

SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA



ITEM
3.38
(ID # 5965)

FROM : COUNTY COUNSEL AND

MEETING DATE:

TRANSPORTATION & LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY/PLANNING Tuesday, December 12, 2017

SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION & LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY/PLANNING: RESOLUTION NO. 2017-239 AMENDING THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN - FOURTH CYCLE OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR 2017 (General Plan Amendment (GPA) Nos. 720, 721 and 1165), RESOLUTION NO. 2017-246 CERTIFYING EIR NO. 471 AND APPROVING SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 342, ORDINANCE NO. 348.4876 RELATED TO SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 342, and ORDINANCE NO. 664.60 APPROVING DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 73. DISTRICTS 2 and 5. [Applicant Fees 100%]

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2017-246 certifying Environmental Impact Report No. 471 for General Plan Amendment Nos. 720 and 721, Specific Plan No. 342, Change of Zone No. 7055, Development Agreement No. 73, and approving Specific Plan No. 342; and,

ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2017-239 amending the Riverside County General Plan in accordance with the Board's actions taken on General Plan Amendment Nos. 720, 721, and 1165; and,

ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 348.4876 amending the zoning in the Lakeview, Nuevo, Homeland, Juniper Flats, N. Perris Areas, the Hemet-San Jacinto District and the Perris Reservoir District shown on Map Nos. 2.2422, 17.107 and 55.040 Change of Zone No. 7055; and,

ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 664.60 adopting Development Agreement No. 73 consistent with the Board's action on December 5, 2017; and,

DIRECT the Planning Department to incorporate the changes adopted by Resolution No. 2017-239, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, to the Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element, Circulation Element, and associated Area Plan, tables and figures.


ACTION: Policy

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Ashley, seconded by Supervisor Tavaglione and duly carried, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as recommended.

Ayes: Jeffries, Tavaglione, Perez and Ashley
Nays: None
Absent: Washington
Date: December 12, 2017
xc:

Kecia Harper-Ihem
Clerk of the Board

By 
Deputy

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

FINANCIAL DATA	Current Fiscal Year:	Next Fiscal Year:	Total Cost:	Ongoing Cost
COST	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A
NET COUNTY COST	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A
SOURCE OF FUNDS: Applicant Fees 100%			Budget Adjustment:	None
			For Fiscal Year:	N/A

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION: Approve

BACKGROUND:

Summary

The County has the ability to process four cycle updates to its General Plan annually. The General Plan Amendments comprising the Fourth Cycle of General Plan Amendments for 2017 were considered by the Board of Supervisors during public hearings, which are listed below. GPA Nos. 721 and 1165 are Entitlement/Policy Amendments, and GPA No. 720 is a Technical, Entitlement/Policy, Extraordinary Foundation Component, and Agriculture Foundation Component Amendment.

INDIVIDUAL AMENDMENTS:

Villages of Lakeview

General Plan Amendment No. 720 (Technical, Entitlement/Policy, and Agriculture Foundation Amendment and Foundation Amendment – Extraordinary): A proposal to amend the Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan, which includes the following amendments:

1. A Technical Amendment is needed to rectify errors related to mapping which resulted in inaccuracies related to areas within the Lakeview Mountains and those in the lowlands to reflect the actual topography for the area.
2. An Entitlement/Policy Amendment that proposes to change the underlying land use designations in the Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan from Rural: Rural Mountainous (R:RM) [10 Acre Minimum], Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) [5 Acre Minimum], Rural Community: Very Low Density Residential (RC:VLDR) [1 Acre Minimum], Agriculture (A:AG) [10 Acre Minimum], Open Space: Conservation (OS:C), Community Development: Very Low Density Residential (CD:VLDR) [1 Acre Minimum], Community Development: Low Density Residential (CD:LDR) [0.5 Acre Minimum], Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD:CR) [0.25 - 0.35 FAR], Community Development: Light Industrial (CD:LI) [0.25 - 0.60 FAR], and Community Development: Highest Density Residential (CD:HHDR) [20+ Dwelling Units per Acre) to those as reflected in the Specific Plan land use plan.
3. An Extraordinary Foundation Component Amendment that proposes to change the underlying Foundations from Rural, Rural Community, and Open Space to Community Development.
4. The Agriculture Foundation Component Amendment proposes to change the underlying Foundation of Agriculture to Community Development.

General Plan Amendment No. 721 (Entitlement/Policy Amendment): A proposal to amend the Circulation Element of the General Plan, which includes upgrades and downgrades to numerous

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

existing and proposed roadway classifications and trails shown on the current Circulation Element plan for the Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan to match the circulation plan as proposed by the Specific Plan. In particular, the changes are listed below:

1. Elimination of 9th Street/Yucca Avenue as a through street from the project boundary easterly.
2. Rerouting 10th Street/Wolfskill Avenue as a Secondary roadway east of Hansen Avenue.
3. Elimination of Bridge Street, 3rd Street, 5th Street, and 6th Street within the Specific Plan boundaries and will not have direct access to Ramona Expressway, as access to Ramona Expressway will be shifted to Town Center and Park Center Boulevards.
4. Additional detailed modifications to standard County roadway cross sections for roads within the Specific Plan.
5. Modify the current trail alignments within the Specific Plan area and propose a 10-12 foot Multi-Purpose Community Trail that would allow for horses along the north side of the project and connect to the Combination trail along the San Jacinto River and to Ramona Expressway.
6. Implement a portion of a Community Trail (restricted use) above the portion of the California Aqueduct that extends east to west through the Specific Plan area. The area for the trail above the aqueduct is owned and operated by the Metropolitan Water District and any use of the easement area above the aqueduct for trails would be subordinate to the MWD water conveyance use.
7. A policy amendment to General Plan Circulation Element Policy C 2.1 to expressly confirm the County's authority to accept Level of Service (LOS) D in certain Area Plans. In addition, the Board of Supervisors may, on occasion, approve a project that fails to meet the General Plan LOS targets in order to balance congestion management considerations in relation to benefits, environmental impacts and costs, provided an Environmental Impact Report, or equivalent, has been completed to fully evaluate the impacts of such approval. This is the same language that exists in the General Plan as currently adopted and amended as part of the County's 2015 General Plan. However, the County's approval of GPA No. 960 is currently being challenged. Since the outcome of the litigation related to GPA No. 960 is unknown, General Plan Amendment No. 721 restates this policy language so it will be part of the County's General Plan regardless of the litigation outcome. With the inclusion of Policy C 2.1, Specific Plan No. 342 is consistent with the General Plan's Circulation Element.

The project site for GPA Nos. 720 and 721 is located within the Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan in the Fifth Supervisorial District; the overall project specifically located on either side of Ramona Expressway, generally east of Martin Street, west of Princess Ann Road, south of Marvin Road, and generally north of Brown Avenue. GPA Nos. 720 and 721 are associated with Specific Plan No. 342, the Villages of Lakeview, Change of Zone No. 7055, Development Agreement No. 73, and Environmental Impact Report No. 471, which were considered concurrently with this amendment at the public hearings before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. On October 18, 2017, the Planning Commission recommended to the Board of Supervisors tentative approval of GPA Nos. 720 and 721 with the approval of Planning Commission Resolution No. 2017-006. The Board of Supervisors tentatively approved General Plan Amendment Nos. 720 and 721 on December 5, 2017.

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

The adoption of Resolution Nos. 2017-246 and 2017-239, Ordinance No. 348.4876, and Ordinance No. 664.60 will finalize the Board's tentative approval of Specific Plan No. 342 and the associated Change of Zone No. 7055 and Development Agreement No. 73 on December 5, 2017. Ordinance No. 348.4876 will formally change the property's zoning classification and amend the County's zoning map to reflect the new Specific Plan zoning classification.

Circle K

General Plan Amendment No. 1165 (Entitlement/Policy Amendment): A proposal to amend the current General Plan land use designation of 7.48 acres from Community Development: Light Industrial (CD: LI) [0.25 - 0.60 FAR] to Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD: CR) [0.20 - 0.35 FAR] and Open Space-Conservation (OS-C), as reflected in Exhibit 6 titled "CZ07900 GPA01165 CUP03739," attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference. The project site is located within the Temescal Canyon Area Plan in the Second Supervisorial District, specifically located northerly of Cajalco Road, easterly of Temescal Canyon Road, and westerly of Eagle Canyon Road. GPA No. 1165 is associated with Change of Zone No. 7900, Conditional Use Permit No. 03739, and Environmental Assessment (EA) No. 42871, which were considered concurrently with this amendment at the public hearings before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. The Planning Commission recommended to the Board of Supervisors tentative approval of GPA No. 1165 on November 15, 2017, by adopting Planning Commission Resolution No. 2017-013. The Board of Supervisors tentatively approved General Plan Amendment No. 1165 on December 5, 2017.

Development Agreement No. 73 and Ordinance No. 664.60

On December 5, 2017, the Board of Supervisors tentatively approved Development Agreement No. 73, based on the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report, with modifications to Section 4.2.1.(i) and Exhibit G of the Development Agreement. Development Agreement No. 73 as attached to this agenda item contains the modifications made by the Board of Supervisors. On December 5, 2017, the Board also introduced Ordinance No. 664.60 approving Development Agreement No. 73. The adoption of Ordinance No. 664.60 will finalize the Board's approval of Development Agreement No. 73. Per state law, a development agreement is a legislative act that must be approved by ordinance. Ordinance No. 664.60 incorporates by reference and adopts Development Agreement No. 73.

Impact on Residents and Businesses

These projects have been carefully considered, analyzed, and reviewed during the public hearings before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors on the dates specified for each item listed above.

SUPPLEMENTAL:

Additional Fiscal Information

All fees paid by the applicant. There is no General Fund obligation.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Resolution No. 2017-239
- B. Resolution No. 2017-246

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

- C. Ordinance No. 348.4876
- D. Ordinance No. 664.60 with Development Agreement No. 73 as modified by the Board on December 5, 2017 (modifications to Section 4.2.1(i) and Exhibit G)


Melissa Noone, Associate Management Analyst 12/6/2017

**RESOLUTION NO. 2017-246
ADOPTING SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 342 AND
CERTIFYING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 471
(VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW)**

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65450 et. seq., public hearings were held before the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in Riverside, California on November 14 and December 5, 2017, and before the Riverside County Planning Commission in Riverside, California on September 6, October 4, and October 18, 2017, to consider Specific Plan No. 342 (Villages of Lakeview) and the related General Plan Amendment Nos. 720 and 721, Change of Zone No. 7055, and Development Agreement No. 73; and,

WHEREAS, all the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Riverside County CEQA implementing procedures have been satisfied, and Environmental Impact Report No. 471 (EIR No. 471), prepared in connection with Specific Plan No. 342, General Plan Amendment Nos. 720 and 721, Change of Zone No. 7055 and Development Agreement No. 73 and related cases (referred to alternatively herein as "the Project"), is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially significant effects of the Project on the environment and measures necessary to avoid or substantially lessen such effects have been evaluated in accordance with CEQA and the above referenced Rules; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15151, the evaluation of environmental effect is to be completed in light of what is reasonably feasible; and,

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Planning Department circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a 30-day public review period from July 20, 2006 to August 21, 2006, and held an initial public scoping meeting on August 9, 2006; and a second scoping session occurred on September 21, 2006 and was announced in an errata notice released on August 23, 2006. The County prepared a Draft EIR No. 471 (State Clearinghouse No. 2006071095) to address the General Plan Amendment Nos. 720 and 721, Change of

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: *ARQ*
AARON C. GELTIS
DATE: 11-30-17

1 Zone No. 7055, and Development Agreement No. 73. The Draft EIR No.471 (“EIR”) was circulated for
2 public review and comment as specified in the State CEQA Guidelines for a 45-day period from September
3 30, 2016 through November 14, 2016). Public comments were received by the County and have been
4 responded to by the County in accordance with CEQA requirements. The Project Final EIR Responses to
5 Comments document was published August 7, 2017 (the "Responses"); and,

6 **WHEREAS**, on December 5, 2017, the Board of Supervisors denied the proposed Specific Plan
7 No. 342 submitted by the applicant, and tentatively approved Alternative 7 in EIR No. 471 as Specific Plan
8 No. 342 along with tentatively certifying EIR No. 471 and tentatively approving the other related cases;
9 and,

10 **WHEREAS**, the matter was discussed fully with testimony and documentation presented by the
11 public and affected government agencies; now, therefore,

12 **BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Board of Supervisors
13 of the County of Riverside, in regular session assembled on December 12, 2017, that:

- 14 A. Specific Plan No. 342 is a 2,883-acre planned community located northerly of Wolfskill
15 Avenue and Pulsar View Road, south of Marvin Road, east of the San Jacinto River, and
16 west of the border of the City of San Jacinto. It proposes the construction of a maximum of
17 8,725 dwelling units within the Specific Plan Area. Land uses include: 737 acres
18 designated for primarily residential uses which may include 5,950 dwelling units, 282
19 acres for a mixed-use town center area which may include a maximum of 555,000 square
20 feet of commercial uses and a maximum of 2,775 dwelling units, 71 acres designated for
21 commercial office uses and a maximum of 825,000 square feet, 82 acres designated as
22 Open Space – Recreation, 241 acres of public facility, drainage, and Metropolitan Water
23 District (MWD) Aqueduct areas, 1,030 acres of open space, and 181 acres for major roads.
- 24 B. Specific Plan No. 342 is associated with General Plan Amendments Nos. 720 and 721,
25 Change of Zone No. 7055, and Development Agreement No. 73, which were considered
26
27
28

1 concurrently at the public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of
2 Supervisors.

- 3 C. General Plan Amendment No. 720 proposes to change the existing land use designations
4 on the subject site from Rural: Rural Mountainous, Rural: Rural Residential, Rural
5 Community: Very Low Density Residential, Agriculture, Open Space: Conservation,
6 Community Development: Very Low Density Residential, Community Development: Low
7 Density Residential, Community Development: Commercial Retail, Community
8 Development: Light Industrial, and Community Development: Highest Density Residential
9 to those land use designations reflected in the land use plan for Specific Plan No. 342.
- 10 D. General Plan Amendment No. 721 proposes the upgrading and downgrading of numerous
11 trails and roadway designations including, but not limited to, the following: the elimination
12 of 9th Street/Yucca Avenue as a through street through the Project easterly; the rerouting
13 of 10th Street/Wolfskill Avenue as a Secondary roadway east of Hanson Avenue, and
14 Bridge Street, 3rd Street, 5th Street, and 6th Street will be eliminated on the Project site;
15 and access to the Ramona Expressway will be shifted to Town Center and Park Center
16 Boulevards. General Plan Amendment No. 721 will also amend the Circulation Element
17 Trails and Bikeway System to include the Community Trail designation for a number of
18 the trails proposed within the Project boundary. In addition, the proposed Project will
19 amend the General Plan Circulation Element Policy C 2.1 to clarify the County's authority
20 to approve this Project given the County's "Level of Service" targets for traffic circulation.
- 21 E. Change of Zone Case No. 7055 proposes to change the existing zoning classifications of A-
22 1-10 (Light Agriculture with a 10-acre minimum lot size), A-2-10 (Heavy Agriculture with
23 a 10-acre minimum lot size), A-P (Light Agriculture with Poultry), C-R (Commercial
24 Retail), M-SC (Manufacturing - Service Commercial), R-A-1 (Residential Agricultural with
25 a 1-acre minimum lot size), R-A-10 (Residential Agricultural with a 10-acre minimum lot
26 size), and R-R (Rural Residential), R-A (Residential Agricultural), R-A-2 1/2 (Residential
27
28

1 Agricultural with a 2-1/2 acre minimum lot size), and N-A-640 (Natural Assets) to Specific
2 Plan. The associated Specific Plan zoning ordinance would establish development standards
3 to implement Specific Plan No. 342.

4 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental
5 impacts associated with the EIR No. 471 are determined to have no environmental impacts in consideration
6 of existing regulations and Project Design Features for reasons documented in the Final EIR No. 471 and
7 summarized below.

8 **A. Agricultural and Forestry Resources.**

9 ***Impact: Loss or Conversion of Forest Resources.***

10 ***Threshold F: Project construction and implementation would not result in the loss of forest***
11 ***land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.***

12 1. **No Impact:**

- 13 a. Project – No forest lands exist or have been designated within or in the lands
14 adjacent to the Project site. Therefore, the Project has no potential to result
15 in the loss or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. (EIR, p. 5.2-12.)
16 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project
17 and there is no impact for the reasons set forth in the preceding paragraph and
18 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-32; 7.0-174.)

19 ***Impact: Changes in Existing Environment.***

20 ***Threshold G: Project construction and implementation would not involve other changes in***
21 ***the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion***
22 ***of forestland, to non-forestland use.***

23 1. **No Impact:**

- 24 a. Project – Because there are no forest lands within or adjacent to the Project
25 site, the Project has no potential to cause conversion of forest land to non-
26 forest use. (EIR, p. 5.2-13.)

