieve the performance standard of best available
11 technology economically achievable (BAT) and best conventional pollutant control
12 technology (BCT). Additionally, the General Industrial Permit requires the
13 development of a SWPPP and a monitoring plan. The SWPPP facilitates the
14 identification of pollutant sources and the means by which to manage pollutant
15 sources to reduce stormwater pollution. With implementation of Mitigation Measure
16 HYD-1, potential impacts regarding water quality would be reduced to a less than
17 significant level. (RDEIR at 3.9-21).

18 2. Mitigation:

19 Mitigation Measure HYD-1 will require the submittal of a WQMP and a SWPPP to
20 identify sources that could affect the quality of stormwater discharges from the
21 Project site during both construction and operations. A series of BMPs would also
22 be included for effective treatment of target pollutants in stormwater discharges
23 anticipated from Project construction. With implementation of Mitigation Measure
24 HYD-1, impacts related to water quality would be less than significant.

25 **Impact:** *Alteration of Drainage Pattern: Flooding.*

26 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not substantially alter the*
27 *existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course*
28 *of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a*

1 *manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site., with the implementation of mitigation*
2 *measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and*
3 *Reporting Program).*

4 1. Project Impact(s):

5 Development of the Project will increase runoff from the site by increasing the
6 amount of impervious surfaces (e.g., asphalt, concrete, water tanks, rooftops, etc.)
7 and decreasing the pervious surfaces that could allow infiltration of precipitation. As
8 part of Project implementation, grading of land surfaces will occur prior to
9 construction. On-site grading has the potential to alter existing drainage patterns;
10 however, the Project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface
11 runoff in a manner that would result in flooding. **(RDEIR at 3.9-28)**. The Project's
12 detention basins will reduce the 10-year and 100-year, 24-hour duration stormwater
13 runoffs to less than existing conditions. The Project's detention basins will include a
14 low-flow channel, and basin function as a flow-by detention basin for low-flow
15 conditions. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not increase the amount
16 or rate of surface runoff in a manner that could produce flooding on- or off-site.
17 **(RDEIR at 3.9-29)**. As described at **RDEIR page 3.9-30**, both site design and source
18 control BMPs will be used to reduce runoff and improve water quality. Thus, with
19 implementation of the BMPs described above, impacts from flooding are anticipated
20 to be less than significant. There are no streams or rivers on-site that would be
21 impacted by the Project, but direct impacts to USACE jurisdictional areas would
22 result from development of the Project. Impacts to USACE jurisdictional areas total
23 0.46 acre, all consisting of ephemeral drainages. Direct impacts to CDFW
24 jurisdictional areas would also result from development of the Project. Areas under
25 CDFW jurisdiction exist in the same areas as those that are USACE jurisdictional,
26 but they are slightly wider. Approximately 1.37 acres of the CDFW drainages are
27 ephemeral, along with 0.04 acre of disturbed wetland. Although Project construction
28 could alter the existing drainage pattern (including these ephemeral drainages and

1 disturbed wetland), it would not result in an increase in the amount or rate of runoff
2 that could result in flooding on or off-site with implementation of Mitigation
3 Measure HYD-1, which requires preparation of a WQMP and a SWPPP. Channels,
4 basins and trenches, storm drain facilities, and detention basins that will be part of
5 the post-development drainage system will reduce stormwater runoff to less than
6 existing conditions. Likewise, any changes in absorption rates or the rate or amount
7 of surface runoff would be less than significant. (RDEIR at 3.9-30 to 3.9-31).

8 2. Mitigation:

9 Mitigation Measure HYD-1 requires preparation of a WQMP and a SWPPP.
10 Channels, basins and trenches, storm drain facilities, and detention basins that will
11 be part of the post-development drainage system will reduce stormwater runoff to
12 less than existing conditions, such that the Project will not substantially increase the
13 rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-
14 site.

15 G. Noise.

16 *Impact: Noise Levels in Excess of Standards.*

17 *Threshold: Project implementation would not result in exposure of persons to or generation*
18 *of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise*
19 *ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, with the implementation of mitigation*
20 *measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and*
21 *Reporting Program).*

22 1. Project Impact(s):

23 As shown in RDEIR Table 3.12-9, the reasonable worst-case construction noise
24 level expected at the City of Calimesa home located adjacent to the western Project
25 boundary is 54 dBA Leq. The reasonable worst-case analysis considers the loudest
26 pieces of construction equipment all operating simultaneously at full power at the
27 closest potential locations to off-site receptors. This worst-case noise level is below
28 the City's noise level limit for construction activities and can be expected to lower

1 as construction moves away from the property line. In addition, such worst-case
2 construction noise levels would not occur for eight continuous hours, because
3 equipment would not remain operating all day at the nearest construction limits.
4 Thus, the Project is not anticipated to exceed applicable construction noise standards.
5 However, Mitigation Measures NOI-4a through NOI-4e are included to reduce
6 potentially substantial temporary increases related to construction noise. **(RDEIR at**
7 **3.12-20)**. With regard to traffic noise, the highest traffic noise levels on segments of
8 Cherry Valley Boulevard adjacent to the Project site would occur under horizon (year
9 2040) traffic conditions with implementation of the Project. Based on the traffic
10 noise modeling results shown in Noise Impact Analysis, the Project site would be
11 exposed to traffic noise levels ranging up to approximately 73.1 dBA CNEL at 50
12 feet from the centerline of the nearest travel lane of Cherry Valley Boulevard, under
13 Horizon (year 2040) plus Project traffic conditions. At the nearest façade of the
14 proposed warehouse buildings, located approximately 465 feet from the centerline
15 of Cherry Valley Boulevard, these traffic noise levels would attenuate to below 56
16 dBA CNEL. Therefore, the proposed Project use is compatible with the noise land
17 use compatibility standard of 75 dBA CNEL for new warehouse land use
18 development, and traffic noise levels would result in a less than significant impact
19 on the proposed land use. Project-generated traffic noise would result in a less than
20 significant impact on off-site sensitive receptors along areawide roadways. **(RDEIR**
21 **at 3.12-20)**. Implementation of the interim traffic improvements could result in
22 temporary noise impacts from construction activities associated with the lane
23 additions and shoulder improvements. These potential impacts would be similar to
24 construction noise impact discussed above. The reasonable worst-case combined
25 construction noise level expected for these types of proposed interim traffic
26 improvements would be 85 dBA Lmax as measured at 50 feet from an active
27 construction site. Based on typical operational usage factors, these reasonable worst-
28 case noise levels could result in reasonable worst-case hourly average of 82.9 dBA