1 **Threshold D:** *Project construction and implementation would not interfere with the*
2 *nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County*
3 *Ordinance No. 655*

4 1. Project Impact(s):

5 a. Project – The Project will not create a new source of substantial day time light
6 or glare. Potential impacts to residents of Lakeview/Nuevo community will
7 be less than significant through compliance with all applicable design
8 standards for lighting that limit off-site light spillage and restrict the use of
9 certain light fixtures, including regulations in the MSHCP and Riverside
10 County Ordinance No. 655. The Project site is located within 45 miles of the
11 Observatory, within Zone B of the Special Lighting Area that surrounds the
12 Mt. Palomar Observatory and it must comply with the mandatory
13 requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 655. Riverside County
14 Ordinance No. 655 contains approved materials and methods of installation,
15 definition, general requirements, requirements for lamp source and shielding,
16 prohibition and exceptions. With the incorporation of Project lighting
17 requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 into the proposed
18 Project’s future lighting design, the potential for conflict with night time use
19 of the Observatory can be minimized to a less than significant impact. Since
20 Riverside Ordinance No. 655 establishes minimum performance thresholds
21 for outdoor lighting, there is no need for additional mitigation, as this
22 ordnance is self-implementing. (EIR, pp. 5.1-2, 5.1-5, 5.1-15, 5.1-38-5.1-
23 39.)

24 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
25 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
26 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-26; 7.0- 7.0-174.)

1 **B. Agricultural and Forestry Resources.**

2 *Impact: Conflict with Zoning or Rezoning of Forest Land, Timberland or Timberland Zoned*
3 *Timberland Production.*

4 *Threshold E: Project construction and implementation would not conflict or cause rezoning*
5 *of forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production*

6 1. Project Impact(s):

7 a. Project – The Project site does not contain and will not impact any forest land
8 as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g) or timberland zoned
9 Timberland Production as defined by Government Code section 51104(g).
10 (EIR, p. 5.2-12.)

11 Public Resources Code section 4526 defines timberland to include land
12 “available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of a commercial
13 species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including
14 Christmas trees.” Because Christmas trees are allowed within certain of the
15 County’s zoning designations (i.e., the A-1, A-2, A-P, and R-A zones)
16 applicable to portions of the Project site, the proposed rezoning of the Project
17 site could be construed as rezoning of “timberland” due to the possibility of
18 growing Christmas trees. However, due to the fact that the site and
19 surrounding areas have not been specifically zoned for timberland
20 production, and have never been used for timber or Christmas tree
21 production, potential impacts related to the rezoning of timberland within the
22 meaning of Public Resources Code section 4526 are less than significant.
23 (EIR, p. 5.2-12.)

24 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
25 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
26 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-32; 7.0-174.)

27 **C. Air Quality.**

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

comply with all of the requirements of, and not conflict with, these ordinances. County Ordinance 559 regulates the removal of trees in areas above 5,000 feet in elevation. Specific Plan area is located on land that is substantially below 5,000 feet in elevation, and the proposed Project will not conflict with County Ordinance 559. Appendix N of the EIR summarizes the Project's consistency with the 2003 County General Plan, including the Multipurpose Open Space Element and Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan policies. Appendix N of the EIR also summarizes the Project's consistency with the adopted 2015 GP policies. (EIR, p. 5.4-61.)

- b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are similar to the proposed Project and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-40; 7.0-175.)

E. Cultural Resources.

Impact: Restrict Religious or Sacred uses within Project Area.

Threshold D: Project construction and implementation would not restrict religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area.

1. Project Impact(s):

- a. Project – Site CA-RIV-397 consisting of a boulder outcrop and rockshelter with pictographs and an associated midden area. pictograph's style and presence suggests ritual activities may have occurred at this site. Site CA-RIV-806 is a small rockshelter located in an Open Space planning area that was reported by a Native American consultant to have once contained a "spirit stick," which may indicate the site was formerly used for ritual activities. The artifact was not observed during surveys for the current Project. Site CA-RIV-8712 is a large site complex reflecting a range of past human activities. The array of prehistoric ceramic artifacts at this site

1 suggests a variety of functions including utilitarian, decorative, and perhaps
2 ritual. Ritual behavior and artistry are also reflected in the numerous rock art
3 panels, which include cupules and geometric, cross-hatching, and
4 zoomorphic designs. No evidence of current or ongoing religious or sacred
5 use of any of these three sites has been documented, although the sites are
6 known to have been visited on occasion primarily for the purposes of Native
7 American youth education. Nevertheless, should Native American
8 communities desire access to these sites, the sites are proposed to be located
9 in Open Space or buffer areas where public access will be maintained. These
10 three sites were researched to determine their significance and; there is no
11 evidence of current or ongoing religious or sacred uses of any of the three
12 sites. They have been known to be visited on occasion for Native American
13 youth education; these three sites are proposed to be located in Open Space
14 where the public may access the sites. Because the Project will not restrict
15 religious or sacred uses, the impact is less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.5-48-
16 5.5- 49.)

- 17 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7 and the Project would have similar impacts to
18 Sites CA-RIV-397 and CA-RIV-806. Alternative 7 would have different
19 impacts to Site CA-RIV-8712. Fewer acres of CA-RIV-8712 would be
20 directly impacted (6.68 acres directly impacted under Alternative 7 instead
21 of 11.7 acres under the proposed Project). However for this Threshold D,
22 Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project and are less than
23 significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding paragraph and in the EIR.
24 (EIR, pp 7.0-42–7.0-53, 7.0-175.)

25 **F. Geology and Soils.**

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

1 **Threshold C:** *Project construction and implementation would not be subject to seismic-*
2 *related ground failure, expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects,*
3 *including the risk of loss, injury, or death from seismic shaking; be subject to rupture of a*
4 *known earthquake fault.*

5 2. Project Impact(s):

- 6 a. Project – The Project is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone or an Earthquake
7 Fault Hazard Management Zone identified by Riverside County. The Project
8 will be required to comply with seismic safety provisions of the California
9 Building Standards Code, the California Building Code, the County Building
10 Code, County of Riverside permit review and approval process, and General
11 Plan policies regarding seismic shaking. Therefore, the proposed Project will
12 not be exposed to significant seismic-related ground failure and potential
13 impacts related to fault-induced ground rupture are less than significant.
14 (EIR, pp. 5.6-20–5.6-21.)
- 15 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
16 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
17 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-54; 7.0-175.)

18 **Impact:** *Geologic Hazards - Seiche, Mudflow, or Volcanic Hazard.*

19 **Threshold D:** *Project construction and implementation would not be subject to geologic*
20 *hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard.*

21 1. Project Impact(s):

- 22 a. Project – Potential Project-related impacts related to seiches, mudflows, and
23 volcanic hazards were all found to be less than significant in the Notice of
24 Preparation (NOP) prepared for this Project (see EIR Appendix A). Potential
25 impacts related to dam failure, which could cause inundation are analyzed in
26 Section 5.8 Hydrology of the EIR under Threshold K “expose people or
27 structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding,
28

1 including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation
2 Area).” Impacts were found to be less than significant.” (EIR, pp. 5.6-21-5.6-
3 22)

- 4 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
5 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
6 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-54; 7.0-175.)

7 ***Impact: Changes to Topography, Ground Relief Features/Cut or Fill Slopes/Subsurface***
8 ***Sewage Disposal Systems.***

9 ***Threshold E: Project construction and implementation would not change topography or***
10 ***ground surface relief features; create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10***
11 ***feet; or, result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems.***

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

- 13 a. Project – Implementation of the Project will result in a change to the
14 topography or ground surface relief features, and will create cut or fill slopes.
15 Grading within the Project will be tailored with the existing topography;
16 grades will range from 1% in the flat area to 10% in the foothills. No
17 engineered slopes greater than 2:1 are anticipated in the flat areas of the
18 Project; areas adjacent to the Lakeview Mountains could have engineered
19 slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than ten feet. A Slope Stability Report is
20 required for areas of slopes steeper than 2:1 or higher than ten feet; a
21 landscaping and irrigation plan is required for areas where cut and fill slopes
22 are higher than ten feet. Through the implementation of Specific Plan
23 Development Standards, potential impacts resulting from the creation of
24 slopes over 10-feet in height and/or greater than 2:1 slopes will be reduced;
25 therefore impacts will be less than significant. Existing septic systems on the
26
27
28

1 site will be removed per County standards, therefore impacts are considered
2 less than significant (EIR, p. 5.6-22).

- 3 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
4 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
5 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-54; 7.0-175.)

6 ***Impact: Modify the Channel of a River or Stream or Bed of a Lake.***

7 ***Threshold G: Project construction and implementation would not change deposition,***
8 ***siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake***

9 1. Project Impact(s):

- 10 a. Project – During construction, the Project will be subject to grading,
11 excavation, trenching, temporary stockpiling and construction work in areas
12 of varying terrain. The Project will implement standard construction
13 procedures required with the SWPPP, best management practices (BMPs),
14 and develop a storm water quality program (WQMP). Erosion will be
15 minimized on site, reducing the chance of on- and off-site erosion.
16 Implementation of mandatory standard design and installation requirements
17 required by the respective agencies will reduce potential impacts to less than
18 significant levels. (EIR, p. 5.6-24.)

- 19 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
20 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
21 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-54; 7.0-175.)

22 ***Impact: Water Erosion.***

23 ***Threshold H: Project construction and implementation would not result in any increase in***
24 ***water erosion either on or off site.***

25 1. Project Impacts:

- 26 a. Project – Potential Project-related impacts related to deposition, siltation, and
27
28

1 erosion that could modify a channel of a river or a stream, or the bed of a
2 lake, or result in any increase in water erosion are analyzed in Section 5.8
3 Hydrology of the EIR under Threshold I “substantially alter the existing
4 drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a
5 stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff
6 in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site” and Threshold L
7 “change in the amount of surface water in any water body.” Impacts were
8 found to be less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.6-24.)

- 9 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
10 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
11 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-54; 7.0-175.)

12 **G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.**

13 *Impact: Create a Hazard to the Public or the Environment.*

14 *Threshold A: Project construction and implementation would not create a hazard to the*
15 *public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials*

16 1. Project Impact(s):

- 17 a. Project – The Project is comprised of a residential community with
18 commercial uses, schools, parks, public facilities and open space
19 conservation, which are land uses that do not typically use or transport
20 hazardous materials. The types of hazardous materials used by these land uses
21 could involve small amounts of cleaning materials, household pesticides,
22 sanitary wastes or fuels. Transportation and handling of hazardous materials
23 must comply with federal, state and local storage rules and regulations
24 including detailed inventory, disclosure, handling, storage and disposal
25 requirements. As a result, potential Project impacts to the public or the
26 environment related to the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous
27 materials will be less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.7-23.)

1 are three schools proposed in the Project; they will be located within
2 residential or residential/commercial areas. None of the proposed school sites
3 would be located within ¼ mile of a commercial or residential activity
4 contemplated in the Specific Plan that would emit hazardous emissions or
5 handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste
6 therefore the proposed Project impacts would be less than significant. (EIR,
7 p. 5.7-25.) Commercial activities could occur near one proposed school that
8 would be adjacent to areas of the Specific Plan designated for mixed use.
9 Compliance with all applicable federal and state laws related to the
10 transportation, storage and use of hazardous materials, would reduce the
11 likelihood and severity of upsets and accidents during transit, storage, and
12 use throughout the site and that may be associated with any commercial
13 activity near the potential school site. Potential impacts to existing or
14 proposed schools from hazardous emissions and the handling of hazardous
15 materials, substances, or waste related to potential commercial activities
16 would be less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.7-26.) The Project site contains or
17 is located adjacent to existing underground pipelines which could pose a
18 hazard if ruptured. School sites are regulated by the California Department
19 of Education (CDE), which approve school site acquisition or expansion
20 whenever state funding is requested for a school project. As part of the CDE
21 approval process for the proposed schools, the Project area school district will
22 either certify that no such facilities occur within 1,500 feet of each site, or a
23 detailed pipeline risk assessment will be completed to assess potential risks
24 from any high-pressure pipeline located within 1,500 feet of a proposed
25 school. Compliance with school siting regulations will ensure that potential
26 impacts to existing or proposed schools from hazardous emissions and the
27 handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste related to high pressure
28

1 pipelines are less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.7-26.)

2
3 b. Alternative 7 – Similar to the Project, Alternative 7 proposes 3 schools that
4 will be located within residential or residential/commercial areas.

5 Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project and are less
6 than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding paragraph and in
7 the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-56; 7.0-175.)

8 **H. Hydrology and Water Quality.**

9 *Impact: Altered Drainage Patterns - Course of Stream or River/Increase Rate or Amount*
10 *of Surface Runoff.*

11 *Threshold A: Project construction and implementation would not substantially alter the*
12 *existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course*
13 *of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a*
14 *manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.*

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

16 a. Project – The proposed Project site's existing drainage pattern will be altered;
17 a Hydromodification Technical Report prepared for the Project incorporates
18 Project Design Features that address runoff and water quality and the
19 Project's runoff management and flood control measures and drainage design
20 as projected in the Project's Drainage Plan. The Hydromodification
21 Technical Report concludes that low-flows from the water quality basin will
22 have velocities below the levels that could cause significant scour or erosion
23 of the downstream existing on-site channel. The Project Specific Plan will be
24 required to prepare Project specific Preliminary WQMPs and comply with all
25 applicable WQMP requirements, including CNRP, design capture volumes,
26 LID and treatment BMPs. The Project will also be required to comply with
27 Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's standards
28

1 for designing and operating storm drain systems and BMPs, and comply with
2 Riverside County ordinances, including Ordinance 457, Ordinance 461, and
3 Ordinance 754, each of which require erosion control measures in Project
4 development. Therefore, potential impacts related to substantial off-site
5 erosion and siltation-case drainage or stream alterations will be less than
6 significant. (EIR, pp.5.8-42-5.8-47.)

- 7 b. Alternative 7 – As noted in the EIR, the drainage study shows that
8 Alternative 7 will result in similar impacts or reduce potential impacts to
9 hydrological resources below the levels anticipated for the proposed project,
10 including the volume, timing, water quality and erosive potential of
11 stormwater and nuisance flows to, within and from the site. As such,
12 Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project for this
13 Threshold A, and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the
14 preceding paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176.)

15 *Impact: Water Quality Standards and Waste Discharge Requirements.*

16 *Threshold B: Project construction and implementation would not violate any water quality*
17 *standards or waste discharge requirements?*

18 1. Project Impact(s):

- 19 a. Project – The Project will have no impacts on applicable waste discharge
20 requirements as no waste discharge requirements have been issued for the
21 Project. The Water Quality Technical Report prepared for the Project (EIR
22 Appendix H) concluded that concentrations and loads of most modeled
23 pollutants of concern (POCs) will decrease under post-development
24 conditions. None of the POCs, whether quantitatively or qualitatively
25 assessed, are expected to significantly impact receiving waters due to the
26 implementation of a comprehensive site design, source control, and treatment
27

1 control strategy in compliance with the MS4 Permit requirements, General
2 Construction Permit, and De Minimus Discharges Permit requirements.
3 Potential Project impacts on receiving water quality will be less than
4 significant. Groundwater quality will be fully protected through
5 implementation of the Project's site design, source control, and treatment
6 control BMPs prior to discharge of Project runoff to groundwater; therefore
7 the Project impacts to groundwater quality will be less than significant. The
8 Project will comply with all applicable water quality regulatory requirements
9 and potential impacts will be less than significant. (EIR, pp.5.8-47-5.8-58.)

- 10 b. Alternative 7 – As noted in the EIR, the drainage study shows that
11 Alternative 7 will result in similar impacts or reduce potential impacts to
12 hydrological resources below the levels anticipated for the proposed
13 Project, including the volume, timing, water quality and erosive potential of
14 stormwater and nuisance flows to, within and from the site. As such,
15 Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project and are less
16 than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding paragraph and in
17 the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176.)

18 ***Impact: Groundwater Supplies and Groundwater Recharge.***

19 ***Threshold C: Project construction and implementation would not deplete groundwater***
20 ***supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net***
21 ***deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.***

22 1. Project Impact(s):

- 23 a. Project – The Project will not directly use groundwater, and all groundwater
24 wells within the Project site will be abandoned in conformance with the
25 County Department of Environmental Health requirements as the Project is
26 built out over time. As a result, the Project will reduce the level of on-site
27
28

1 groundwater extraction from the San Jacinto basin that has historically
2 occurred from on-site wells, and potential impacts to aquifer volume or a
3 lowering of the local groundwater table related to direct Project groundwater
4 use will be less than significant. All of the future demand projected by the
5 EMWD, including the demand that would be generated by the Project, will
6 be met by using water resources other than groundwater. The Project will not
7 indirectly cause significant new groundwater extractions from the San Jacinto
8 Groundwater Basin to meet Project demand. Potential impacts to
9 groundwater supplies will be less than significant. Approximately 36% of the
10 Project site will include impervious surfaces that reduce the amount of
11 surface available for infiltration; however, the Project is designed to include
12 features that meet the requirements of the 2010 MS4 permit to maximize on-
13 site stormwater retention and infiltration. Therefore Project impacts from
14 reduced on-site recharge rates is less than significant. The Project has been
15 designed to maintain the pre-development hydrology, including off-site
16 flows, as much as possible. The San Jacinto River is the primary recharge
17 zone for the San Jacinto Groundwater Basin. Based on the Project's
18 contribution to the watershed, the Project will not significantly affect flows
19 in the San Jacinto River or affect groundwater recharge rates in the river area.
20 The volume of runoff from the site that is available for groundwater recharge
21 in downstream locations will not be significantly affected by Project
22 development. Potential impacts to groundwater related to reduced offsite
23 flows available for recharge will be less than significant. (EIR, pp.5.8-59.5.8-
24 60.)