1 Leq as measured at 50 feet from the operating equipment. The nearest receptor to
2 these roadway improvements is the residential land use located northeast of the
3 Cherry Valley Boulevard and Calimesa Boulevard intersection. This receptor is
4 located approximately 300 feet from the nearest construction footprint where heavy
5 equipment would be operating in order to construct these roadway improvements. At
6 this distance, reasonable worst-case construction noise levels would attenuate up to
7 approximately 74.4 dBA Lmax and 67.3 dBA Leq. These reasonable worst-case
8 noise levels are well below the City of Calimesa's noise level limit for construction
9 activities. In addition, such construction noise levels are unlikely to continue for eight
10 continuous hours, because equipment would not remain operating all day at the
11 nearest construction limits. Construction noise impacts from the proposed interim
12 traffic improvements would be less than significant with Mitigation Measures NOI-
13 4a to NOI-4e. **(RDEIR at 3.12-21)**. Potential long-term on-site stationary noise
14 impacts would be associated with operations at the proposed warehouse land uses.
15 The Project would generate noise from truck delivery, loading/unloading activities
16 at the loading areas, and other noise-producing activities at the parking lot such as
17 customers conversing, doors slamming, engine startup, and slow-moving vehicles.
18 These activities are potential point sources of noise that could affect noise-sensitive
19 receptors near the loading areas and parking lots, including single-family residences
20 located to the west, north, east, and southeast. Of these noise sources, noise from
21 truck delivery loading/unloading would result in the highest noise levels at off-site
22 sensitive receptors. Representative parking activities, such as vehicles cruising at
23 slow speeds, door slamming, cars starting, would generate approximately 60 dBA to
24 70 dBA Lmax at 50 feet. Conversation between two persons at a distance of 4 to 5
25 feet apart would generate a noise level of 60 dBA Leq at 5 feet, or approximately 40
26 dBA Leq as measured at 50 feet. Truck delivery, loading/unloading activities at the
27 loading areas of the proposed warehouse facility would be expected to produce the
28 highest stationary source noise levels. Typical noise levels from larger delivery truck

1 loading and unloading activities can range from 75 dBA to 85 dBA Lmax as
2 measured at 50 feet. The typical truck unloading process takes an average of 15 to
3 20 minutes. Loading and unloading areas associated with the Project face the
4 northern, western, and southern Project property lines. The closest residential land
5 use to the west of the Project site is located approximately 870 feet from the closest
6 Project truck bays and loading areas. At this distance, activity at the Project's western
7 truck bays of multiple trucks loading/unloading simultaneously could result in a
8 reasonable worst-case noise level of up to 60 dBA Lmax and a reasonable worst-case
9 combined hourly average noise level of 54 dBA Leq. The closest residence to the
10 Project's south facing loading area is located over 1,000 feet to the southeast across
11 Cherry Valley Boulevard. At this distance, activity at the Project's southern truck
12 bays of multiple trucks loading/unloading simultaneously could result in a reasonable
13 worst-case noise level of up to 59 dBA Lmax and a reasonable worst-case combined
14 hourly average noise level of 51 dBA Leq. Project operational noise associated with
15 loading/unloading and other parking lot noises would not be audible at the Rancho
16 Calimesa Mobile Home Ranch or at the homes located north and east of the Project
17 site due to distance from the site and intervening topography. Noise associated with
18 loading/unloading activities would potentially affect the residences located west and
19 southeast of the Project site. (RDEIR at 3.12-22). Project operational noise that can
20 be expected at these residences are summarized in RDEIR Table 3.12-9. The
21 existing residence adjacent to and to the west of the Project site is located within the
22 City of Calimesa and zoned Commercial Regional (CR). The applicable noise level
23 limits for Project operational noise projected to property in the City zoned CR is 52.5
24 dBA Leq between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. and 65 dBA Leq between the
25 hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. As shown in RDEIR Table 3.12-9, projected
26 operational noise levels could range up to 54 dBA Leq when multiple truck
27 loading/unloading operations occur simultaneously at the nearest loading areas of the
28 Project site. The applicable noise level limit for Project noise projected to adjacent

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

land within the CR zone in the City is 52.5 dBA Leq between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. and 65 dBA Leq between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. These loading/unloading operations could, therefore, exceed the City's nighttime operational noise level standard unless mitigation is incorporated. Inclusion of loading bay doors equipped with sealed gaskets would be expected to reduce loading/unloading maximum operational noise levels by at least 10 dBA. This would effectively reduce loading/unloading operational noise levels to below a combined hourly average noise level of 44 dBA Leq, well below the City of Calimesa's nighttime operational noise standard of 52.5 dBA Leq. With implementation of this measure, loading/unloading operational noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant. The County of Riverside prohibits noise levels from exceeding 45 dBA Leq, between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. (nighttime standard) and from exceeding 65 dBA Leq between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. (daytime standard) at residential properties. These standards apply to operational noise projected to the homes located southeast of the site. As noted previously, the closest residence to the south of the Project site could experience a reasonable worst-case combined average noise level of 51 dBA Leq from loading/unloading of multiple trucks simultaneously. These loading/unloading operations could, therefore, result in an exceedance of the County's nighttime operational noise level standard unless mitigation is incorporated. Inclusion of loading bay doors equipped with sealed gaskets would be expected to reduce loading/unloading maximum operational noise levels by at least 10 dBA. This would effectively reduce loading/unloading operational noise levels to below a combined reasonable worst-case average noise level of 41 dBA Leq, meeting the County of Riverside's nighttime operational noise standard of 45 dBA Leq. With implementation of this measure, loading/unloading operational noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant. **(RDEIR at 3.12-25)**. Noise from the Project's rooftop heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment units would attenuate to below 37 dBA Leq based on distance