1 regulatory requirements will result in no significant impacts. (EIR, pp. 5.8-
2 63-5.8-64.)

- 3 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
4 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
5 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176.)

6 ***Impact: New or Retrofitted Stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices***
7 ***(BMPs).***

8 ***Threshold H: Project construction and implementation would not include new or retrofitted***
9 ***Stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs), the operation of which***
10 ***could result in significant environmental effects.***

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

- 12 a. Project – The Project’s drain time in its drainage system complies with local
13 regulations, including County Ordinance 859 and RCFC&WCD’s
14 Stormwater Quality Best Management Practices Design Handbook (2006).
15 Through regulatory compliance impacts are less than significant. (EIR, pp.
16 5.8-64-5.8-65.)

- 17 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
18 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
19 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176.)

20 ***Impact: Loss, Injury, or Death Involving Flooding, Including Flooding as a Result of the***
21 ***Failure of a Levee or Dam.***

22 ***Threshold K: Project construction and implementation would not expose people or***
23 ***structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding***
24 ***as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.***

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

26
27
28

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

a. Project – Portions of the Project site are within areas that could be subject to inundation by the failure of: the Lake Perris Dam, the West, Saddle and East Diamond Valley Reservoir dams, the Lake Hemet Dam, the Lakeview Dam, and MWD pipeline. The locations potentially subject to inundation in the event of an “instantaneous” or worst case dam failure, at Lake Perris are in the northwest corner of the Specific Plan area. The likelihood that individuals using the far northern portions of the site for recreation or similar open space could be exposed to significant risk of loss, injury, or death, from the instantaneous failure of the Lake Perris Dam is very low, particularly during the Department of Water Resources (DWR) remediation program when the facility is subject to constant monitoring. Certain of the locations potentially subject to inundation under existing conditions will be elevated as a result of the proposed Project floodplain modifications (see EIR Section 5.8 Thresholds E and F) and less likely to be affected by a dam failure. As a result, potential Project impacts from a failure of the Lake Perris Dam are less than significant. The Saddle Dam inundation area contains no habitable structures. The likelihood that individuals would be located at the Project boundary line at the far western tip of the site at the time when the Saddle Dam instantaneously failed is extremely low. Potential Project impacts from a failure of the Saddle Dam at the Diamond Valley Reservoir are less than significant. The West Dam inundation area contains no habitable structures. The likelihood that individuals using Project areas for recreation or similar open space uses could be exposed to significant risk of loss, injury, or death, from the instantaneous failure of the West Dam is also extremely low. As discussed above, certain of the locations potentially subject to inundation under existing conditions will be elevated as a result of the proposed Project floodplain modifications and less likely to be affected by a dam failure. As a

1 result, potential Project impacts from a failure of the West Dam at the
2 Diamond Valley Reservoir are less than significant. The East Dam (of the
3 Diamond Valley Reservoir) inundation area will include mixed use,
4 residential and commercial development, schools, parks, public facilities and
5 utilities. However, certain of the locations potentially subject to inundation
6 under existing conditions north of the Ramona Expressway will be elevated
7 as a result of the proposed Project floodplain modifications (see EIR Section
8 5.8 Thresholds E and F) and less likely to be affected by a dam failure. The
9 proposed floodplain modifications would not reduce inundation risks in the
10 central portions of the site. As a result, potential Project impacts from an
11 instantaneous failure of the Diamond Valley Reservoir East Dam are
12 potentially significant. A small portion of the Lake Hemet inundation area
13 will include open space and parks. The likelihood that individuals using these
14 areas could be exposed to significant risk of loss, injury, or death, from the
15 instantaneous failure of the Hemet dam is extremely low. Also, a portion of
16 two residential planning areas are subject to inundation: approximately 7.8
17 acres of Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) in PA 10 and 4.0 acres
18 of High Density Residential (HDR) in PA 12. Based on the assumed
19 residential densities of eight dwelling units (DU) per acre for MHDR and
20 nine du/acre for HDR (Figure 3-1), respectively, there may be an estimated
21 98 DU within the inundation areas with a population of approximately 315
22 (3.21 persons per household). Because these areas will be elevated from the
23 floodplain, they are less likely to be affected by dam failure. In the event of
24 an emergency, the County implements the Riverside County Emergency
25 Operations Plan, which include response activities structured to minimize the
26 effects of an emergency which may include, but are not limited to:
27 disseminating warnings, emergency public information, and instructions;
28

1 coordinating evacuations and/or rescue operations; and coordinating the
2 restriction of traffic/people movement and unnecessary access to affected
3 areas. As a result of floodplain modifications and implementation of the
4 County's Emergency Operations Plan, potential Project impacts from a
5 failure of the Hemet Dam are less than significant. Significant inundation of
6 downstream areas related to a potential failure of the Lakeview Dam could
7 only occur if: (a) the maximum amount of runoff is temporarily retained at
8 the facility (estimated to be approximately 500 AF in a 100-year storm)
9 immediately following a severe storm event, and (b) an earthquake or similar
10 event with sufficient energy to destroy the retention structure and release the
11 retained water occurs at the same time. The probability that an earthquake
12 capable of destroying the Lakeview Dam at the same time flows from a 100-
13 year storm were fully retained is extremely low, and related impacts are less
14 than significant. Should the MWD pipelines leak or rupture within the
15 Specific Plan area, the proposed storm drain system would capture the flows.
16 Therefore Project impacts are less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.8-67-5.8-76).

- 17 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project
18 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
19 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176.)

20 ***Impact: Surface Water Amount Changes.***

21 ***Threshold L: Project construction and implementation would not result in changes in the***
22 ***amount of surface water in any water body.***

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

- 24 a. Project – Potential hydrologic alterations resulting from the proposed Project
25 include changes to surface runoff volumes and dry weather flows, changes to
26 the frequency and number of runoff events, and changes to the long-term
27
28

1 cumulative duration of flows, as well as increased peak flows. An alteration
2 to the hydrologic regime is considered a Hydrologic Condition of Concern
3 (HCOC) if the change could have a significant impact on downstream natural
4 channels and habitat integrity. A Hydromodification Technical Report
5 Addendum was prepared that estimated average annual runoff volumes to the
6 following discharge locations: the San Jacinto River, off-site wetlands, and
7 vernal pools. As shown in EIR Tables 5.8-H and 5.8-I, the annual average
8 volumes discharged directly to the San Jacinto River via the on-site existing
9 channel from the proposed MS4 Channel are expected to increase by
10 approximately 178 acre-feet per year as compared to existing conditions. This
11 increase is due to the change in imperviousness and resulting runoff, the
12 current lack of defined conveyances connecting the Project area directly to
13 the river, and the proposed routing of treated flows from the Water Quality
14 Basins (WQBs) to the on-site existing channel via the newly constructed MS4
15 Channel. As shown in the Hydromodification Technical Report Addendum,
16 the majority of the Project runoff volumes are not considered hydrologically
17 significant due to the relative magnitude of the additional flows in
18 comparison to the San Jacinto River flows. The increase in flows do not result
19 in scouring velocities for the 10-year event, and the shallow slope of the
20 existing onsite channel to the river allows the possibility of the river backing
21 up into the channel, further reducing any potential risks during extreme
22 events. Additionally, Project runoff will generally occur at times when the
23 San Jacinto River is receiving flows from other contributing areas (e.g. runoff
24 from Ramona Expressway), not affecting the timing of flows or the
25 seasonality of the river. As shown in the Hydromodification Technical Report
26 Addendum, the annual average runoff volume from the Project site that could
27 reach the off-site wetlands (see EIR Section 5.4, Biological Resources, for
28

1 discussion of this wetland area) will increase by one acre-foot (or ~1%) and
2 the average annual monthly volumes did not show a statistical difference
3 between the proposed Project and existing conditions. The seasonal water
4 balance, calculated as the monthly total volume, is not expected to change.
5 Total wet times per month are predicted to increase by a maximum of 2.3
6 additional days of flow, which is expected due to extended detention
7 treatment provided by the East WQB with a functional drawdown time of
8 approximately 48 hours. Thus, runoff to the San Jacinto Wildlife Area
9 (SJWA) expected to remain relatively similar after Project development. In
10 addition to closely matching volumes, frequency, and duration of discharge,
11 the proposed adjustable flow control structures would allow future discharges
12 to the SJWA from the Project to be adaptively managed to provide flexibility
13 as the understanding of the system and associated management goals change
14 over time. The Lakeview Disposal Site (also referred to in EIR as the
15 Lakeview Burn Dump), which is located west of Davis Road and south of
16 Marvin Road, blocks any Davis Road flows from entering the disturbed alkali
17 playa habitat area (which contains the vernal pool). Therefore, Project runoff
18 to the vernal pool will be minimal, if at all, and is not considered a significant
19 hydrologic concern since the nature of the vernal pool is projected to be
20 sustained with direct rainfall and shallow subsurface flow from adjacent areas
21 (i.e., the WQB). Therefore, based on the estimated average flows from the
22 Project site, the Project will not significantly change the amount of surface
23 water entering the San Jacinto River, downstream water bodies, or off-site
24 wetlands areas, therefore Project impacts to surface water in any water body
25 will be less than significant. (EIR, pp.5.8-76-5.8-79.)
26
27
28

1 **Impact:** *Affect Land Use - City Sphere of Influence and/or Within Adjacent City or County*
2 *Boundaries.*

3 **Threshold B:** *Project construction and implementation would not affect land use within a*
4 *city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries.*

5 1. Project Impact(s):

6 a. Project – The proposed Project is not within a city sphere of influence and it
7 does not propose any land use changes within a city sphere of influence or
8 incorporated city. The Project proposes land use changes in areas that are
9 adjacent to city boundaries. Specifically, portions of the Project site abuts
10 property located in the City of San Jacinto with City General Plan land use
11 designations of Open Space, Low Density Residential (2.1 to 5 du/ac), Water
12 Source, and Gateway Specific Plan. (See EIR Figure 5.9-3.) Most of the land
13 in this area of San Jacinto is currently undeveloped or utilized for agricultural
14 purposes with a few residential (ranch) units. The Project proposes a visual
15 separation and buffer to separate the Project's proposed land uses from the
16 City of San Jacinto. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant
17 impact with respect to affecting land uses within a city sphere of influence
18 and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries without mitigation. (EIR,
19 pp. 5.9-46–5.9-47.)

20 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project
21 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
22 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176.)

23 **Impact:** *Consistency with Existing or Proposed Zoning.*

24 **Threshold C:** *Project construction and implementation would be consistent with the site's*
25 *existing or proposed zoning.*

26 1. Project Impact(s):

1 a. Project – The Project proposes a Change of Zone No. 7055. Because approval
2 of Change of Zone No. 7055 and GPA No. 720 will create consistency
3 between Project zoning and the General Plan, impacts will be less than
4 significant. (EIR, p. 5.9-47.)

5 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project
6 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
7 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-58; 7.0-176.)

8 ***Impact: Disrupt or Divide an Established Community.***

9 ***Threshold F: Project construction and implementation would not disrupt or divide the***
10 ***physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority***
11 ***community).***

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

13 a. Project – The Project will not divide a community, it will be adjacent to an
14 existing community; therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
15 (EIR, p. 5.9-51)

16 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project
17 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
18 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-58; 7.0-176.)

19 **J. Public Services.**

20 ***Impact: Public Medical Service Facilities.***

21 ***Threshold B: Project implementation will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts***
22 ***associated with the provision of new or physically altered public medical service facilities,***
23 ***the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to***
24 ***maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other established performance***
25 ***objectives.***

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

27

28

- 1 a. Project – Project Design Features include the establishment of wellness
2 clinics in onsite schools and medical offices are an allowable use within the
3 Specific Plan Mixed-Use areas. Although the Project’s proposed land use
4 plan does not specifically include medical facilities, the Project includes land
5 use designations for onsite medical office and urgent care clinics.
6 Construction-related impacts related to health service facilities were analyzed
7 in the applicable substantive sections of the EIR. Impacts will be less than
8 significant after mitigation except for Project direct impacts to agricultural
9 resources, air quality, noise, and population. The potential impacts associated
10 with construction of new or physically altered public health service facilities
11 to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance
12 objectives are less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.12-13–5.12-14)
- 13 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are less than the proposed Project
14 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
15 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-65; 7.0-177.)

16 ***Impact: Library Services and Facilities.***

17 ***Threshold C: Project construction and implementation will not result in substantial adverse***
18 ***physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library service***
19 ***facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order***
20 ***to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for***
21 ***any of the public services, including library services.***

22 1. Project Impact(s):

- 23 a. Project – At full buildout, the Project would have a resident population of
24 approximately 34,000 and require approximately 17,000 square feet of
25 library facilities and 84,000 volumes. The Project will construct a new onsite
26 twenty thousand (20,000) square foot stand-alone library facility. Potential
27
28

1 impacts that could be associated with the onsite construction of library
2 facilities are considered in the applicable substantive sections of the EIR, all
3 of which will be less than significant after mitigation, except for Project direct
4 impacts to agriculture resources, air quality, noise and population. The
5 Project is also subject to the DIF requirements in County Ordinance No. 659,
6 which would be \$115.00 per single family residential dwelling unit and
7 \$80.00 per multi-family residential dwelling unit for library construction and
8 \$57.00 per single family residential dwelling unit and \$40.00 per multi-
9 family residential dwelling unit for library books/media. The Project
10 proponent will be required to pay these mitigation fees or such Ordinance No.
11 659 fees in effect at the time of construction. Because the on-site library and
12 library-related DIF fee payments the Project will create new library service
13 capacity sufficient to meet the Project's build-out demand impacts are less
14 than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.12-18-5.12-19.)

- 15 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are similar to the proposed Project
16 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
17 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-65; 7.0-177.)

18 ***Impact: Educational Services and Facilities.***

19 ***Threshold D: Project construction and implementation will not result in substantial adverse***
20 ***physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities,***
21 ***the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to***
22 ***maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any***
23 ***of the public services, including schools.***

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

- 25 a. Project – At full buildout, and utilizing school facility demand factors
26 developed by the NUSD and the PUHSD, the Project could generate
27

1 approximately 2,656 elementary school students, 1,288 middle school
2 students, and 1,172 high school students. The Specific Plan designates three
3 K–8 school sites to meet school demand within the Project site to avoid and
4 minimize potential school service impacts through Project Design. Potential
5 impacts that could be associated with the onsite construction of school
6 facilities are considered in the applicable substantive sections of the EIR, all
7 of which will be less than significant after mitigation, except for Project direct
8 impacts to agriculture resources, air quality, noise and population.
9 Additionally, the Project will be required to pay school impact fees in
10 accordance with California Education Code sections 17620 et seq. and
11 California Government Code sections 65995 et seq. Government Code
12 Section 65995(h) provides that the payment of these fees comprises “full and
13 complete mitigation of the impacts” of the Project on schools. Impacts to the
14 provision of school facilities are less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.12-25–5.12-
15 26.)

- 16 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are similar to the proposed Project
17 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
18 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-66; 7.0-177.)

19 ***Impact: Sherriff Services and Facilities.***

20 ***Threshold E: Project construction and implementation will not result in substantial adverse***
21 ***physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered Sherriff Service***
22 ***facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order***
23 ***to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for***
24 ***health services.***

- 25 1. Project Impact(s):
26
27
28

1 a. Project – At full build-out using Riverside County Sheriff Department and
2 County Board of Supervisors’ desired staffing ratio of 1.2 officers per 1,000
3 residents, the Project would generate the need for an additional 41 officers.
4 The Project will comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 and pay
5 development impact fees that are allocated toward maintaining applicable
6 sheriff service ratios within the Specific Plan area. Project payment of
7 development impact fees for law enforcement services will ensure that the
8 RCSD has the resources to meet the incremental increase in demand
9 associated with the Specific Plan. The Project will also incorporate lighting,
10 public space, and gated facilities that will reduce the incidence of crime
11 within the Specific Plan area. These design features will be subject to County
12 and RCSD review and approval during the building permit and plan check
13 process and would reduce the need for sheriff services, including responses
14 to calls for assistance, within the Project. The Project’s payment of
15 development impact fees and public safety-related design considerations will
16 reduce potential impacts related to the need for new or physically altered
17 sheriff facilities are considered to less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.12-30–
18 5.12-31.)

19 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are similar to the proposed Project
20 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
21 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-66; 7.0-177.)