1 to the nearest sensitive receptor. This is below the existing measured ambient noise
2 level in the vicinity of this receptor, and well below both the daytime and nighttime
3 operational noise standards of the City of Calimesa and County of Riverside.
4 Therefore, noise from operation of proposed rooftop HVAC units would not result
5 in violations of County of Riverside Code or City of Calimesa Municipal Ordinance,
6 and would result in a less than significant impact. **(RDEIR at 3.12-25 to 3.12-26).**
7 Because of the location of the Project in a predominantly rural area, there are no land
8 uses in the vicinity of the Project site (such as refineries, landfills) or other similar
9 land uses that could generate excessive noise levels that would result in impacts to
10 the proposed land use development. Based on the documented ambient noise levels,
11 there are no existing stationary noise sources that would expose persons working on
12 the Project site to noise levels in excess of these normally acceptable land use
13 compatibility standards for the proposed land use. **(RDEIR at 3.12-26; Refer also**
14 **to Final EIR Section 03-00, Responses to SIERRA 37-44 and CVAN 36-37).**

15 2. Mitigation:

16 Mitigation Measure NOI-1 will ensure that operational noise impacts are less than
17 significant, by requiring inclusion of loading bay doors with sealed gaskets that
18 would effectively reduce loading/unloading operational noise levels to below a
19 combined hourly average noise level of 44 dBA Leq, as measured at the nearest
20 receptor within the City of Calimesa, thus meeting the City's nighttime operational
21 noise standard of 52.5 dBA Leq. In addition, this measure would effectively reduce
22 loading/unloading operational noise levels to below a combined hourly average noise
23 level of 41 dBA Leq, as measured at the nearest receptor within the County of
24 Riverside, thus meeting the County of Riverside's nighttime operational noise
25 standard of 45 dBA Leq. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 (as
26 well as Mitigation Measures NOI-4a to 4e, discussed *infra*), impacts related to
27 exposure of persons to noise in excess of standards would be less than significant.

28 ***Impact: Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.***

1 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation would not result in a substantial*
2 *temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels*
3 *existing without the Project, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to*
4 *Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

5 1. Project Impact(s):

6 Project construction activities have the potential to cause short-term noise impacts to
7 the rural single-family homes in the Project area. Construction noise may also be
8 audible at the Rancho Calimesa Mobile Home Ranch, located west of the Project site
9 near the I-10 freeway. **(RDEIR at 3.12-32)**. As shown in **RDEIR Table 3.12-13**,
10 Project construction activities would result in temporary increases in ambient noise
11 levels at nearby sensitive receptors. These are reasonable worst-case noise levels that
12 can be expected to be lower at sensitive receptors as construction moves away from
13 the property line. A ridgeline breaks the line of sight between the Project site and the
14 Calimesa Mobile Home Ranch. Combined with the distance between the noise
15 sources on the Project site and the sensitive receptor, the break in the line of sight
16 afforded by the ridgeline would result in a 10-dBA deduction from construction noise
17 calculations. Similarly, existing hills and ridgelines block the line of sight from the
18 homes north of the Project site, thus a deduction of 10 dBA was taken into account.
19 **(RDEIR at 3.12-33)**. The reasonable worst-case construction noise level expected at
20 the City of Calimesa home located adjacent to the western Project boundary is 64
21 dBA Leq for the loudest hourly average noise level. Such construction noise levels
22 would not occur for eight continuous hours, because equipment would not remain
23 operating all day at full power. In addition, construction activities would not occur
24 continuously along the nearest Project property line, but would move around the
25 Project site. The modeled operational usage factor for the type of equipment that
26 would operate nearest the single-family home southeast of the Project site is 40
27 percent. Therefore, based on this operational usage factor averaged with the
28 measured background ambient noise levels of 51 dBA Leq at this location, the

1 resulting 8-hour average construction activity noise level is expected to be
2 approximately 57 dBA Leq. This reasonable worst-case 8-hour average noise level
3 is well below the City's noise level threshold of 75 dBA Leq (8-hour) for
4 construction activities. The County of Riverside does not have an absolute noise level
5 threshold for construction activities, but rather exempts construction noise from the
6 noise ordinance standards provided such activities occur within the stated
7 permissible hours of construction. However, in order to provide an equivalent
8 (conservative) evaluation of construction noise impacts on all sensitive receptors in
9 the Project vicinity, this analysis also applies the City of Calimesa threshold of 75
10 dBA Leq (8-hour) standard to the modeled receptor locations within the County of
11 Riverside. As shown in **RDEIR Table 3.12-12**, the reasonable worst-case modeled
12 construction noise levels could range up to 78 dBA Leq (loudest hourly average) at
13 the nearest single-family residence located southeast of the Project site within the
14 County of Riverside. However, similar to the discussion above, such construction
15 noise levels would not occur for 8 continuous hours, because equipment would not
16 remain operating all day at full power at the nearest construction limits. In addition,
17 construction activities would not occur continuously along the nearest Project
18 property line but would move around the Project site. The modeled operational usage
19 factor for the type of equipment that would operate nearest the single-family home
20 southeast of the Project site is 40 percent. Therefore, based on this operational usage
21 factor averaged with the measured background ambient noise levels of 69 dBA Leq
22 at this location, the resulting 8-hour average construction activity noise level is
23 expected to be approximately 73 dBA Leq. This reasonable worst-case 8-hour
24 average noise level is below the City's noise level threshold of 75 dBA Leq (8-hour)
25 for construction activities. As shown in **RDEIR Table 3.12-12**, construction
26 activities would result in a potential maximum increase of up to approximately 13
27 dBA in the hourly average ambient noise levels at the home within the City of
28 Calimesa immediately west of the site, when multiple pieces of heavy construction

1 equipment operate simultaneously near the westernmost portion of the Project site.
2 **(RDEIR at 3.12-34)**. Similarly, the closest home located southeast of the Project
3 site could experience a maximum increase of up to approximately 9 dBA in the
4 hourly average noise levels when multiple pieces of heavy construction equipment
5 operate simultaneously at the nearest Project construction limits. However, by
6 restricting construction activities to the County's permissible hours of construction
7 and by implementing best practices, these construction noise levels, when averaged
8 over a 24-hour period with existing background noise levels, would be expected to
9 be reduced so as not to result in a substantial increase (increase of 5 dBA CNEL or
10 greater) in the ambient noise levels at any sensitive receptor in the Project vicinity.
11 Therefore, to reduce this potential impact, Mitigation Measures NOI-4a to NOI-4e
12 would be implemented. **(RDEIR at 3.12-35)**.