22 **K. Recreation**

23 ***Impact: Facilities – New or Expanded.***

24 ***Threshold A: Project construction and implementation will not include recreational***
25 ***facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have***
26 ***an adverse physical effect on the environment.***

1 1. Project Impact(s):

2 a. Project – The Specific Plan includes approximately 82 acres of public parks
3 and recreational facilities, 22 acres of private parks and recreational facilities,
4 and 9.7 acres of public and private trails that will be constructed onsite.
5 Potential impacts that could be associated with the construction of these
6 facilities are considered in the footprint of the entire Project and are analyzed
7 in the applicable substantive sections of the EIR. Impacts associated
8 specifically with recreational facilities are considered less than significant,
9 with the exception of the impacts to agricultural resources, air quality, noise,
10 and transportation as discussed in their respective sections of the EIR. (EIR,
11 p. 5.13-12.)

12 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
13 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
14 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-68; 7.0-177.)

15 ***Impact: Quimby Fees.***

16 ***Threshold B: Project construction and implementation would be located within a County***
17 ***Service Area. or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan***
18 ***(Quimby fees).***

19 1. Project Impact(s):

20 a. Project – The Project area is located within Riverside County Service Area
21 (CSA) 146 and the Project proponent will pay applicable Quimby Act fees
22 per Section 10.35 of County Ordinance No. 460. The Project requires
23 dedication or in-lieu fee payment of 146.9 acres of neighborhood and
24 community park facilities. The Project will include 101.9 acres of onsite
25 public parks, trails and private parks, an amount sufficient to meet the
26 parkland requirements at 3 acre to 1,000 person level, or approximately 69%

1 of the Project's parkland need under a 5-acre to 1,000 person requirement.
2 The Project is also proposing 45 acres of off-site parks, to meet the 5-acre to
3 1,000 person requirement. Compliance with the development standards
4 proposed in the Specific Plan will ensure that the Project will provide
5 sufficient parkland under Ordinance No. 460, which implements the Quimby
6 Act in Riverside County, and impacts will be less than significant. (EIR,
7 p. 5.13-12.)

- 8 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project
9 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
10 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-68; 7.0-177.)

11 ***Impact: Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities.***

12 ***Threshold C: Project construction and implementation will not include the use of existing***
13 ***neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial***
14 ***physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.***

15 1. Project Impact(s):

- 16 a. Project – There is one neighborhood park within five miles of the Project site.
17 Use of the existing facility will not result in substantial physical deterioration
18 as community parks demand will be met by onsite construction and in-lieu
19 fees. The Project will comply with requirements in County Ordinance No.
20 659, therefore impacts will be less than significant. Through the provision of
21 onsite recreational facilities, payment for offsite facilities, payment of fees
22 for regional parks and trails, subject to potential credits, if applicable for
23 building facilities listed on the County's Public Facilities Needs List,
24 potential impacts will be less than significant levels. (EIR, pp. 5.13-13–5.13-
25 14.)
26
27
28

1 therefore the need for additional road maintenance is less than significant.
2 (EIR, p. 5.14-117.)

- 3 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
4 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
5 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-83; 7.0-177.)

6 **M. Utilities.**

7 *Impact: Available Water Supply.*

8 *Threshold B: Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project*
9 *from existing entitlements and resources.*

10 1. Project Impact(s):

- 11 a. Project – Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) will provide water
12 service for the proposed Project. EMWD prepared a Water Supply
13 Assessment (WSA) for the Specific Plan, which was approved by EMWD’s
14 Board of Directors on May 1, 2013. At full build-out the Project’s water
15 demand would be approximately 4,843 acre-feet per year (AFY). The WSA
16 determined that the Project’s anticipated demand is within the limits of future
17 demand accounted for and in the demand projection tables presented in the
18 EMWD 2010 UWMP, the most recent plan adopted by EMWD. The
19 Project’s 2013 WSA states that EWMD has sufficient supplies to meet
20 existing and future demands, including the Project’s water needs. Therefore,
21 potential impacts related to sufficient water supplies from existing
22 entitlements and resources are less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.15-28–5.15-
23 32.)

- 24 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
25 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
26 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-87; 7.0-177.)

1 **Impact: Waste Water Treatment Facilities.**

2 **Threshold C:** *Project construction and implementation will not require or result in the*
3 *construction of new waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the*
4 *construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.*

5 1. Project Impact(s):

6 a. Project – Wastewater treatment services will be provided to the Project by
7 EMWD. At full build-out the Project is estimated to generate approximately
8 3.2 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater, which will be treated at
9 the Perris Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility (PVRWRF), which is
10 planned to be expanded to provide sufficient wastewater treatment capacity.
11 In addition to on-site wastewater collection facilities, the Project will
12 construct off-site wastewater conveyance infrastructure within existing
13 roadways or adjacent disturbed right-of-ways. Construction-related impacts
14 related to these off-site facilities were analyzed in the applicable substantive
15 sections of the EIR. Potential Project impacts related to the construction or
16 expansion of wastewater treatment facilities will be less than significant.
17 (EIR, p. 5.15-32–5.15-34.)

18 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are less than the proposed Project
19 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
20 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-88; 7.0-177.)

21 **Impact: Inadequate Wastewater Treatment Capacity.**

22 **Threshold D:** *Project construction and implementation would not result in a determination*
23 *by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the project that it has inadequate*
24 *capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing*
25 *commitments.*

26 1. Project Impact(s):

1 a. Project – The existing PVRWRF facility has the capacity to treat Project-
2 generated flows at full build-out of the Project. With the Project at full build-
3 out plus the existing volume, PVRWRF still has approximately 4.8–6.8 MGD
4 additional capacity; therefore impacts will be less than significant. (EIR, p.
5 5.15-35.)

6 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are less than the proposed Project
7 and are less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding
8 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-88; 7.0-177.)

9 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental
10 impacts associated with the EIR No. 471 are potentially significant unless otherwise indicated, but each of
11 these impacts will be avoided or substantially lessened to a level of less than significant through existing
12 regulations, Project Design Features, and/or mitigation measures specified in Attachment A (Mitigation
13 Monitoring and Reporting Program) which is incorporated herein by this reference, for reasons documented
14 in the Final EIR No. 471 and summarized below. Accordingly, the County makes the following findings
15 as to each of the following impacts pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a): “Changes or
16 alterations have been require in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the
17 significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.”

18 **A. Aesthetics.**

19 ***Impact: Scenic Vista.***

20 ***Threshold A: Project construction and implementation will not have a substantial adverse***
21 ***effect on a scenic vista with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project***
22 ***Resolution Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).***

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

24 a. Project – The Project will have a less than significant impact with regard to
25 on-site scenic vistas and other resources as well as scenic vistas and views
26 from Hansen Avenue. The Lakeview Mountains are currently visible from
27

1 Poppy Road to the east; however, the Project would construct a 24-foot high
2 2:1 up-slope adjacent to the east side of Poppy Road, which will block the
3 existing view along the northernmost 800 feet of the approximately 1,600-
4 foot Project border with the street. The remaining 800 feet of the Project
5 border with Poppy Road would be developed as a trailhead park that will
6 generally retain the existing topography and views of the Lakeview
7 Mountains. Mitigation measure MM Aesthetics 4 requires that grading plans
8 for the portions of the Project that abut Poppy Road be reviewed by the
9 County to ensure that slopes and grade conform with applicable Project plans
10 and standards to avoid significant impacts to scenic vistas along Poppy Road.
11 Due to the relatively small area from which easterly views could be affected
12 by the Project, the preservation of existing views along approximately 50%
13 of the Project's border with Poppy Road, and the implementation of MM
14 Aesthetics 4, impacts to vistas from Poppy Road are less than significant.
15 (EIR, pp. 5.1-16-5.1-17.)

16 Additionally, the maximum height of residential structures east of the horse
17 ranch along Wolfskill Avenue would result in structural profiles
18 approximately 15 to 33 feet higher than the existing site gradients. Mitigation
19 measure MM Aesthetics 4 also requires that grading plans for the portions of
20 the Project that abuts Wolfskill Avenue, be reviewed by the County to ensure
21 that slopes and grade conform to applicable Project plans and standards. In
22 addition, the County must review Project building layouts and setbacks along
23 Wolfskill Avenue to maintain views over or between proposed buildings.
24 Due to building heights and spacing that would preserve vistas from several
25 locations along Wolfskill Avenue even if building with the maximum
26 allowable height are constructed in these areas, and the implementation of
27
28

1 MM Aesthetics 4, impacts to vistas from Wolfskill Avenue are less than
2 significant. (EIR, p. 5.1-17.)

- 3 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project
4 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
5 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
6 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-26; 7.0-174.)

7 2. Mitigation:

- 8 a. Project – To minimize the effects on Scenic Vistas, MM Aesthetics 4 will be
9 required. (EIR, p. 5.1-39.)
10 b. Alternative 7 – To minimize the effects on Scenic Vistas, MM Aesthetics 4
11 will be required. (EIR, pp. 7.0-26; 7.0-99.)

12 **B. Agricultural and Forestry Resources.**

13 *Impact: Right-to-Farm Ordinance.*

14 *Threshold C: Project construction and implementation will not cause development of non-*
15 *agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625*
16 *“Right-to-Farm”), with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project*
17 *Resolution Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

18 1. Project Impact(s):

- 19 a. Project – The Specific Plan development would result in non-agricultural
20 uses within 300 feet of agriculturally-zoned properties located to the west,
21 north, and south of the boundaries of the Project site. However, the Project
22 will comply with Ordinance No. 625 for any tentative land division proposed
23 within 300 feet of land primarily zoned for agricultural purposes. To further
24 reduce impacts related to incompatibility with adjacent agriculture,
25 mitigation measure MM Ag 2 requires that proposed Project residences and
26 school buildings, be set back by at least 300 feet from any of the following
27 active agricultural uses: corrals, chicken houses, dairy waste ponds, manure
28

1 stockpiles, or commercial livestock pens, including interim uses within the
2 Project area (such as the chicken ranch). Additionally, mitigation measure
3 MM Ag 3 requires that purchasers or renters of all residential units in the
4 Project be provided with a recorded deed disclosure or similar notice
5 approved by the County Planning Department regarding the proximity and
6 nature of neighboring agricultural uses, including the possibility that existing
7 agricultural activities in the vicinity of the Project may create nuisances such
8 as flies, odors, dust, and chemical spraying. Potentially significant impacts
9 related to nonagricultural land uses located within 300 feet of existing
10 agricultural activities will be reduced to less than significant through
11 compliance with Ordinance 625 and the implementation of mitigation
12 measures MM Ag 2 and MM Ag 3. (EIR, p. 5.2-11.)

- 13 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
14 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
15 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
16 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-26; 7.0-174.)

17 B. Mitigation:

- 18 a. Project – To reduce the potential for impacts related to agricultural and non-
19 agricultural land use incompatibilities, mitigation measures MM Ag 2 and
20 MM Ag 3 are required. (EIR, pp. 5.2-17–5.2-18.)
21 b. Alternative 7 – To reduce the potential for impacts related to agricultural and
22 non-agricultural land use incompatibilities, mitigation measures MM Ag 2
23 and MM Ag 3 are required. (EIR, pp. 7.0-26; 7.0-100.)

24 C. Air Quality.

25 *Impacts: Construction of a Sensitive Receptor Located within One Mile of a Point Source*
26 *Emitter*

1 **Threshold E:** *Project construction and implementation will not, involve the construction of*
2 *a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter,*
3 *specifically: expose sensitive receptors to a toxic air contaminant, at a level that exceeds*
4 *10 excess cancer cases per one million people? (Cancer Health Risks); and expose sensitive*
5 *receptors to a hazard index of 1.0 or greater using a reference exposure level for chronic*
6 *non-cancer risks associated with TACs? (Non-Cancer Health Risks), with the*
7 *implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A",*
8 *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

9 1. Project Impact(s):

- 10 a. Project – The analysis of estimated cancer risk impacts of the Ramona
11 Expressway/Mid County Parkway on the Project site for the year 2035
12 indicate the areas within 900 feet of the northern edge and 1,300 feet of the
13 southern edge of Ramona Expressway/Mid County Parkway are estimated to
14 have a cancer risk greater than the South Coast Air Quality Management
15 District (SCAQMD) significance threshold of ten in a million. However,
16 planting tiered vegetation on either side of the Ramona Expressway/Mid
17 County Parkway could effectively reduce the cancer risk impacts by 50%
18 assuming Deodar trees are used. This tiered vegetation could effectively limit
19 the areas on the Project site with a cancer risk greater than the SCAQMD's
20 significance threshold of ten in a million to a region within 390 feet of the
21 northern edge and 550 feet of the southern edge of Ramona Expressway/Mid
22 County Parkway. Mitigation measure MM AQ 5 requires tiered vegetation
23 on either side of Ramona Expressway to reduce the health impacts from toxic
24 air contaminants (TACs). Additionally, mitigation measure MM AQ 6
25 requires the incorporation of MERV-13 air filters into homes that still show
26 a cancer risk greater than 10 in a million (i.e., approximately within 550 feet
27 from the Ramona Expressway/Mid County Parkway). After implementation
28

1 of mitigation measures MM AQ 5 and MM AQ 6, the cancer risk impacts
2 associated with exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs are less than
3 significant with respect to the Ramona Expressway/Mid County Parkway.
4 (EIR, p. 5.3-49.)

5 Cancer risks associated with the Nutrilite facility are less than significant
6 (EIR, p. 5.3-50). Non-cancer risks associated with both the Nutrilite Facility
7 and the Ramona Expressway are less than significant without mitigation
8 (EIR, pp. 5.3-50–5.3-51.)

- 9 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are less than the proposed Project and
10 are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for the
11 reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and in
12 the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-37; 7.0-174.)

13 2. Mitigation:

- 14 a. Project – MM AQ 5 and MM AQ 6 will be implemented to reduce potential
15 emissions impacts to sensitive receptors. (EIR, p. 5.3-52.)
16 b. Alternative 7 – MM AQ 5-Alt.7 and MM AQ 6-Alt.7 will be implemented to
17 reduce potential emissions impacts to sensitive receptors. (EIR, pp. 7.0-37;
18 7.0-101–102.)

19 ***Impact:*** *Generation of objectionable odors.*

20 ***Threshold F:*** *Project construction and implementation will not create objectionable odors*
21 *affecting a substantial number of people (refer to Project Resolution Attachment “A”,*
22 *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

23 1. Project Impact(s):

- 24 a. Project – The Project presents the potential for generation of
25 objectionable odors in the form of diesel exhaust during construction in the
26 immediate vicinity of the Project site. Impacts of construction related odors
27 cannot be quantified because it is subjective to each person’s sensitivity to
28

1 smell. Recognizing the short-term duration of construction of any specific
2 portion of the property, the Project will not expose substantial numbers of
3 people to objectionable odors. Impacts from short-term Project construction
4 odors are considered less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.3-51.)

5 The existing agricultural land uses around the Project site may be a source of
6 odor. The purpose of Riverside County Ordinance 625 ("Right to Farm")
7 ordinance is to allow agricultural facilities protection from nuisance
8 complaints generated from new non-agricultural land uses. Ordinance 625
9 applies to new land divisions, and requires notice to owners of newly divided
10 land that agricultural zoning exists within 300 feet of their property.
11 Ordinance 625 restricts property owners from filing a nuisance grievance on
12 "normal" operating activities of the neighboring agricultural properties
13 including odor producing activities and livestock keeping. In addition, the
14 Project shall implement mitigation measure MM Ag 3, which requires that
15 purchasers or renters of all residential units in the Project be provided with a
16 recorded deed disclosure or similar notice approved by the County Planning
17 Department regarding the proximity and nature of neighboring agricultural
18 uses, including the possibility that existing agricultural activities in the
19 vicinity of the Project may create nuisances such as flies, odors, dust, and
20 chemical spraying. (EIR, p. 5.3-51.)

- 21 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same the proposed Project and
22 are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for the
23 reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and in
24 the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-38, 7.0-174.)

25 2. Mitigation:
26
27
28

- 1 a. Project – Mitigation measure MM Ag 3 has been identified to reduce impacts
2 relating to long-term impacts from odors generated by agricultural operations
3 in the vicinity of the Project. (EIR, pp. 5.2-17-5.2-18, 5.3-51.)
4 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measure MM Ag 3 has been identified to reduce
5 impacts relating to long-term impacts from odors generated by agricultural
6 operations in the vicinity of the Project. (EIR, pp. 7.0-100.)

7 **D. Biological Resources.**

8 *Impact: Conflict With Conservation Plans.*

9 *Threshold A: Project construction and implementation will not conflict with the provisions*
10 *of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other*
11 *approved local, regional, or state conservation plan, with the implementation of mitigation*
12 *measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring and*
13 *Reporting Program).*

14 1. Project Impact(s):

- 15 a. Project –

16 **Western Riverside County MSHCP**

17 The Project is within the Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan area as described in
18 Section 3.3.8 of the MSHCP, and includes land located outside and inside of
19 MSHCP Criteria Areas. Activities affecting land outside of Criteria Areas
20 must comply with the “Other Plan Requirements” of the MSHCP to be
21 consistent with the plan. Activities affecting land inside Criteria Areas must
22 comply with additional requirements, including the Habitat Acquisition and
23 Negotiation Strategy (HANS) and Joint Project Review (JPR) processes, as
24 well as the “Other Plan Requirements” of the MSHCP, including MSHCP
25 Sections 6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.3.2, and 6.1.4. (EIR, p. 5.4-32.)

26 The Regional Conservation Agency (RCA) included recommended
27 conditions of approval during the Project’s JPR process that address the
28

1 toxics, lighting, noise, invasive plant and landscaping, barrier and
2 grading/land development guidelines in Section 6.1.4. Pursuant to County
3 policy, these recommendations will be included as enforceable conditions of
4 approval in Project permits issued by Riverside County. The Project will also
5 be subject to the following mitigation measures that will further ensure
6 consistency with MSHCP Section 6.1.4, including: (1) MM Bio 13, which
7 requires that conservation areas be identified and avoided by Project
8 construction workers; (2) MM Bio 11, MM Bio 11a and MM Bio 11b, which
9 require the implementation of an Environmental Stewardship program that
10 will inform Project residents about potential conservation area edge and
11 wildlife edge effects and impacts, including: (a) the need to control and limit
12 the use of household chemicals or wastes (toxics), (b) the need to avoid light
13 spillage into conservation areas, (c) the importance of avoiding invasive plant
14 introduction and removal of invasives in landscaping near conservation areas,
15 and (d) the importance of avoiding unauthorized entry, dumping or trespass
16 into conservation areas; (3) MM Bio 9, which requires that the Project's
17 central detention basin be designed to allow for water releases that
18 approximate existing 2-year and 10-year storm conditions and support onsite
19 and adjacent wetlands; (4) MM Bio 1, which limits the extent and placement
20 and specifies the design of lighting within the Project, and prohibits lighting
21 spillage into MSHCP conservation areas; (5) MM Bio 2 and MM Bio 3,
22 which require the incorporation of appropriate barriers along roads and in
23 other Specific Plan planning areas to minimize unauthorized public access,
24 domestic animal predation, illegal trespass, or unauthorized dumping in
25 MSHCP conservation areas; and (6) MM Bio 14, which requires trash
26 receptacles and refuse containers within the Greenbelt and parks within 100
27 feet of all Conservation areas to include mechanisms to prevent animal
28

1 scavenging. In summary, the incorporation of the RCA recommendations,
2 which address the Section 6.1.4 guidelines, into the Project's conditions of
3 approval, Project design considerations that minimize potential hydrological,
4 noise, light, grading and unauthorized access and invasive plant impacts to
5 conservation areas, and implementation of mitigation measures MM Bio 1,
6 MM Bio 2, MM Bio 3, MM Bio 9, MM Bio 11, MM Bio 11a, MM Bio 11b,
7 MM Bio 13 and MM Bio 14 ensure that the Project is consistent with MSHCP
8 Section 6.1.4. (EIR, pp. 5.4-32-5.4-39.)

9 The MSHCP species-specific objectives for the burrowing owl provide that
10 take of active nests be avoided. If approved by applicable resource agencies,
11 passive measures may be used to relocate burrowing owls outside of the
12 nesting season. Mitigation measure MM Bio 4 incorporates and ensures
13 compliance with the MSHCP burrowing owl species-specific requirements.
14 Mitigation measure MM Bio 10 requires that the Project proponent pay a fee
15 to the County in accordance with County Ordinance 810.2 that will provide
16 additional mitigation for impacts to burrowing owl habitat. The Project's
17 impacts to impacts to the burrowing owl are less than significant with
18 mitigation. (EIR, pp. 5.4-40-5.4-47.) The Project would directly impact
19 approximately 43 acres of native scrub habitats where the Bell's sage sparrow
20 has been observed. The sage sparrow is also known to be sensitive to edge
21 effects from adjacent development. The Project will mitigate for impacts to
22 Bell's sage sparrow habitat by avoiding, permanently preserving, and
23 reducing potential edge effects to approximately 900 acres suitable habitat in
24 the Lakeview Mountains which will be included in Proposed Noncontiguous
25 Habitat Block 5 of the MSHCP. This area supports a population of Bell's
26 sage sparrow. Impacts to Bell's sage sparrow are considered less than
27 significant. Potentially suitable habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher
28

1 species occurs within the southern and southeastern portions of Specific Plan
2 area although it was not detected in a focused survey conducted for the
3 Project. The coastal California gnatcatcher is designated as a Covered
4 Species Adequately Conserved under the MSHCP without additional
5 conservation requirements, subject to a prohibition against clearing occupied
6 habitat in public/quasi-public lands and the Criteria Area during the nesting
7 season (March 1–August 15). In addition, the Project will implement MM
8 Bio 5, which requires preconstruction surveys and prohibits gnatcatcher nest
9 disturbance during the breeding season, and MM Bio 10, which requires that
10 the Project pay a fee to the County in accordance with County Ordinance
11 810.2 that will provide additional mitigation for impacts to gnatcatcher
12 habitat. Impacts to the coastal California gnatcatcher are less than significant.
13 (EIR, p. 5.4-41.)

14 The proposed gravity sewer lines all would occur within the ROW of existing
15 unpaved roadways, including Pico Avenue from Nuevo Road to San Jacinto
16 Avenue, San Jacinto Avenue from Pico Avenue to Dawson Road, Dawson
17 Road from San Jacinto Avenue to Ellis Avenue, and Ellis Avenue from
18 Dawson Road west to an existing sewer line. Impacts to sensitive biological
19 resources as a result of the gravity sewer line construction outside disturbed
20 areas would be reduced to less-than-significant levels through compliance
21 with the MSHCP and other applicable laws, ordinances and regulations,
22 including applicable mitigation requirements. (EIR, p. 5.4-41.)

23 A water line is proposed within the Nuevo Road ROW from Pico Avenue
24 west for approximately 0.50 mile to the future location of Antelope Road,
25 and then further west for approximately 0.42 mile. At Nuevo Road and
26 Antelope Road, a water line is proposed to extend north along the future
27 Antelope Road to a proposed booster station. Impacts to sensitive biological
28

1 resources as a result of the water line along Nuevo Road from Pico Avenue
2 to the future Antelope Road would be reduced to less-than-significant levels
3 through compliance with the MSHCP and other applicable laws, ordinances
4 and regulations, including applicable mitigation requirements. (EIR, p. 5.4-
5 44.)

6 A water line is proposed to begin within the Warren Street ROW northeast
7 from Contour Avenue to Wosslick Avenue, then northwest within Wosslick
8 Avenue ROW from Warren Street to Water Avenue, then continuing west
9 within Water Avenue ROW from Wosslick Avenue to Wosslick Avenue,
10 then continuing north within Wosslick Avenue ROW from Water Avenue to
11 Corso Alto Avenue, and then continuing from Corso Alto Avenue ROW to
12 the Project boundary at Foothill Village (piping continues on site). Impacts
13 to sensitive biological resources as a result of the water line construction
14 outside disturbed areas would be reduced to less-than-significant levels
15 through compliance with the MSHCP and other applicable laws, ordinances
16 and regulations, including applicable mitigation requirements. (EIR, p. 5.4-
17 44.)

18 The proposed lift station #1 located at the southwest corner of Pico Avenue
19 and Nuevo Road would occur mostly within a disced field. The proposed lift
20 station #2 is located along C Avenue and the San Jacinto River,
21 approximately 0.17 mile south of the Colorado River Aqueduct ROW. A
22 formal jurisdictional delineation should be conducted, if applicable, once the
23 location and construction footprint of these proposed infrastructure
24 improvements are determined to identify the extent of MSHCP
25 riparian/riverine resources. If impacts to MSHCP riparian/riverine areas
26 cannot be avoided, then a Determination of Biologically Equivalent or
27 Superior Preservation (DBESP) will be required, including mitigation for the
28

1 loss of riparian habitat at a minimum 1:1 ratio through the purchased of
2 credits from an approved mitigation bank/in-lieu fee program, as required in
3 MM Bio 15. Impacts to sensitive biological resources as a result of the lift
4 stations #1-2 would be reduced to less-than-significant levels through
5 compliance with the MSHCP and other applicable laws, ordinances and
6 regulations, including applicable mitigation requirements. (EIR, p.5.4-45.)

7 The proposed lift station #3 is located along Marvin Road (an unpaved road),
8 immediately north of the Project boundary, and approximately 0.45 mile
9 north of the intersection of 6th Street and Ramona Expressway. Impacts to
10 sensitive biological resources as a result of the lift station would be reduced
11 to less-than-significant levels through compliance with the MSHCP and other
12 applicable laws, ordinances and regulations, including applicable mitigation
13 requirements. (EIR, p. 5.4-45.)

14 Trails are proposed within along Hansen Avenue, Wolfskill Avenue, Poppy
15 Road, Lakeview Avenue, and along a portion of the Colorado River
16 Aqueduct. Impacts to burrowing owl as a result of the trails would be reduced
17 to less-than-significant levels through compliance with the MSHCP and other
18 applicable laws, ordinances and regulations, including applicable mitigation
19 requirements. (EIR, p. 5.4-46.)

20 Construction within the ROW of the existing roads is not likely to result in
21 significant impacts to special-status biological resources for the majority of
22 the road segments based on the level of existing disturbance within the ROW.
23 However, portions of the road segments may require biological surveys in
24 order to establish compliance with the MSHCP. Impacts to sensitive
25 biological resources as a result of off-site roadways would be reduced to less-
26 than-significant levels through compliance with the MSHCP and other
27 applicable laws, ordinances and regulations, including applicable mitigation
28

1 requirements. (EIR, p. 5.4-46.)

2 None of the off-site intersections to be improved are located within the
3 LAPM survey area, or the NEPSSA and CAPSSA, and therefore focused
4 surveys would not be required for LAPM or rare plants within the intersection
5 footprints. Several of the intersections are located within the burrowing owl
6 survey area, including Lakeview Avenue and Ramona Expressway,
7 Lakeview Avenue and 9th Street, Lakeview Avenue and 10th Street, Menifee
8 Road and Nuevo Road, Menifee Road and Ellis Road, Menifee Road and
9 Mapes Road, and Ramona Expressway and Bridge Street. Impacts to
10 sensitive biological resources as a result of the off-site intersections would be
11 reduced to less than significant levels through compliance with the MSHCP
12 and other applicable laws, ordinances and regulations, including applicable
13 mitigation requirements. (EIR, p. 5.4-47.)

14 The Lateral D storm drain, from the Lakeview Dam outlet west along Water
15 Avenue and 11th Street to the Nuevo Channel, will be constructed. In
16 addition, a training dike will be constructed along a dirt road and across a
17 disturbed field in order to direct runoff from east of Lakeview Dam into the
18 dam. Impacts to burrowing owls as a result of the Lateral D storm drain
19 would be reduced to less-than-significant levels through compliance with the
20 MSHCP and other applicable laws, ordinances and regulations, including
21 applicable mitigation requirements. (EIR, p. 5.4-47.)

22 **Stephens' Kangaroo Rat HCP**

23 The Project site is located within the Fee Area boundary of the Western
24 Riverside County Stephens' Kangaroo Rat HCP, adjacent to the San Jacinto-
25 Lake Perris Core Reserve for the species. The San Jacinto-Lake Perris Core
26 Reserve is part of the Lake Perris State Recreation Area and the SJWA. The
27 Project site is not in an SKR Core Reserve, and will comply with the fee
28

1 payment requirements established by the HCP and the County's related
2 ordinance. As outlined in Section 9.0 of the MSHCP (Volume 1, Section 9,
3 p. 105-106), "the long term SKR HCP provides Take Authorization for SKR
4 within its boundaries. The MSHCP will provide Take Authorization for SKR
5 outside the boundaries of the SKR HCP, but within the Plan Area [MSHCP]
6 boundaries." The Project will not conflict with the SKR HCP and impacts are
7 less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.4-48.)

- 8 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are similar to or less than the proposed
9 Project because of the additional 18 acres of conservation habitat and no
10 residential development north of Ramona Expressway and elimination of the
11 frontage road (JJ Street) that would connect PA 75 with PA 77 under the
12 proposed Project. With the elimination of JJ Street, Alternative 7 would not
13 increase the length of the future wildlife undercrossing at Ramona
14 Expressway for Proposed Constrained Linkage (PCL) 20 compared to the
15 proposed Project. As such, Alternative 7 would reduce impacts to wildlife
16 movement at the undercrossing compared to the proposed Project, by limiting
17 the distance for wildlife to cross under the roadway. Alternative 7's impacts
18 are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for the
19 reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and in
20 the EIR. (EIR pp. 7.0-38–7.0-39; 7.0-175.)

21 2. Mitigation:

- 22 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Bio 1, MM Bio 2, MM Bio 3, MM Bio 4,
23 MM Bio 5, MM Bio 9, MM Bio 11, MM Bio 11a, MM Bio 11b, MM Bio 13,
24 MM Bio 14, and MM Bio 15 have been identified to reduce impacts relating
25 to conflicts with adopted conservation plans. (EIR, pp. 5.4-62–5.4-66)
- 26 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Bio 1, MM Bio 2, MM Bio 3, MM
27 Bio 4, MM Bio 5, MM Bio 9, MM Bio 11, MM Bio 11a, MM Bio 11b, MM
28

1 Bio 13, MM Bio 14, and MM Bio 15 have been identified to reduce impacts
2 relating to conflicts with adopted conservation plans. (EIR, pp. 7.0-104–108.)

3 ***Impact:*** *Adverse effect on endangered or threatened species.*

4 ***Threshold B:*** *Project construction and implementation will not have a substantial adverse*
5 *effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened*
6 *species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Section 670.2 or 670.5)*
7 *or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Section 17.11 or 17.12) or species identified as*
8 *a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or*
9 *regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife*
10 *Service with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution*
11 *Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

12 1. Project Impact(s):

- 13 a. Project – The following endangered or threatened, candidate, sensitive, or
14 special status plant species occur within the Project site: Coulter’s goldfields,
15 Smooth tarplant, Thread-leaved Brodiaea, and Paniculate tarplant. The
16 proposed Project will not directly impact these plant species and the majority
17 of potentially suitable habitat is located in conserved areas of the plan either
18 in the disturbed alkali playa, the San Jacinto River floodplain or the Lakeview
19 Mountains. Therefore, impacts to these species are less than significant. (EIR,
20 pp. 5.4-49–5.4-50.)

21 As discussed in the EIR, the Project complies and is consistent with the
22 MSHCP and impacts to all MSHCP-covered species are less than significant.
23 The majority of potentially suitable live in habitat for sensitive species that
24 occur or could occur on site but that are not covered under the MSHCP, is
25 located in the conserved areas of the Lakeview Mountains; therefore, impacts
26 to these sensitive wildlife species not covered under the MSHCP are less than
27 significant. The Project’s compliance with the MSHCP, which will protect
28

1 and conserve raptor habitat throughout the region, the permanent
2 conservation of land contiguous with the San Jacinto Wildlife Area (SJWA)
3 and the Lakeview Mountains, and the maintenance of large buffers between
4 development and the conserved lands, impacts to special status raptors,
5 including raptors that are not covered by the MSHCP, are less than
6 significant. (EIR, pp.5.4-53-5.4-54.)

7 During construction, mitigation measure MM Bio 13 requires that
8 conservation areas be identified and avoided by Project construction workers.
9 Other mitigation measures, including MM Bio 4, MM Bio 5 and MM Bio 6,
10 which require surveys and nest avoidance during breeding periods, will
11 further reduce potential impacts. Construction related impacts to special
12 status species and habitat will less than significant with implementation of
13 the previously mentioned mitigation measures. (EIR, p. 5.4-54.)

14 Indirect effects associated with lighting, drainage, noise, etc., are expected to
15 be adequately mitigated for and reduced through various Project-specific
16 measures, previously discussed under Threshold A, including: (1) MM Bio
17 11, MM Bio 11a and MM Bio 11b, which require the implementation of an
18 Environmental Stewardship program that will inform the public about
19 potential conservation area edges and wildlife edge effects and impacts,
20 including (a) the need to control and limit the use of household chemicals or
21 wastes (toxics), (b) the need to avoid light spillage into conservation areas,
22 (c) the importance of avoiding invasive plant introduction and removal of
23 invasives in landscaping near conservation areas, and (d) the importance of
24 avoiding unauthorized entry, dumping or trespass into conservation areas; (2)
25 MM Bio 12 where barriers are required between established conservation
26 areas or other areas of the Project, impacts to cultural resources shall be taken
27 into consideration with respect to location design and cultural resources
28

1 adjacent to conservation areas will be avoided; (3) MM Bio 13 prior to
2 issuance of grading permit for all Planning Areas located adjacent to a
3 conservation area that will come under Riverside Conservation Authority
4 Management, sensitive resources (conservation areas) shall be delineated
5 with temporary construction fencing. Training for construction workers and
6 construction management personnel shall have occurred which informs
7 Project workers of their responsibilities in regards to avoiding and
8 minimizing impacts to sensitive biological resources through avoiding the
9 fenced areas; and (4) MM Bio 14 to further deter wildlife from entering
10 developed areas, trash receptacles and refuse containers located within the
11 Greenbelt and parks located within 100 feet of all Conservation Areas shall
12 be provided with mechanisms which prevent scavenging animals from
13 gaining access to the contents of such trash containers. Additionally,
14 implementation of MM Bio 2 and MM Bio 3, which require the incorporation
15 of appropriate barriers along roads and in other Specific Plan planning areas
16 to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal
17 trespass, or unauthorized dumping in MSHCP conservation areas, indirect
18 impacts will be reduced to less than significant. Construction of the off-site
19 infrastructure would not significantly impact sensitive plant or wildlife
20 species not covered by the MSHCP (EIR, pp. 5.4-54–5.4-55.)