13 2. Mitigation:

14 Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-4a through NOI-4e would ensure
15 compliance with County standards, including construction hours restrictions, which
16 have been established by the County in an effort to reduce the potential impact from
17 construction noise on nearby sensitive receptors to acceptable levels of significance.
18 Further, the implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-4a through NOI-4e would
19 also ensure that a variety of feasible measures are incorporated during Project
20 construction to further reduce construction noise to acceptable levels, and would
21 reduce construction noise levels to not result in a substantial increase in ambient
22 noise levels at off-site sensitive land uses.

23 **H. Transportation and Circulation**

24 ***Impact:*** *Hazards Due to Design Feature.*

25 ***Threshold:*** *Project construction and implementation will not substantially increase hazards*
26 *due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses*
27 *(e.g., farm equipment) with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project*
28 *Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

1 1. Project Impact(s):

2 The Project involves the conversion of undeveloped land to an industrial
3 development. The Project will include improved circulation of existing roads that
4 will be designed in accordance with County standards. (RDEIR at 3.16-101). The
5 Project would provide substantial improvements to Cherry Valley Boulevard along
6 its frontage, and payment of TUMF and DIF fees would provide additional funding
7 for improvements to the local road systems. The Project is consistent with the
8 General Plan Circulation Element. In addition, state and federal gasoline sales taxes
9 generated from the Project would further support ongoing County Road maintenance
10 efforts, which would further reduce hazards from poorly maintained roadways. The
11 roads in the Project vicinity are generally straight or include gentle vertical and
12 horizontal curves, and do not have design feature hazards such as sharp curves such
13 that the Project would substantially increase these hazards. However, the Project
14 does propose site access improvements from Cherry Valley Boulevard to provide
15 vehicles access to the Project site. Roadway improvements adjoining the Project site
16 that are required as Mitigation Measures TRAN-4a to TRAN-4e, to ensure that
17 hazardous conditions are not created, are assumed to be constructed in conjunction
18 with site development. These improvements will be in place prior to occupancy. The
19 recommended site-adjacent roadway improvements for the Project are described at
20 **RDEIR page 3.16-102**. The Traffic Study for the Project recommends site access
21 driveway improvements for the Project, which have been incorporated as mitigation
22 measures to reduce potential impacts from the addition of site access driveways as
23 part of the Project. In addition, improvements required pursuant to Mitigation
24 Measures TRAN-4a to TRAN-4e shall ensure that necessary site access driveway
25 improvements are constructed prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for
26 the Project.

27 1. Mitigation:

28 Mitigation Measures TRAN-4a to MM TRAN-4e will ensure adequate sight distance

1 and appropriate placement of driveways, stop signs, traffic signals, and pavement
2 striping to ensure that the Project does not substantially increase roadway hazards
3 due to a design feature.

4 ***Impact: Emergency Access.***

5 ***Threshold: Project construction and implementation will not result in inadequate***
6 ***emergency access) with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project***
7 ***Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).***

8 1. Project Impact(s):

9 The Project will include improvements on streets adjacent to the Project site and will
10 include three site access points for the Project site. Construction of the Project may
11 cause temporary delays along Cherry Valley Boulevard; however, the County
12 requires temporary road construction and traffic congestion management plans
13 during construction to minimize delay. With the Project's required preparation of a
14 traffic congestion management plan under Mitigation Measure TRAN-5, the Project
15 is anticipated to have a less than significant impact regarding circulation during
16 construction. Considering the temporary nature of Project construction, and
17 established County and City requirements for traffic control on public roadways
18 during construction, the Project is expected to have a less than significant impact on
19 emergency access during construction. Emergency access to serve the operational
20 Project site will be developed in accordance with applicable ordinances, standard
21 conditions of approval, and permits related to emergency access. **(RDEIR at 3.16-**
22 **104; refer also to Final EIR at 4-6 to 4-7).**

23 2. Mitigation:

24 Preparation of a traffic congestion management plan as required by MM TRAN-5
25 will ensure that construction traffic and activities do not adversely affect safe and
26 efficient traffic flow during construction; therefore, impacts related to emergency
27 access will be less than significant.

28 I. Utilities

1 **Impact:** *Wastewater Treatment Requirements of Regional Board.*

2 **Threshold:** *Project construction and implementation will not exceed wastewater treatment*
3 *requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, with the*
4 *implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A",*
5 *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

6 1. Project Impact(s):

7 The proposed Project will include on-site stormwater drainage facilities designed to
8 convey and capture on-site surface flows, as well as those off-site flows that would
9 traverse the Project site. The Project's drainage facilities designed to limit the storm
10 flow resulting from Project activities are described at **RDEIR page 3.17-19.**
11 Additionally, off-site drainage improvements are required to capture and direct
12 flows. Although the proposed Project will require development of new stormwater
13 drainage facilities on the Project site, these improvements will be located within the
14 Project's development footprint, and, therefore, impacts associated with the
15 construction and operation of these facilities are analyzed as part of the
16 environmental impact analysis contained within the RDEIR. The Project will be
17 required to prepare a SWPPP that conforms to the SWRCB NPDES permit. The
18 SWPPP shall identify BMPs to prevent construction related pollutants from reaching
19 stormwater and all products of erosion from moving off-site. Compliance with the
20 SWPPP and implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1 will ensure that
21 construction activities do not result in violation of any water quality standard. The
22 Project is designated a Priority Project. Therefore, treatment control BMPs are
23 required to remove pollutants typically associated with urban runoff. The final Water
24 Quality Management Plan shall provide detailed descriptions and instructions for
25 implementing the various BMPs for the Project, as required by Mitigation Measure
26 HYD-1. Long-term stormwater quality concerns will be managed pursuant to a
27 County-approved WQMP or SWPPP. Conformance with the mandatory
28 requirements of a SWPPP and/or a WQMP for the Project would ensure that no

1 substantial degradation of water quality associated with long-term construction
2 activities would occur. In addition, the Project will need to apply for an Industrial
3 Storm Water General Permit 2014-0057- DWQ (Industrial General Permit), which
4 is an NPDES permit that regulates discharges associated with 10 broad categories of
5 industrial activities. Industrial General Permit 2014-0057-DWQ became effective
6 July 1, 2015 and shall expire June 30, 2020, and the Project would be subject to this
7 permit. The General Industrial Permit requires implementation of management
8 measures to achieve the performance standard of best available technology
9 economically achievable (BAT) and best conventional pollutant control technology
10 (BCT). Additionally, the General Industrial Permit requires the development of a
11 SWPPP and a monitoring plan. The SWPPP facilitates the identification of pollutant
12 sources and the means by which to manage pollutant sources to reduce stormwater
13 pollution. With implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1, the Project would
14 not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control
15 Board. (RDEIR at 3.17-21).