- 21 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are similar to or less than the proposed
22 Project because of the additional 18 acres of conservation habitat and no
23 residential development north of Ramona Expressway. Therefore, impacts
24 are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for the
25 reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and in
26 the EIR. (EIR pp. 7.0-38–7.0-42; 7.0-175.)

27 2. Mitigation:
28

1 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Bio 2, MM Bio 3, MM Bio 4, MM Bio 5,
2 MM Bio 6, MM Bio 11, MM Bio 11a, MM Bio 11b, MM Bio 12, MM Bio
3 13 and MM Bio 14 were identified to reduce Project impacts related to
4 threatened and endangered species. (EIR, pp. 5.4-62 – 66.)

5 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Bio 2, MM Bio 3, MM Bio 4, MM
6 Bio 5, MM Bio 6, MM Bio 11, MM Bio 11a, MM Bio 11b, MM Bio 12, MM
7 Bio 13 and MM Bio 14 were identified to reduce Alternative 7 impacts related
8 to threatened and endangered species. (EIR, pp. 7.0-104–108.)

9 ***Impact: Habitat Modifications - Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species.***

10 ***Threshold C: Project construction and implementation will not interfere substantially with***
11 ***the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with the***
12 ***established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife***
13 ***nursery sites, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution***
14 ***Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).***

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

16 a. Project – Native resident or migratory fish do not occur within the Special
17 Plan area and the Project will not significantly impact the movement of native
18 resident or migratory fish species (EIR, p. 5.4-55). There are no nursery sites
19 within or near the proposed Project in which significant numbers of native
20 wildlife communally breed and raise offspring. The Project will not
21 significantly impact native wildlife nursery sites. Avian species have the
22 potential to nest within the site. Compliance with MSHCP requirements and
23 implementation of Project mitigation measures including MM Bio 4, MM
24 Bio 5 and MM Bio 6, that requires the avoidance of active nests during
25 breeding periods, will reduce potential impacts to less than significant. (EIR,
26 p. 5.4-55.)
27
28

1 The MSHCP includes “Proposed Constrained Linkage 20” (PCL-20), which
2 extends north from the northeast corner of the site and between the Existing
3 Core H and Proposed Noncontiguous Habitat Block 5 areas. The Project will
4 set aside a minimum 1,500-foot-wide corridor that will extend from the
5 Lakeview Mountains to the Ramona Expressway, contributing to the overall
6 assemblage of PCL-20. Although impacts to PCL-20 are less than significant
7 without mitigation, the Master Developer has agreed to additional mitigation
8 measure MM Bio 3b to further reduce potential impacts. (EIR, pp. 5.4-57–
9 5.4-58.)

- 10 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the less than the proposed Project
11 with the elimination of JJ Street because Alternative 7 would not increase the
12 length of the future wildlife undercrossing at Ramona Expressway for the
13 PCL-20. Impacts are less than significant with implementation of mitigation
14 measures for the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed
15 Project and in the EIR. (EIR pp 7.0-38–7.0-39; 7.0-175.)

16 2. Mitigation:

- 17 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Bio 3b, MM Bio 4, MM Bio 5 and MM
18 Bio 6 were identified to reduce Project impacts related to nesting as well as
19 wildlife corridors. (EIR, p. 5.4-63.)
- 20 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Bio 4, MM Bio 5 and MM Bio 6
21 were identified to reduce Alternative 7 impacts related to nesting. MM Bio
22 3b is not required. (EIR pp. 7.0-105.)

23 ***Impact:*** *Riparian and Sensitive Habitat/Other Sensitive Natural Community.*

24 ***Threshold D:*** *Project construction and implementation will not have a substantial adverse*
25 *effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or*
26 *regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or*

1 *U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to*
2 *Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

3 1. Project Impact(s):

- 4 a. Project – The Project’s potential impacts to federal jurisdictional aquatic
5 resources are discussed in EIR Section 5.4 Threshold E. Approximately 4.85
6 acres of state jurisdictional waters, including 1.65 acres of ephemeral
7 watercourses, and 3.20 acres of riparian habitat occur within the Project site;
8 however, the Project will avoid all of the on-site state-regulated riparian
9 habitat. (EIR, pp. 5.4-58–5.4-59.)

10 Approximately 1.37 acres of unvegetated ephemeral watercourses will be
11 impacted by Project development. Pursuant to mitigation measure MM Bio
12 7, the Project must obtain all applicable state permits, including a Streambed
13 Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife
14 (CDFW), prior to impacting these resources. Mitigation measure MM Bio 8
15 requires mitigation for impacts to state wetlands, waters and riparian habitats
16 at a 3:1 ratio. Mitigation measure MM Bio 9 allows for future Project
17 drainage system flexibility to manage flows from the proposed Central Park
18 detention basin and/or water quality basins and meet the needs of off-site
19 wetlands and the San Jacinto River. With the implementation of the
20 mitigation measures identified in Section 5.8 of the EIR and MM Bio 7, MM
21 Bio 8, and MM Bio 9 the Project will not result in significant impacts to state
22 riparian habitats and jurisdictional waters. (EIR, p. 5.4-59.)

23 The Project would impact approximately 37.23 acres of Riversidean sage
24 scrub, including 18.59 acres of undisturbed Riversidean sage scrub, 0.21 acre
25 of sage scrub/cholla vegetation, and 18.59 acres of disturbed Riversidean
26 sage scrub. The Specific Plan will avoid and permanently preserve
27 approximately 282 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, including 267 acres
28

1 interspersed with other native vegetation within the Lakeview Mountains that
2 have high-quality habitat functions and values for the Bell's sage sparrow and
3 other special-status animals and plants. As discussed in EIR Section 5.4
4 Threshold A, the Project is consistent and complies with the MSHCP.
5 Impacts to Riversidean sage scrub are less than significant with MSHCP
6 compliance and the conservation of 282 acres of Riversidean sage scrub.
7 (EIR, p. 5.4-59.) For off-site facilities, a formal jurisdictional delineation
8 should be conducted once the location and construction footprint are
9 determined to determine the extent of unvegetated watercourses or riparian
10 habitat. If the construction is subject to the MSHCP, and if impacts to
11 MSHCP riparian/riverine areas cannot be avoided, then a Determination of
12 Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) will be required,
13 including mitigation for the loss of riparian habitat at a minimum 1:1 ratio
14 through the purchase of credits from an approved mitigation bank/in-lieu fee
15 program, as identified in mitigation measure MM Bio 15. Impacts to
16 jurisdictional waters may require authorization from the regulatory agencies,
17 including the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional
18 Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and CDFW, as identified in
19 mitigation measure MM Bio 7. Any impacts to jurisdictional waters will be
20 mitigated at a minimum 1:1 ratio through the purchase of credits from an
21 approved mitigation bank/in-lieu fee program, as identified in MM Bio 8.
22 Impacts to jurisdictional resources as a result of the off-site facilities would
23 be reduced to less-than-significant levels through compliance with the
24 MSHCP, mitigation measures (MM Bio 7, MM Bio 8 and MM Bio 15), and
25 other applicable laws, ordinances and regulations, including the conditions
26 associated with any applicable permits from CDFW, USACE, and RWQCB.
27 (EIR, p. 5.4-60.)
28

1 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7 will conserve the same areas that were identified
2 for conservation through the HANS and JPR process as the proposed Project.
3 In addition, the amount of Conservation Habitat north of Ramona
4 Expressway is increased to approximately 47 acres in Alternative 7,
5 compared with 29 acres under the proposed Project. This increase provides
6 additional conservation benefit to the MSHCP as compared to the proposed
7 Project. Impacts will be less than the proposed Project. Alternative 7 will not
8 impact any MSHCP riparian areas, but will impact approximately 1.16 acres
9 associated with nine unvegetated riverine features. The total amount of
10 MSHCP riverine areas impacted due to Alternative 7 is 0.21 acres less than
11 that of the proposed Project, due to the elimination of development areas from
12 the proposed Project that contain drainage features. Although Alternative 7
13 will be impacting the lowermost portions of the drainage features that are at
14 the base of the Lakeview Mountains, the site almost entirely avoids the on-
15 site portions of the watersheds that support these riverine features. However,
16 Alternative 7 will develop along the toe-of-slope of the Lakeview Mountains,
17 which will intercept flows from the watershed of the Lakeview Mountains
18 and the associated drainage features. Other than the change in impacted
19 acreage, these conditions are the same as the proposed Project. Like the
20 proposed Project, Alternative 7 will construct a series of debris basins and
21 storm drain inlets to intercept storm flows, the grading of which will impact
22 the lowermost portions of the three riverine features. Like the proposed
23 Project, Alternative 7 is consistent with the biological requirements of the
24 MSHCP, including Section 6.1.2, Protection of Riparian, Riverine, and
25 Vernal Pool Areas. This impact is less than the Project and remains less than
26 significant.

1 The unvegetated riverine features to be affected by Alternative 7 lack habitat
2 value for riparian resources, and they also lack other functions associated
3 with vegetated areas. However, along with the overall watershed, the
4 unvegetated features do provide hydrologic function to aquatic resources
5 supported in downstream receiving waters. Alternative 7 will not result in a
6 loss of this hydrologic function because Alternative 7's drainage plan will
7 maintain flows across the property, such that flows to the San Jacinto Wildlife
8 Area and the San Jacinto River will be maintained. All along the boundary
9 with the San Jacinto Wildlife Area, the Alternative 7 project will be designed
10 to closely match the pre-project conditions pertaining to hydrology and flow
11 rates, which is similar to the proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative 7 with
12 implementation of the design features will maintain the hydrological and
13 biological functions and values of the San Jacinto River. Alternative 7 would
14 be compliant with the biological requirements of the MSHCP, including
15 Sections 6.1.2, Protection of Riparian, Riverine, and Vernal Pool Areas. This
16 impact is less than the Project and remains less than significant with
17 implementation of mitigation measures. (EIR, pp. 7.0-39; 7.0-175.)

18 2. Mitigation:

- 19 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Bio 7, MM Bio 8, MM Bio 9, and MM
20 Bio 15 were identified to reduce Project impacts to riparian habitat or other
21 sensitive natural community as identified by applicable agencies and plans.
- 22 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Bio 7, MM Bio 8, MM Bio 9, and
23 MM Bio 15 were identified to reduce Alternative 7 impacts to riparian habitat
24 or other sensitive natural community as identified by applicable agencies and
25 plans.

26 ***Impact: Federally Protected Wetlands.***

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

7 1. Project Impact(s):alter

- 8 a. Project – Approximately 2.08 acres of federal jurisdictional waters, including
9 1.69 acres of ephemeral non-wetland waters, and 0.39 acres of wetlands occur
10 within the Project site (see EIR Figure 5.4-3). The Project will avoid all of
11 the federally jurisdictional wetlands that occur within the site and avoid the
12 portions of the San Jacinto River within the Specific Plan area.
13 Approximately 1.37 acres of unvegetated ephemeral waters will be impacted
14 by Project development. Pursuant to mitigation measure MM Bio 7, the
15 Project must obtain all applicable state permits, including a permit for the
16 USACE under Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act, and RWQCB
17 certification under Section 401 of the Act, prior to impacting these resources.
18 Mitigation measure MM Bio 8 requires mitigation for impacts to federal
19 wetlands and waters habitats at a 3:1 ratio. Mitigation measure MM Bio 9
20 allows for future Project drainage system flexibility to manage flows from
21 the proposed Central Park detention basin and/or water quality basins and
22 meet the needs of off-site wetlands and the San Jacinto River. The Project's
23 potential impacts to federally jurisdictional waters due to hydrological
24 interruption or other hydrological effects, such as post-development erosion,
25 sedimentation and construction and operational runoff water quality, timing
26 and volume, are discussed in Section 5.8, Hydrology of the EIR. As discussed
27 in Section 5.8, the Project's impacts to federally jurisdictional waters due to
28

1 hydrological interruption or other hydrological effects, will be less than
2 significant with mitigation. With the implementation of the mitigation
3 measures identified in Section 5.8 of the EIR, and MM Bio 7, MM Bio 8, and
4 MM Bio 9, the Project will not result in significant impacts to federally
5 jurisdictional waters. (EIR, pp. 5.4-60–5.4-61.)

6 Additionally, for the off-site infrastructure improvements, a formal
7 jurisdictional delineation should be conducted once the location and
8 construction footprint are determined to determine the extent of unvegetated
9 watercourses or riparian habitat. If the construction is subject to the MSHCP,
10 and if impacts to MSHCP riparian/riverine areas cannot be avoided, then a
11 DBESP will be required, including mitigation for the loss of riparian habitat
12 at a minimum 1:1 ratio through the purchase of credits from an approved
13 mitigation bank/in-lieu fee program, as identified in mitigation measure MM
14 Bio 15. Impacts to jurisdictional waters may require authorization from the
15 regulatory agencies, including the USACE, Regional Board, and CDFW, as
16 identified in MM Bio 7. Any impacts to jurisdictional waters will be
17 mitigated at a minimum 1:1 ratio through the purchased of credits from an
18 approved mitigation bank/in-lieu fee program, as identified in MM Bio 8.
19 Impacts to jurisdictional resources as a result of the off-site facilities would
20 be reduced to less-than-significant levels through compliance with the
21 MSHCP, MM Bio 7, 8 and MM Bio 15, and other applicable laws, ordinances
22 and regulations, including applicable permits from CDFW, USACE, and/or
23 RWQCB. (EIR, p. 5.4-61.)

- 24 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the less than the proposed Project
25 due to the elimination of development areas from the proposed Project that
26 contain drainage features and are less than significant with implementation
27
28

1 of mitigation measures for the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion
2 of the proposed Project and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-41–7.0-42; 7.0-175.)

3 2. Mitigation:

4 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Bio 7, MM Bio 8, MM Bio 9, and MM
5 Bio 15 were identified to reduce Project impacts to federally protected
6 wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

7 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Bio 7, MM Bio 8, MM Bio 9, and
8 MM Bio 15 were identified to reduce Alternative 7 impacts to federally
9 protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

10 E. Cultural Resources.

11 *Impact: Historical Resources and Historic Sites.*

12 *Threshold A: Project construction and implementation would not cause a substantial*
13 *adverse change in the significance of a historic site and/or cause a substantial adverse*
14 *change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of*
15 *Regulations, Section 15064.5. with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to*
16 *Project Resolution Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

17 1. Project Impact(s):

18 a. Project – The on-site nine historical-period sites and three “isolates” are listed
19 and described on Table 5.5-A of the EIR. Of these sites, two historical-period
20 sites (CA-RIV-6726H (P-33-11265) and CA-RIV-8710H (P-33-16596)) are
21 eligible for National Registrar of Historical Places (NRHP)/California
22 Registrar of Historical Resources (CRHR) listing. Site CA-RIV-6726H, the
23 Aqueduct, corridor is a Great Depression-era work opportunity and is a major
24 water conveyance system that is located in a Project planning area identified
25 with a Public Facility/Open Space-Aqueduct land use designation, and will
26 be preserved on site in a 300-foot-wide open space area that will primarily
27 serve as a trail corridor. The second site (CA-RIV-8710H, TVOL-20H) is a
28

1 long, narrow surface scatter of approximately 220 historical-period artifacts
2 deposited along the north side of the California Southern Railroad Lakeview
3 spur berm. CA-RIV-8710H is located within a Project planning area
4 identified for Open Space, and thus, will not be directly impacted by grading
5 or development by the Project; however, the site may be subject to indirect
6 impacts from possible illicit artifact collection or vandalism due to the
7 increased population of the Project area. Because the site is eligible for
8 listing, the indirect impacts will thus be significant without mitigation. Data
9 recovery is preferred to preservation in place because the site has the potential
10 to provide additional information as noted above. To minimize these
11 significant indirect adverse impacts, data recovery particularly through
12 detailed recording and mapping of all items at the dump, along with
13 photographic documentation or collection of diagnostic and unique items is
14 required as part of mitigation measure MM Cultural 1. Mitigation measure
15 MM Cultural 1 requires the implementation of the master Cultural Resources
16 Management Plan (CRMP) which was prepared and is contained in Chapter
17 9 of the Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation (EIR Appendix E). The
18 master CRMP contains mitigation measures for cultural sites and strategies
19 to implement the mitigation measures over the course of the Project's
20 development. Implementation of mitigation measure MM Cultural 1 (MM
21 Cultural 1d) will reduce impacts to this historic site to less than significant
22 with mitigation. (EIR, pp. 5.5-26–5.5-29.)

23 Construction in the off-site improvement area would not result in any direct
24 or indirect impacts to known historical resources and no mitigation is
25 required for such impacts. However, prehistoric or historic subsurface
26 cultural resources could be discovered in off-site improvement areas.
27 Therefore, mitigation measures are required to avoid inadvertent impacts to
28

1 unidentified historical resources. With implementation of mitigation measure
2 MM Cultural 2, direct impacts to potential historic resources in the off-site
3 improvement area will be less than significant with mitigation (EIR, p. 5.5-
4 30).

- 5 b. Alternative 7 – One previously recorded historical-period resource within the
6 Alternative 7 area is the Colorado River Aqueduct (CRA), recorded as CA-
7 RIV-6726H. While more of the CRA and its right-of-way is included in the
8 west-central portion of the Alternative 7 site, there is an overall reduced
9 quantity of the CRA within the Alternative 7 site as a result of the removal of
10 49 acres in the northeast corner of the site, which includes part of the CRA
11 alignment. The 200.34 acre Nutrilite facility, a complex of 21 buildings, 9
12 structures, and 2 landscape features, is not eligible for listing in the NRHP or
13 CRHR and is not a historical resource under CEQA. Additionally, the 32
14 resources within the Nutrilite Farm are not individually eligible for listing in
15 the NRHP or CRHR and are not individual historical resources under CEQA.
16 (EIR, p. 7.0-43.)

17 Alternative 7 includes a different configuration of planning areas than the
18 proposed Project, and would have different potential impacts to identified
19 prehistoric and historical-period resources than the potential impacts
20 identified at the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, development
21 under Alternative 7 would require implementation of the master CRMP
22 contained in Chapter 9 of the Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation by
23 SRI, unless otherwise stated in this discussion. Addenda to the CRMP would
24 be prepared to address the sites affected by tentative tracts or development
25 and would include Site Preservation Plans (SPP) for sites to be preserved in
26 place and Data Recovery Plans (DRP) for sites that cannot be avoided and
27 require archaeological excavations as provided by CEQA Guidelines Section
28

1 15126.4(b)(3). Addenda to the CRMP for Alternative 7 development would
2 be subject to the same requirements and review and approval as those under
3 the proposed Project. (EIR, p. 7.0-44.) Alternative 7's impacts are less than
4 significant with implementation of mitigation measures for the reasons set
5 forth in the preceding paragraphs and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-42-7.0-44;
6 7.0-175.)

7 2. Mitigation:

- 8 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Cultural 1 and MM Cultural 2 were
9 identified to reduce Project impacts to historic sites or the significance of
10 historic resources.
11 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Cultural 1-Alt 7 and MM Cultural
12 2 were identified to reduce Alternative 7 impacts to historic sites or the
13 significance of historic resources. (EIR, pp. 7.0-108-7.0-114)

14 ***Impact: Human Remains.***

15 ***Threshold C: Project construction and implementation would not result in a significant***
16 ***impact if it disturbs any human remains, including those interred outside of formal***
17 ***cemeteries; with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution***
18 ***Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).***

19 1. Project Impact(s):

- 20 a. Project – While the Project is not expected to disturb any human remains,
21 provisions of state law (CA Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 and CA
22 PRC Section 5097.98), and Section 15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines
23 outline the appropriate steps to be taken upon the accidental discovery of
24 human remains. these requirements are applicable to the construction of the
25 proposed Project, the impacts associated with the potential discovery of
26 human remains during construction activities are considered to be less than
27 significant; however if human remains are found, implementation of
28

1 mitigation measures MM Cultural 1c and MM Cultural 2 will assure that
2 impacts remain less than significant. Provisions of state law (CA Health &
3 Safety Code Section 7050.5, CA PRC Section 5097.98, and Section
4 15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines are also applicable to the off-site
5 improvement area. Therefore, the impacts associated with the potential
6 discovery of human remains during construction activities in the off-site
7 improvement areas are considered to be less than significant; however if
8 human remains are found, implementation of MM Cultural 1c and MM
9 Cultural 2 will assure that impacts remain less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.4-
10 47-5.4-48.)

- 11 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
12 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
13 the reasons set forth in the preceding paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR pp 7.0-
14 47; 7.0-175.)

15 2. Mitigation:

- 16 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Cultural 1(c) and MM Cultural 2 were
17 identified to reduce Project impacts to human remains.
18 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Cultural 1-Alt 7 and MM Cultural
19 2 were identified to reduce Alternative 7 impacts to human remains. (EIR,
20 pp. 7.0-108-114).

21 ***Impact:*** *Paleontologist Resource, Site, or Unique Geologic Feature.*

22 ***Threshold E:*** *Project construction and implementation would not directly or indirectly*
23 *destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature; with the*
24 *implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment “A”,*
25 *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

1 1. Project Impact(s):

- 2 a. Project – The portion of the Project site that includes the Lakeview Mountains
3 are generally located in an area mapped by the Paleontological Resource
4 Assessment Report as having a Low potential for paleontological resources
5 (see EIR Figure 5.5-2). However, in the unlikely event that paleontological
6 resources are discovered during earth-moving operations, mitigation
7 measures MM Paleontology 1 and MM Paleontology 2 shall be implemented
8 to reduce potential impacts to a level less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.5-49.)
9 The remaining areas of the site are generally located within an area mapped
10 as High B. The High B – 4 category indicates that fossils are likely to be
11 encountered at or below 4 feet of depth, and the High B – 15 category at or
12 below 15 feet of depth. Activities such as the installation of pipelines, which
13 may entail excavation up to 20 feet below the surface, may encounter
14 sediments with high sensitivity. Grading is expected to disturb soils below 4
15 feet of depth. Because there is a potential to encounter these sensitive
16 resources during ground-disturbing activities on the Project site, impacts to
17 paleontological resources are therefore potentially significant. Compliance
18 with mitigation measures MM Paleontology 1 and MM Paleontology 2 will
19 reduce impacts to less than significant levels as it will ensure an appropriate
20 protocol is in place for the discovery and treatment of paleontological
21 resources that may be encountered during construction of the off-site utility
22 infrastructure and recreational trails for the Project. Based on records search
23 and previous analyses, it was determined that in order to mitigate potential
24 adverse impacts to nonrenewable paleontological resources in sediments that
25 have high paleontological sensitivity, similar mitigation measures developed
26 for on-site development of the Project should be followed for construction of
27 off-site utility infrastructure and recreational trails in the off-site
28

1 improvement area. Compliance with mitigation measures MM Paleontology
2 1 and MM Paleontology 2 will reduce impacts to less than significant levels
3 as it will ensure an appropriate protocol is in place for the discovery and
4 treatment of paleontological resources that may be encountered during
5 construction of the off-site utility infrastructure and recreational trails for the
6 Project. (EIR, pp.5.5-49–5.5-50.)

- 7 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
8 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
9 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
10 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-48; 7.0-175.)

11 2. Mitigation:

- 12 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Paleontology 1 and MM Paleontology 2
13 were identified to reduce Project impacts to paleontological resources.
14 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Paleontology 1 and MM
15 Paleontology 2 were identified to reduce potential impacts to
16 paleontological resources. (EIR, pp. 7.0-108-73.0-114.)

17 **F. Geology and Soils.**

18 *Impact: On- or off- site Landslide, Lateral Spreading, Collapse or Rockfall.*

19 *Threshold A: Project construction and implementation would not be located on a geologic*
20 *unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and*
21 *potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards,*
22 *with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment*
23 *“A”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

24 1. Project Impact(s):

- 25 a. Project – Compliance with the California Building Standards Code, County
26 of Riverside grading regulations, County General Plan policies that address
27
28

1 unstable geology or soil conditions will reduce potential impacts related to
2 liquefaction and lateral spreading to less than significant levels. (EIR, pp.5.6-
3 17-5.6-18.)

4 Preliminary geotechnical investigations of the site indicate that soils located
5 from 5 to 8 feet below the existing ground surface are not prone to collapse.
6 Mitigation measure MM Geo 2 requires grading to remove and recompact
7 the upper 5 to 8 feet of the existing soils in all proposed areas of development.
8 Implementation of mitigation measure MM Geo 2 and compliance with the
9 California Building Standards Code, County of Riverside grading
10 regulations, and County General Plan policies that address unstable geology
11 or soil conditions will reduce potential impacts related to collapse to less than
12 significant levels. (EIR, p. 5.6-18.) Potential Project impacts related to
13 landslides will be less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.6-18.)

14 A Rockfall Evaluation was conducted for the Project site that identifies three
15 rockfall risk zones along the northern face of the Lakeview Mountains as
16 shown on EIR Figure 5.6-5. Rockfall risks are minimal to low in Remedial
17 Zone 1, higher in Remedial Zone 2, and highest in Remedial Zone 3, where
18 rocks are exposed at the surface, have been eroded or weathered away from
19 the base rock, and rest on top of or behind other loose boulders or rock
20 fragments. Almost all of the Project development will occur in locations that
21 are not included in the rockfall risk zones. Mitigation measure MM Geo 1
22 requires the implementation of rockfall risk reduction measures applicable to
23 each of the three risk zones. Implementation of mitigation measures MM Geo
24 1 and compliance with the California Building Standards Code, County of
25 Riverside grading regulations, and County General Plan policies that address
26 unstable geology or soil conditions will reduce potential impacts related to
27
28

1 rockfalls along the northern perimeter of the Lakeview Mountains to less than
2 significant levels. (EIR, pp.5.6-18-5.6-19.)

- 3 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
4 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
5 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
6 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-54; 7.0-175.)

7 2. Mitigation:

- 8 a. Project – Implementation of MM Geo 1 and MM Geo 2 would reduce the
9 Project impacts related to unstable geologic units or soils.
10 b. Alternative 7 – Implementation of MM Geo 1 and MM Geo 2 would reduce
11 the Alternative 7 impacts related to unstable geologic units or soils. (EIR, pp.
12 7.0-116-7.0-118.)

13 ***Impact: Unstable Soil and Ground Subsidence.***

14 ***Threshold B: Project construction and implementation would not be located on a geologic***
15 ***unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and***
16 ***potentially result in ground subsidence.***

17 1. Project Impact(s):

- 18 a. Project – Alluvial soils within the Specific Plan area are potentially subject
19 to subsidence. Figure S-7 of the Riverside County General Plan indicates that
20 the Project site is located in a region that is generally susceptible to ground
21 subsidence, largely due to groundwater withdrawals. The proposed Project
22 will not affect surface hydrology and regional aquifer recharge rates, will not
23 extract or use groundwater, and will not increase the risk of subsidence that
24 could be related to the over-extraction of groundwater. The Project’s
25 potential impacts related to subsidence are less than significant. All
26 development within Riverside County is required to comply with the
27 California Building Standards Code, which includes standards for the
28

1 construction of structures and facilities in areas potentially subject to
2 subsidence risks or other geologic and soil instability. A geotechnical
3 assessment of potentially unstable soils must be completed by a certified
4 geologist prior to grading. (EIR, pp. 5.6-19–5.6-20.)

5 On-site preliminary geotechnical investigations indicate that the upper 3 to
6 15 feet of Project area soil may be subject to low to moderate compression
7 risks. Localized areas of uncontrolled artificial fill are highly compressible.
8 The preliminary geotechnical investigations further indicate that soil
9 compression risks are insignificant below the upper 3 to 15 feet of soil and
10 decrease with depth. Mitigation measure MM Geo 2 requires grading to
11 remove and recompact the upper 5 to 8 feet of the existing soils in all
12 proposed areas of development. This excavation, regrading, and compaction
13 process will reduce potential soil compression impacts to less than significant
14 levels. Additionally, compliance with the California Building Standards
15 Code, County of Riverside grading regulations, and County General Plan
16 policies that address unstable geology or soil conditions will further reduce
17 potential impacts related to compressible soils to less than significant levels.
18 (EIR, p. 5.6-20.)

- 19 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
20 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
21 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
22 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-54; 7.0-175.)

23 2. Mitigation:

- 24 a. Project – Implementation of mitigation measure MM Geo 2 would reduce
25 potential impacts as a consequence of compressible soils.
26 b. Alternative 7 – Implementation of mitigation measure MM Geo 2 would
27 reduce potential impacts as a consequence of compressible soils.
28

1 **Impact:** *Soil Erosion, Loss of Topsoil, Expansive Soil.*

2 **Threshold F:** *Project construction and implementation would not result in substantial soil*
3 *erosion or the loss of topsoil or be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of*
4 *the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property, with the*
5 *implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A",*
6 *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

7 1. Project Impact(s):

- 8 a. Project – Implementation of the proposed Project will require extensive
9 grading, excavation, and fill throughout the Project site that could result in
10 the loss of topsoil and substantial soil erosion. The construction phases of
11 the Project are subject to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge
12 Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges
13 Associated with Construction Activity (General Permit) from the Regional
14 Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) which requires that Best
15 Management Practices (BMPs) be used on site to ensure that soil erosion and
16 loss of topsoil due to wind or water does not occur during the construction
17 phase. Any potential for erosion or loss of topsoil during construction would
18 be further controlled as mandated by Southern California Air Quality
19 Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 dust prevention measures, as
20 well as regulatory requirements imposed by other responsible agencies, and
21 through standard conditions of approval issued for grading permits. Once
22 developed the site would be hardscaped (i.e., streets, parking lots, sidewalks,
23 buildings) and landscaped which will stabilize the soil and prevent any
24 substantial erosion or loss of topsoil. Furthermore, the installation, operation,
25 and maintenance of drainages and permanent landscaping in accordance with
26 County standards and the requirements listed in the Specific Plan would
27 ensure that surface soils would be stable. Therefore, construction and
28

1 operational impacts associated with topsoil loss would be less than
2 significant. Potential soil erosion impacts related to site hydrology are
3 discussed in Section 5.8, Hydrology, of the EIR and will be less than
4 significant with mitigation (EIR, p. 5.6-23).

5 Preliminary geotechnical investigations found that the expansive potential of
6 on-site soils ranges from very low to high in certain locations. Expansive soils
7 contain clay particles that expand or contract in response to proximity to
8 water and can generate unstable ground conditions. Mitigation Measure MM
9 Geo 2 requires grading to remove and recompact the upper 5 to 8 feet of the
10 existing soils in all proposed areas of development. This grading and
11 compaction process will result in the mixture of soils throughout the site and
12 will reduce the concentration of clay particles associated with expansion in
13 certain locations. Implementation of mitigation measures MM Geo 2 along
14 with compliance with the California Building Standards Code, County of
15 Riverside grading regulations, and County General Plan policies that address
16 unstable geology or soil conditions will reduce potential impacts related to
17 soil expansion to less than significant levels. (EIR, p. 5.6-23.)

- 18 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
19 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
20 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
21 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-54; 7.0-175.)

22 2. Mitigation:

- 23 a. Project – Mitigation measure MM Geo 2 will reduce the Project impact from
24 expansive soil. Mitigation measure MM Hydro 1 will reduce impacts related
25 to erosion.
26
27
28

- 1 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measure MM Geo 2 will reduce the potential
2 impacts from expansive soil. Mitigation measure MM Hydro 1 will reduce
3 impacts related to erosion. (EIR, pp. 7.0-116-7.0-118.)

4 ***Impact: County of Riverside Maximum Standards.***

5 ***Threshold I: Project organic material content in the soil would not exceed County of***
6 ***Riverside maximum standards, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to***
7 ***Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).***

8 1. Project Impact(s):

- 9 a. Project – The Project site is located in a portion of Riverside County that is
10 subject to County methane investigation and mitigation protocols due to
11 existing and historical dairy, animal husbandry, and agricultural land uses
12 that could increase the organic content of local soils (EIR, p. 5.6-24).
13 Potential methane-related hazards will be less than significant with
14 implementation of mitigation measure MM Hazards-Mat 3 (refer to EIR
15 Section 5.7, Hazards) requires that all on-site soils used as fill be subject to a
16 geotechnical evaluation prior to the approval of any grading permit, and that
17 measures must be implemented to ensure that organic matter comprises less
18 than 1 percent by weight of the compacted fill prior to grading operations, or
19 less than 3 percent by weight if Type V cement is used. Compliance with the
20 County methane investigation and mitigation protocols and mitigation
21 measure MM Hazards-Mat 3, and the reduction of organic content in on-site
22 structural fill to less than 1 percent by weight or less than 3 percent by weight
23 if Type V cement is used will reduce the potential for adverse impacts from
24 organic materials in soil to less than significant levels. (EIR, pp. 5.6-24–5.6-
25 25.)
- 26 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project
27 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
28

1 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
2 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-56; 7.0-175.)

3 2. Mitigation:

- 4 a. Project – Implementation of MM Hazards-Mat 3 will reduce the Project
5 impact from organic matter content in soils.
6 b. Alternative 7 – Implementation of MM Hazards-Mat 3 will reduce the
7 potential impacts from organic matter content in soils. (EIR, pp. 7.0-118.)