16 2. Mitigation:

17 Mitigation Measure HYD-1 will require the submittal of a WQMP and a SWPPP to
18 identify sources that could affect the quality of stormwater discharges from the
19 Project site. A series of BMPs would also be included for effective treatment of target
20 pollutants in stormwater discharges anticipated from Project construction sites.

21 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following impacts potentially
22 resulting from the adoption of the EIR No. 534 cannot be fully mitigated and will be only partially avoided
23 or lessened in consideration of existing regulations, Project Design Features or mitigation measures
24 specified in Attachment A (Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, incorporated by reference into
25 this document). Accordingly, and as further explained below, the County makes the following findings as
26 to each of the following impacts as allowed by State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a): “Changes or
27 alterations [that might further reduce Project impacts] are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of
28 another public agency and not the [County]. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency”; or

1 Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the mitigation
2 measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.” Therefore, a statement of overriding
3 considerations consistent with State CEQA Guidelines sections 15093, 15216(b), and 15126.2(b) and
4 discussed in the Final EIR Section 15132 is required and included herein:

5 A. **Air Quality.**

6 ***Impact:*** *Conflict with Air Quality Plan.*

7 ***Threshold:*** *Project operations would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the*
8 *applicable air quality plan.*

9 1. **Project Impact(s):**

10 The Project’s localized construction-source emissions would not exceed applicable
11 LSTs. In addition, the Project would not exceed the applicable SCAQMD regional
12 construction thresholds after application of mitigation. Therefore, the Project would
13 not conflict with the AQMP according to this criterion during construction. Project
14 operational-source emissions would not exceed applicable LSTs, and are, therefore,
15 less than significant. However, the Project would exceed the applicable SCAQMD
16 *regional* numeric thresholds for operational ROG and NOx emissions (which are
17 ozone precursors) even after implementation of mitigation. Therefore, during Project
18 operations, the Project would conflict with the AQMP according to this criterion.
19 **(RDEIR at 3.3-32).** Development of the Project would also not be accounted for in
20 the air quality management plan; the Project would impede attainment because the
21 project is inconsistent with the current General Plan land use designation and the
22 Project’s emissions exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds. The
23 Project would comply with all applicable rules and regulations. However, the Project
24 could impede attainment of the AQMP because its emissions will exceed the
25 SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for NOx and ROG during operations,
26 even after implementation of all feasible mitigation. The predominant source of
27 operational emissions would be generated by Project truck traffic, and, at present,
28 there are no additional feasible mitigation measures that would reduce these

1 emissions to levels that are less than significant, even though the Project will require
2 as mitigation the use of the cleanest heavy-duty diesel trucks under current
3 regulations. Even if all passenger (employee) car trips to the site were eliminated,
4 this would result in a negligible percentage reduction in NOx emissions. Federal and
5 state agencies are charged with regulating and enforcing vehicle emission standards,
6 which is not within the County's control. Requiring an accelerated phase-in for non-
7 diesel-powered trucks would not be feasible, as it is not feasible for the County of
8 Riverside or the Project applicant to effectively enforce a prohibition on trucks from
9 entering the property that are otherwise permitted to operate in California and access
10 other properties in the County, region, and State. Even if the County or the Project
11 applicant were to apply such a restriction, it would merely cause warehouse operators
12 using older truck fleets to locate in another area within in the SoCAB where the
13 restriction does not apply, thereby resulting in no improvement to regional air
14 quality. Furthermore, if a truck that did not meet this requirement were to attempt
15 access to the site and be denied, there would be more idling emissions and travel
16 emissions associated with that truck. Likewise, imposing a "trip cap" on the number
17 of trucks that may access the site in a given day would also be infeasible to enforce,
18 and would not avoid or substantially lessen the estimated NOx emissions; in fact, if
19 trucks could be turned away for exceeding a trip cap, this measure could result in the
20 unintended adverse effect of trucks queuing on surrounding streets in the vicinity of
21 the Project until midnight of the following day. Reducing the number of loading
22 docks provided by the Project would also likely result in similar unintended queuing
23 impacts. The provision of additional electric vehicle charging stations and
24 infrastructure that would be needed for future increase in the use of electrical and
25 hybrid vehicles would likely not result in any demonstrable, quantifiable reduction
26 in NOx emissions, and would therefore not avoid or substantially lessen the
27 significant impact. Providing more extensive electric vehicle charging facilities for
28 trucks, based on the assumption that commercial electrical trucks will be in common

1 use in the future, is speculative because technology for commercial electrical trucks
2 is not currently available on a widespread basis. It is possible that electrical
3 infrastructure installed now would not support future, presently unknown technology
4 for commercial electrical trucks. No mid- or long-range parking for trucks will be
5 provided on the Project site, as trucks are expected to spend only a minimal amount
6 of time on-site (enough time to unload/load their trailer and complete any necessary
7 administrative tasks). It is not anticipated that trucks will spend enough time on-site
8 to connect to a charging station and recharge a battery. Given the level of current
9 existing technology, this is an infeasible and unrealistic requirement. SCAQMD,
10 which is the agency charged with managing air quality for the SoCAB, has not
11 adopted any sort of "indirect source rule" to reduce and mitigate emissions from large
12 sources of indirect air pollution (e.g., operational vehicle emissions). The San
13 Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has adopted such a rule
14 (Rule 9510), which requires implementation of certain measures or the payment of
15 an in-lieu fee that the Air District must use to achieve pollution reductions elsewhere
16 in the air basin. SJVAPCD's Rule 9510 contains a complex formula intended to
17 achieve equivalent emission reductions off-site as would have occurred through
18 direct compliance on-site, based on the average statewide cost of emission
19 reductions. Because SCAQMD has not adopted any similar regulation or rule, there
20 is no mechanism to require similar emissions reductions for this Project through the
21 payment of fees. In conclusion, based on the mandatory regulatory changes, most
22 heavy-duty trucks entering the Project site will meet or exceed EPA 2010 (for
23 construction haul trucks) and 2010 (for operational heavy-heavy and medium-heavy
24 duty delivery trucks) emission standards after the Project becomes operational in
25 2018. Suggesting that the County of Riverside or the Project applicant require more
26 stringent controls than required by either the federal government or State of
27 California is neither practical nor feasible for the County to effectively enforce.
28 Beyond these regulatory changes, which will serve to reduce emissions over time,

1 there are no additional feasible mitigation measures, as it is not feasible to reduce the
2 number of truck trips or associated emissions due to the logistics/warehouse nature
3 of the Project. (RDEIR at 3.3-33 to 3.3-41; Errata at 4-3; Refer also to Final EIR
4 Section 03-00, Responses to SIERRA-15 and SIERRA-16).

5 2. Mitigation:

6 The Project will implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1a to AQ-1h to reduce motor
7 vehicle emissions to the greatest extent feasible. These measures include restrictions
8 to reduce construction emissions, as well as operational requirements related to
9 engine idling restrictions, ridesharing, promotion of use of electric vehicles, and the
10 use of electric yard trucks, forklifts and trailer movers. However, despite
11 implementation of all feasible mitigation, the proposed Project cannot be fully
12 mitigated below a level of significance for this issue area and impacts would remain
13 significant and unavoidable.

14 *Impact: Air Quality Standards and Violations; Criteria Pollutants (Operations).*

15 *Threshold: Project construction and implementation would result in a cumulatively*
16 *considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the Project region is non-*
17 *attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including*
18 *releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).*

19 1. Project Impact(s):

20 The air basin is currently in nonattainment for PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and ozone. (RDEIR at
21 3.3-48). RDEIR Table 3.3-11 indicates that the SCAQMD regional emission
22 thresholds would be exceeded for ROG emissions during Project construction.
23 Mitigation Measures AQ-1a through AQ-1h are required (refer to Final EIR at p. 4-
24 2 to 4-3 for revisions to Mitigation Measures AQ-1g and AQ-1h). The mitigated
25 construction emissions are shown in RDEIR Table 3.3-14. After mitigation, the
26 construction activities would not exceed any daily threshold, and construction
27 emissions would be less than significant. As shown in RDEIR Table 3.3-12 and
28 Table 3.3-13, the Project's operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD's

1 regional thresholds for ROG and NOx (which are ozone precursors). The Project
2 would utilize electric trailer movers in place of traditional diesel-powered movers to
3 move trailers throughout the Project site, which would reduce the amount of
4 emissions generated during operation. (RDEIR at 3.3-49). However, even after
5 implementation of all mitigation, the Project's mitigated operational emissions
6 would continue to exceed the SCAQMD's regional thresholds for ROG and NOx,
7 resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. (RDEIR at 3.3-53).

8 2. Operational Mitigation:

9 The Project would comply with all applicable rules and regulations, as well as
10 Mitigation Measures AQ-1a through AQ-1h. However, the Project would exceed the
11 SCAQMD's regional thresholds for ROG and NOx, even after implementation of all
12 feasible mitigation. The predominance of operational emissions are generated by
13 Project truck traffic, and, at present, there are no additional feasible mitigation
14 measures that would reduce these emissions to levels that are less than significant.
15 Even if all passenger (employee) car trips to the site were eliminated, this would
16 result in a negligible percentage reduction in NOx emissions. Federal and state
17 agencies are charged with regulating and enforcing vehicle emission standards,
18 which is not within the County's control. Based on the mandatory regulatory changes
19 that will be phased in over time, most heavy-duty trucks entering the Project site will
20 meet or exceed EPA 2010 (for construction haul trucks) 2010 (for operational heavy-
21 heavy and medium-heavy duty delivery trucks) emission standards after the Project
22 becomes operational in 2018. Beyond these regulatory changes, which will serve to
23 reduce emissions over time, there are no additional feasible mitigation measures, as
24 it is not feasible to reduce the number of truck trips or associated emissions due to
25 the logistics/warehouse nature of the Project. (RDEIR at 3.3-53; Errata at 4-3).

26 Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

27 **B. Transportation and Circulation**

28 *Impact: Projected Future Traffic.*

1 **Threshold:** *The Project would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy*
2 *establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking*
3 *into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and nonmotorized travel*
4 *and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections,*
5 *streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.*

6 1. Project Impact(s):

7 Under Existing Plus Project conditions, there are no additional intersections
8 anticipated to operate at an unacceptable LOS, beyond those intersections which
9 already operate at an unacceptable LOS under existing (2017) conditions. **(RDEIR**
10 **at 3.16-33)**. As shown in **RDEIR Table 3.16-14**, the I-10 Freeway ramp merge and
11 diverge areas were found to operate at acceptable levels of service (i.e., LOS D or
12 better) during the peak hours under Existing plus Project traffic conditions. **(RDEIR**
13 **at 3.16-42)**. Impacts under remaining scenarios are identified as follows:

14 Existing Plus Ambient Plus Project (2018) Freeway Ramps

15 The following intersections are currently operating at an unacceptable LOS (LOS E
16 or worse) under Existing 2017 conditions, as well as under Existing plus Ambient
17 plus Project 2018 conditions:

- 18 ■ I-10 EB Ramps/Cherry Valley Boulevard (AM and PM Peak Hours) LOS F
- 19 ■ I-10 WB Ramps/Cherry Valley Boulevard (PM and PM Peak Hours) LOS F

20 No new deficiencies would occur due to the addition of 2.0 percent ambient growth
21 along with Project traffic under EAP 2018 conditions. However, the Project would
22 contribute more than 50 peak-hour trips to the existing deficiencies at the above
23 freeway ramps, resulting in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the existing
24 cumulatively significant impacts. **(RDEIR at 3.16-83)**.

25 Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative (2018) Local Intersections

26 The following intersections are anticipated to operate at an unacceptable LOS with
27 addition of cumulative traffic from pending and approved, but not yet constructed
28 known development projects in the area, in addition to the ramp deficiencies

1 previously identified under EAP 2018 traffic conditions:

- 2 • Roberts Road/Cherry Valley Boulevard (AM and PM Peak Hours) LOS F
- 3 • I-10 EB Ramps/Cherry Valley Boulevard (AM and PM Peak Hours) LOS F
- 4 • I-10 WB Ramps/Cherry Valley Boulevard (AM and PM Peak Hours) LOS F
- 5 • Calimesa Boulevard/Cherry Valley Boulevard (AM and PM Peak Hours)
6 LOS F
- 7 • Nancy Avenue/Cherry Valley Boulevard (AM Peak Hour only) LOS E
8 **(RDEIR at 3.16-83).**

9 Horizon Year (2040) Freeway Ramps and Local Intersections

10 The Project would also result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the
11 existing cumulatively significant impact at the following intersections, which are
12 anticipated to operate at an unacceptable LOS under Horizon Year (2040) with and
13 without Project conditions:

- 14 • Roberts Road/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM Peak Hours
- 15 • I-10 Eastbound Ramps/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM Peak
16 Hours
- 17 • I-10 Westbound Ramps/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM Peak
18 Hours
- 19 • Calimesa Boulevard/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM Peak
20 Hours
- 21 • Union Street/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM Peak Hours
- 22 • Nancy Avenue/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM Peak Hours
- 23 • Beaumont Avenue/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM Peak
24 Hours
- 25 • Future Beckwith Avenue/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM
26 Peak Hours

27 The addition of Project traffic is not anticipated to result in any intersection
28 deficiencies beyond those identified for Horizon Year (2040) Without Project
conditions. **(RDEIR at 3.16-83).**

Freeway Mainline Segments

1 There are 19 freeway mainline segments that are currently operating at an
2 unacceptable LOS under Existing 2017 traffic conditions and are anticipated to
3 continue to operate at unacceptable LOS through Horizon Year (2040) traffic
4 conditions without and with the Project. In addition, under Opening Year Cumulative
5 (2018) conditions, the Project would result in a worsening of the LOS for an
6 additional six segments, in addition to the 19 segments that currently operate at an
7 unacceptable LOS. As the Project is expected to contribute peak-hour trips to the
8 existing deficiencies on the regional state highway system, the Project's incremental
9 contribution to this impact is considered cumulatively significant and unavoidable.
10 **(RDEIR at 3.16-84).**

11 Mitigation Measures TRAN-1a and MM TRAN-1b are required to mitigate impacts
12 to the I-10 Eastbound and Westbound ramps at Cherry Valley Boulevard as well as
13 impacts to the Cherry Valley Boulevard and Calimesa Boulevard intersection under
14 the scenarios described above. MM TRAN-1c is required to reduce impacts to the
15 other intersections listed below. However, some of the proposed improvements are
16 not within the jurisdiction of the County of Riverside and/or are not specifically
17 included within the TUMF or DIF fee programs at this time. Therefore, while the
18 Project would contribute its fair share of fees to support the implementation of
19 necessary improvements, the applicant and the County cannot fully control the
20 timing or implementation of the improvements listed in other jurisdictions, and
21 impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. **(RDEIR at 3.16-84).**

22 The widening of Cherry Valley Boulevard to its ultimate roadway classification as a
23 4-lane, 2-lanes of travel in each direction, divided arterial highway is currently
24 included in the County's TUMF program. As such, additional eastbound and
25 westbound through lane improvements at study area intersections along Cherry
26 Valley Boulevard are recognized in the County's TUMF program. The installation
27 and/or modification of traffic signals and turn lanes would be subject to payment of
28 fair share fees. **(RDEIR at 3.16-88).** There are 19 freeway mainline segments that

1 are currently operating at an unacceptable LOS under Existing traffic conditions and
2 are anticipated to continue to operate at unacceptable LOS through Horizon Year
3 (2040) traffic conditions, even without the Project. In addition, under Opening Year
4 Cumulative (2018) conditions, the Project would result in a worsening of the LOS
5 for an additional six segments, in addition to the 19 segments that currently operate
6 at an unacceptable LOS under existing conditions. As the Project is expected to
7 contribute peak-hour trips to the existing deficiencies on the regional State highway
8 system, the Project's incremental contribution is considered cumulatively significant
9 and unavoidable. **(RDEIR at 3.16-95; Refer also to Final EIR Section 03-00,**
10 **Responses to CALIMESA 5-8).**

11 2. Mitigation:

12 The transportation impacts associated with the development of the Project were
13 determined based on the Existing plus Ambient Growth plus Project Year 2018,
14 Existing plus Ambient Growth plus Project plus Cumulative Year 2018 and Horizon
15 Year 2040 Without and With Project analysis. As summarized in **RDEIR Table**
16 **3.16-23, Table 3.16-24 and Table 3.16-25**, the development of the Project would
17 contribute to two (2) potentially significant cumulative impacts under Existing plus
18 Ambient plus Project (2018) conditions, three (3) potentially significant cumulative
19 impacts under Existing plus Ambient plus Project plus Cumulative (2018)
20 conditions, and six (6) additional cumulatively significant impacts under Horizon
21 Year 2040 traffic conditions, without mitigation. Implementation of Mitigation
22 Measure TRAN-1a through TRAN-1c requires the applicant to pay its fair share and
23 to participate in the County's DIF and TUMF fee programs as applicable to fund the
24 improvement costs for the impacted intersections. The fair share calculations are
25 provided in **RDEIR Table 3.16-28**. However, as outlined within **RDEIR Table**
26 **3.16-27**, some of the proposed improvements are not specifically included within the
27 TUMF or DIF fee programs at this time. Therefore, while the Project would
28 contribute its fair share of fees to support the implementation of necessary

1 improvements, the applicant and the County cannot fully control the timing or
2 implementation of the improvements listed and impacts would remain significant
3 and unavoidable for the following:

4 Opening Year (2018) EAP Plus Cumulative-Local Intersections

- 5 • Roberts Road/Cherry Valley Boulevard (AM and PM Peak Hours) LOS F
- 6 • Calimesa Boulevard/Cherry Valley Boulevard (AM and PM Peak Hours)
7 LOS F
- 8 • Nancy Avenue/Cherry Valley Boulevard (AM Peak Hour only) LOS E

9 The above impact (Opening Year (2018) EAP Plus Cumulative) is considered a
10 cumulative impact. (RDEIR at 3.16-88). Additionally, the Project would result in a
11 cumulatively considerable contribution to the existing cumulatively significant
12 impacts at the following intersections, which are anticipated to operate at an
13 unacceptable LOS under Horizon Year (2040) without and with Project conditions:

- 14 • Roberts Road/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM Peak Hours
15 (only partially identified in TUMF).
- 16 • Calimesa Boulevard/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM Peak
17 Hours (only partially identified in TUMF)
- 18 • Union Street/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM Peak Hours
19 (only partially identified in TUMF)
- 20 • Nancy Avenue/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM Peak Hours
21 (only partially identified in TUMF)
- 22 • Beaumont Avenue/Cherry Valley Boulevard—LOS F AM and PM Peak
23 Hours (only partially identified in TUMF)
- 24 • Future Beckwith Avenue/Cherry Valley Boulevard (only partially identified
25 in TUMF)

26 Mitigation Measure TRAN-1b further provides that, in the event a fair share program
27 has not been established in the City of Calimesa for the Calimesa Boulevard/Cherry
28 Valley Boulevard intersection, then the Project applicant is required to construct
certain interim improvements to mitigate the Project's cumulative impacts, provided

1 that the agencies with jurisdiction over the improvements allow for such
2 construction. Thus, the implementation of recommended mitigation measures at the
3 impacted intersections would mitigate the direct, cumulative, and long-term impacts
4 of the Project on local roadway segments and intersections to a less than significant
5 level. However, the Calimesa Boulevard/Cherry Valley Boulevard intersection is
6 partially under the jurisdiction of the City of Calimesa, which the County of
7 Riverside does not control. Moreover, the land necessary for the realignment is
8 privately owned and not under the control of the applicant or County. Thus, even
9 though the Project attempts to fully mitigate its impact to the greatest extent feasible
10 as required by CEQA, the mitigation is technically infeasible because the County of
11 Riverside cannot control the timing of the improvements. Other recommended
12 improvements are not currently fully included as part of the TUMF program, as
13 shown in **RDEIR Table 3.16-28**. For those reasons, the proposed Project would
14 result in a significant unavoidable impact with respect to the three intersections
15 identified above under Existing plus Project plus Ambient plus Cumulative (2018)
16 conditions, and the six intersections identified above under Horizon Year (2040)
17 conditions. (**RDEIR at 3.16-93**).

18 *I-10 Freeway Ramps*

19 Implementation of Mitigation Measures TRAN-1a and TRAN-1b require the
20 applicant to pay its fair share by participating in a fair-share contribution program to
21 fund the improvement costs. Mitigation Measures TRAN-1a and TRAN-1b further
22 provide that, in the event a fair share contribution program has not been established
23 for the I-10 at Cherry Valley interchange, then the Project applicant is required to
24 construct certain interim improvements to mitigate the Project's cumulative impacts,
25 provided that the agencies with jurisdiction over the improvements allow for such
26 construction. The installation of these interim traffic improvements contemplated in
27 TRAN-1a(b) and TRAN-1b(b) would mitigate Project impacts to less than
28 significant levels, significantly increasing the capacity of the I-10 at Cherry Valley

1 interchange ramp intersections, such that even with the addition of Project traffic,
2 delay and level of service will be improved to better than current conditions.
3 However, the I-10 Interchange is located within the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the
4 City of Calimesa—namely, I-10 Freeway Eastbound and I-10 Eastbound
5 Ramps/Cherry Valley Boulevard and I-10 Westbound Ramps/Cherry Valley
6 Boulevard within the jurisdiction of the City of Calimesa and Caltrans. Therefore,
7 because the County of Riverside itself does not control these areas, neither the
8 applicant nor the County can guarantee the provision or timing of the specified
9 improvements. For example, the County cannot control when or whether WRCOG
10 and/or the City of Calimesa establishes the Fair Share Contribution Program (under
11 TRAN-1a and TRAN-1b, Option 1), nor can the County grant the requisite permits
12 for construction of the improvements that would be constructed on Caltrans' and
13 Calimesa's property (under TRAN-1a, and TRAN-1b Option 2). Furthermore, the
14 land necessary for the realignment within the City of Calimesa is privately owned
15 and not under the control of the applicant or County. Thus, even though the Project
16 attempts to fully mitigate its impact to the greatest extent feasible as required by
17 CEQA, the mitigation is technically infeasible because the County of Riverside
18 cannot control the timing of the improvements. Therefore, the proposed Project
19 would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant and
20 unavoidable impact to I-10 Eastbound Ramps/Cherry Valley Boulevard and I-10
21 Westbound Ramps/Cherry Valley Boulevard and impacts will remain significant and
22 unavoidable. **(RDEIR at 3.16-94).**

23 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered, consistent with
24 CEQA's requirements, the impacts of the Project together with all other pending or approved projects within
25 the affected area for each resource area, and finds that:

26 **A. Aesthetics Cumulative Impacts.**

27 **Cumulative Impact Finding:** Not cumulatively considerable.

28 As described in the Draft EIR's Aesthetics Section (Section 3.1), potential impacts

1 would be less than significant. The location and design of the Project places the
2 proposed buildings well below the grade of Cherry Valley Boulevard (up to 48.3 feet
3 some places), which would afford the most prominent public views of the Project.
4 Because of their low profiles, views of the buildings would not break the ridgeline
5 profile of the hills to the north of the buildings. Large building setbacks from Cherry
6 Valley Boulevard as well as substantial Project landscaping further facilitate the
7 Project blending with the existing landscape. As indicated in RDEIR Section 3.1, the
8 Project will not significantly impact scenic vistas or scenic resources, or substantially
9 degrade the visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings, either from
10 direct Project impacts or cumulative impacts. Therefore, the Project, in conjunction
11 with other planned and approved projects, would not have cumulatively considerable
12 aesthetic impacts. The Project consists of developing previously undeveloped land
13 with two high-cube warehouse buildings on the Project site. Although historically
14 rural and undeveloped in character, recent new and planned development is
15 transitioning this area to be more urban. Such projects include the approved Sunny
16 Cal Specific Plan, with 497 dwelling units, and Holbert Ranch (TTM 3054) with 131
17 dwelling units. When developed, these two projects (which adjoin the Project site)
18 would result in this area transitioning to an area with visual characteristics that are
19 more urban as compared to existing conditions. These nearby cumulative
20 developments, together with the proposed Project, will contribute to an overall
21 change in the visual character of the area. However, compliance with County General
22 Plan policies, design guidelines, Municipal Code and Zoning Ordinance will be
23 required for the proposed Project and all other cumulative projects in the area, which
24 will ensure cohesive and attractive development that is compatible with the
25 surroundings. With mitigation, the Project would have a less than significant impact
26 regarding impacts to the visual character of the site or creation of a new source of
27 substantial light or glare. Other future projects would be required to implement
28 similar mitigation measures in compliance with County standards. Therefore, the