8 **G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.**

9 *Impact: Hazardous Materials - Hazard to Public.*

10 *Threshold B: Project construction and implementation would not create a significant*
11 *hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of*
12 *hazardous materials; or, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment*
13 *through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of*
14 *hazardous materials into the environment, with the implementation of mitigation measures*
15 *(refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting*
16 *Program).*

17 1. Project Impact(s):

- 18 a. Project – The Phase I ESAs conducted in 2003-2004, 2012 and 2013
19 comprehensively analyzed the potential occurrence of hazardous materials in
20 and within at least one mile of the Specific Plan area. The 2013 ESA,
21 indicated that there were no significant levels of organochlorine pesticides
22 (OCPs) present in the near surface soils at the 53 sample locations, which
23 were historically or currently used for agriculture within the Project site. All
24 of the detected concentrations were below the applicable federal preliminary
25 remediation goals for residential-use soils, and no further testing for
26 pesticides is required for proposed Project development. Therefore,
27 implementation of the Project is not expected to result in the release of
28

1 hazardous materials into the environment and potential impacts are less than
2 significant. Older structures on the site, particularly associated with the
3 chicken and horse ranches, could contain asbestos and lead-based paint that
4 might be released into the environment during demolition activities.
5 Exposure to other contaminants that have not previously been identified
6 could also occur from Project demolition and construction related to USTs,
7 historical spills, or other undetected structural or subsurface conditions. All
8 demolition that could result in the release of lead or asbestos must be
9 conducted according to Cal/OSHA standards. Mitigation measure MM
10 Hazards-Mat 1 requires the completion of, and post-approval compliance
11 with, an asbestos and lead paint survey report prior to issuance of a
12 demolition permit for existing site structures. (EIR, pp. 5.7-23–5.7-24.)

13 Other potential accidental hazard exposure risks could occur due to the
14 deposition of organic material, such as animal wastes or compost related to
15 historical or current farming, ranching, egg production and similar
16 agricultural activities or from the accidental discovery of materials during
17 Project demolition or construction. Mitigation measure MM Hazards-Mat 3
18 requires that all on-site soils used as fill be subject to a geotechnical
19 evaluation prior to the approval of any tentative tract map or site plan, and
20 that measures must be implemented to ensure that organic matter comprises
21 less than 1 % by weight of the fill, or up to 3% by weight if Type V cement
22 is used for Project construction, prior to grading operations. (EIR, p. 5.7-24.)

23 Mitigation measure MM Hazards-Mat 2 requires that any on-site excavation
24 be halted if material believed to be hazardous is discovered and until the
25 material is tested and removed in accordance with applicable laws and
26 regulations if determined to be hazardous. Mitigation measure MM Hazards-
27 Mat 4, which requires a 300-foot buffer between the Lakeview Burn Dump
28

1 and areas where Project development would occur until the site is remediated
2 and closed in accordance with applicable rules and regulations. Compliance
3 with federal, state and local rules and regulations, and mitigation measures
4 MM Hazards-Mat 1, MM Hazards-Mat 2, MM Hazards-Mat 3, and MM
5 Hazards-Mat 4, will reduce potential impacts from asbestos, lead based paint,
6 methane and unknown constituent exposure during demolition and
7 construction to less than significant levels. (EIR, p. 5.7-24.)

8 The transportation and storage of hazardous materials, such as fuels, cleaning
9 solvents or pesticides that could occur in conjunction with Project
10 construction or operations, or along roadways near the Project, could result
11 in accidental spills, leaks, toxic releases, fires, or explosions. Compliance
12 with all applicable federal and state laws related to the transportation, storage
13 and response to upsets or accidents that may involve hazardous materials
14 would reduce the likelihood and severity of upsets and accidents during
15 transit and storage, and potential impacts would be less than significant. (EIR,
16 pp. 5.7-24–5.7-25.)

- 17 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
18 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
19 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
20 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-56; 7.0-175.)

21 2. Mitigation:

- 22 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Hazards-Mat 1, MM Hazards-Mat 2, MM
23 Hazards-Mat 3, and MM Hazards-Mat 4 were identified to reduce Hazardous
24 Materials impacts to the public.
- 25 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Hazards-Mat 1, MM Hazards-Mat
26 2, MM Hazards-Mat 3, and MM Hazards-Mat 4 were identified to reduce
27 Hazardous Materials impacts to the public. (EIR, pp. 7.0-118.)

1 **Impact:** *List of Hazardous Materials Sites.*

2 **Threshold E:** *Project construction and implementation would not be located on a site which*
3 *is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code*
4 *Section 65962.5 [CORTESE] and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the*
5 *public or the environment, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project*
6 *Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

7 1. Project Impact(s):

- 8 a. Project – All of the CORTESE listings located in or near the Project site have
9 been closed, were fully remediated, and do not require further action by the
10 applicable regulatory agencies. Potential Project impacts related to hazardous
11 materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 are
12 less than significant. Additionally, potential Project impacts related to
13 hazardous materials from the Nutrilite manufacturing facility LUST not
14 included in the CORTESE database are less than significant. Potential
15 impacts related to agricultural chemical residues are less than significant with
16 implementation of mitigation measure MM Hazards-Mat 4. Mitigation
17 measure MM Hazards-Mat 4 provides that if the burn dump is not fully
18 remediated and closed by the time Project development is initiated on parcels
19 within 1,000 feet of the burn dump site, a 300-foot buffer from the burn dump
20 site shall be maintained until the site remediation is complete. The Project's
21 design, which largely avoids the Lakeview Burn Dump, compliance with the
22 Site Specific Health and Safety Plan for Project construction in the dump site,
23 and the implementation of mitigation measure MM Hazards-Mat 4 in the
24 event the Project initiates development within the buffer area prior to
25 remediation and closure, will reduce potential Project impacts related to
26 hazardous materials from the Lakeview Burn Dump to less than significant
27 levels. (EIR, pp. 5.7-27--5.7-28.)

1 requirements. Mitigation measure MM Hazards-Fire 5 requires that Project
2 buildings be constructed with fire retardant roofing material as per the
3 California Building Code. Mitigation measure MM Hazards-Fire 6 requires
4 that, prior to the approval of any Project development plan for lands adjacent
5 to the Lakeview Mountains open space areas, a fire protection/vegetation
6 management (fuel modification) plan must be submitted to the fire
7 department for review and approval. After approval, an appropriate
8 management entity must implement and ensure compliance with the fire
9 protection/vegetation management (fuel modification) plan. The Project
10 setback design, compliance with the fire services requirements and mitigation
11 measures discussed in Section 5.12.1 of the EIR, and the implementation of
12 MM Hazards-Fire 5 and MM Hazards-Fire 6 will reduce potential impacts
13 related to exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or
14 death involving wildland fires, to less than significant levels. (EIR, p. 5.7-
15 30.)

16 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project
17 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
18 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
19 in the EIR. (EIR, pp, 7.0-56; 7.0-175.)

20 2. Mitigation:

21 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Hazards-Fire 5 and MM Hazards-Fire 6
22 would reduce Project impacts related to wildfire.

23 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Hazards-Fire 5 and MM Hazards-
24 Fire 6 would reduce potential impacts related to wildfire. (EIR, pp. 7.0-118-
25 7.0-119.)

26 **H. Hydrology and Water Quality.**

27 ***Impact: Runoff and Polluted Runoff.***

28

1 ***Threshold D:*** *Project construction and implementation would not create or contribute*
2 *runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage*
3 *systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, with the implementation*
4 *of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring*
5 *and Reporting Program).*

6 1. Project Impact(s):

- 7 a. Project – Potential impacts related to the generation of substantial additional
8 sources of polluted runoff will be less than significant. The proposed Project
9 drainage plan utilizes streets, underground storm drains, open channels,
10 debris basins, and a detention basin to collect the on-site and off-site storm
11 water, and convey runoff through the Project and into the San Jacinto River
12 floodplain area at the western edge of the site. These facilities will be required
13 by applicable regulations to accommodate a 100-year storm event under post-
14 development conditions. The majority of on-site generated runoff and off-site
15 runoff that is tributary to the Project site will be conveyed by proposed curb,
16 gutters, and/or roadway swales to storm collection inlets, then to storm drain
17 laterals that will convey runoff to the proposed backbone storm drain system.
18 The low flows to be treated (as defined in WQMP) and routed to the WQB,
19 and higher flows will be outlet in a manner consistent with current drainage
20 patterns. The drainage system will be sized to meet all applicable legal and
21 regulatory requirements, including standards applicable to flood control
22 capture volumes. Project drainage will be directed towards the northwest and
23 the storm drain system will generally be based on the historical drainage
24 pattern within the site. On-site runoff will not exceed the capacity of the
25 Project's planned stormwater drainage systems. The Project has been
26 designed to maintain the pre-development hydrology, including off-site
27 flows, as much as possible. The Project will include stormwater conveyance

1 facilities that more efficiently convey water to the San Jacinto River such that
2 the total average annual volume discharged is not considered hydrologically
3 significant due to the relative magnitude of the additional flows in
4 comparison to the San Jacinto flows. As shown in the Hydromodification
5 Technical Report and its Addendum (EIR Appendix I), the majority of the
6 runoff volumes from the Project, including flows above current average
7 levels, will be delivered to the San Jacinto River as low-velocity and volume
8 flows from the West WQB. The Project will have no significant impact to the
9 San Jacinto River drainage system. (EIR, pp. 5.8-60–5.8-61.)

10 The Project will avoid impacts to the drainage system under the Ramona
11 Expressway by routing storm water to the San Jacinto River floodplain at the
12 westernmost extent of the site and reduce runoff volumes that reach the
13 culverts. The Project will reduce demands on the Ramona Expressway
14 drainage system and potential impacts will be less than significant. (EIR, pp.
15 5.8-61–5.8-62.)

16 Other on-site or off-site locations could be subject to temporary flood risks
17 before the proposed Project drainage system is fully operational. Mitigation
18 measure MM Hydro 1 requires that, prior to the approval of any Project
19 tentative tract map submitted to the County before the drainage system is
20 fully operational, hydrology studies must be conducted to identify potential
21 interim storm water flow or water quality impacts that could be related to the
22 development included in the proposed map. Interim measures must be
23 implemented to reduce any such potential impacts to less than significant
24 levels. (EIR, p. 5.8-63).

- 25 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project,
26 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
27
28

1 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
2 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176.)

3 2. Mitigation:

- 4 a. Project – To address potential water quality environmental impacts related to
5 runoff, mitigation MM Hydro 1 has been identified.
6 b. Alternative 7 – To address potential water quality environmental impacts
7 related to runoff, mitigation MM Hydro 1 has been identified. (EIR, pp. 7.0-
8 119.)

9 ***Impact: Alter Drainage Patterns/the Course of a Stream or River/Erosion or Siltation On-
10 or Off-Site.***

11 ***Threshold I: Project construction and implementation would not substantially alter the
12 existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream
13 or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, with
14 the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A",
15 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).***

16 1. Project Impact(s):

- 17 a. Project – Potential Project impacts related to substantial siltation or erosion
18 that could be caused by drainage pattern or stream course changes will be less
19 than significant (see EIR Section 5.8 Threshold A). On-site runoff will be
20 contained within the Project's storm drainage system, including streets,
21 underground storm drains, open channels, debris basins, and detention basins.
22 These facilities will collect and convey on-site and tributary off-site storm
23 water through the Project site towards the San Jacinto River floodplain and
24 are sized to accommodate flows that would be generated by 100-year storm
25 event. Almost all on-site runoff will be directed towards the northwest corner
26 of the site, where an open channel and the West WQB will be located. The
27 Project drainage facilities will approximate existing off-site flow rates. The
28

1 Project will include stormwater conveyance facilities that efficiently convey
2 water to the San Jacinto River similar to existing conditions. As shown in the
3 Hydromodification Technical Report and its Addendum (EIR Appendix I),
4 the majority of the runoff volumes from the Project, including flows above
5 current average levels, will be delivered to the San Jacinto River as low-
6 velocity and volume flows from the West WQB. Therefore, the Project does
7 not result in a substantial increase in surface runoff. On-site flooding risks
8 will be controlled by the Project's drainage facilities and impacts will be less
9 than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.8-65–5.8-66.)

10 The Project drainage system will control on-site flood risks. Runoff discharge
11 volumes and rates will be maintained at approximately the same levels as pre-
12 development, and on-site floodplain storage will slightly increase compared
13 with existing conditions. Interim flood risks along and to the north of the
14 Ramona Expressway will be addressed by implementing the phased measures
15 shown in EIR Figures 5.8-8 to 5.8-12. Potential flood risks in other locations
16 that could occur prior to the completion of the on-site drainage system would
17 be controlled by implementing mitigation measure MM Hydro 1, which
18 requires that prior to the approval of any Project tentative tract map before
19 the Project's drainage system is fully operational, hydrology studies must be
20 conducted to identify potential interim storm water flow or water quality
21 impacts that could occur within or that may be related to the mapped
22 development. Therefore, potential Project impacts related to changes in
23 existing drainage patterns or stream courses that could cause substantial
24 flooding on-site or off-site will be less than significant with mitigation. (EIR,
25 p. 5.8-66.)

- 26 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project,
27 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
28

1 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
2 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176.)

3 2. Mitigation:

4 a. Project – Mitigation measure MM Hydro 1 was identified to reduce altered
5 drainage patterns/the course of a stream or river/erosion or siltation on- or
6 off-site.

7 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measure MM Hydro 1 was identified to reduce
8 altered drainage patterns/the course of a stream or river/erosion or siltation
9 on- or off-site. (EIR, pp. 7.0-119.)

10 ***Impact: Absorption and Surface Runoff Rates.***

11 ***Threshold J: Project construction and implementation would not result in a change in***
12 ***absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff, with the implementation of***
13 ***mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring***
14 ***and Reporting Program).***

15 1. Project Impact(s):

16 a. Project – Potential impacts related to absorption rates affecting groundwater
17 will be less than significant. Potential impacts related to changes in the
18 amount of runoff from the Project site, including flood risks, will be less than
19 significant with the implementation of mitigation measure MM Hydro 1. As
20 a result, potential impacts related to a change in absorption rates or the rate
21 and amount of surface runoff will be less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.8-68.)

22 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project,
23 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
24 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
25 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176.)

1 views from proposed residences into existing homes on Mike Lane, and the
2 Project Design Features, impacts related to compatibility with existing
3 surrounding zoning will be reduced to less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.9-47–
4 5.9-49.)

- 5 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project
6 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
7 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
8 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176.)

9 2. Mitigation:

- 10 a. Project – Mitigation Measures MM Land Use 1 and MM Land Use 2 were
11 identified to reduce impacts with regard to compatibility with existing
12 zoning.
13 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation Measures MM Land Use 1 and MM Land Use 2
14 were identified to reduce impacts with regard to compatibility with existing
15 zoning. (EIR, pp. 7.0-119.)

16 ***Impact: Compatibility with Surrounding Uses.***

17 ***Threshold E: Project implementation would be compatible with existing and planned***
18 ***surrounding land uses with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project***
19 ***Resolution Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).***

20 1. Project Impact:

- 21 a. Project – The community of Lakeview is primarily made up of agricultural
22 land, an agricultural products processing plant (Nutrilite), and rural or low
23 density residential development. Existing surrounding properties to the north
24 include land currently in agricultural use for crop farming and dairies, the San
25 Jacinto River and the SJWA. To the southeast most of the land is undeveloped
26 or sparsely sprinkled with a few homes on large lots. South and west of the
27 Project site are numerous single-family homes on large lots with many of the
28

1 properties also housing horses and/or other livestock, and neighborhood
2 commercial uses.

3 Existing residential uses with ½-acre minimum lot size located on Mike Lane,
4 will directly abut proposed residential development between 5 and 14
5 dwelling units per acres. According to the County General Plan and Zoning
6 Ordinance, Mike Lane is planned to remain in similar use with a General Plan
7 designation of Low Density-Rural Community and zoning classification of
8 Residential Agriculture. The types of potential impacts associated with
9 placing these types of uses adjacent to each other can include loss of privacy
10 for the large lot owners. Conversely, the types of uses, animals, etc., which
11 are allowed and common in rural large-lot areas, may be visually, or
12 otherwise, offensive to new residents unfamiliar with rural communities.
13 Thus, the proposed Project would be incompatible with existing and planned
14 land uses on Mike Lane, which would result in significant adverse impacts
15 without mitigation. Implementation of MM Land Use 2, which requires
16 evidence showing avoidance of views from proposed residences into existing
17 homes on Mike Lane, will reduce this potentially significant impact to less
18 than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.9-50–5.9-51.)

19 Additionally, a portion of Resort Village's northern boundary is adjacent to
20 the SJWA. The SJWA is open to Upland Game Hunting from July 1st through
21 January 31st. All hunting is regulated by the California Department of Fish
22 and Wildlife. According to Fish and Game Code Section 3004, "it is unlawful
23 for any person . . . to hunt or to discharge while hunting, any firearm or other
24 deadly weapon within 150 yards (450 feet) of any occupied dwelling house,
25 residence, or other building or any barn or other outbuilding used in
26 connection therewith." Fish and Game Code Section 3000 limits hunting to
27 the hours from ½ hour before sunrise until ½ hour after sunset. Therefore,
28

1 based on Project design features and compliance with applicable regulations,
2 less than significant impacts would result with respect to the proposed
3 Project's compatibility with existing land uses at the SJWA. (EIR, p. 5.9-51).

- 4 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project
5 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for
6 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and
7 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176.)

8 2. Mitigation:

- 9 a. Project – Mitigation measure MM Land Use 2 was identified to reduce
10 Project incompatibility with surrounding land uses.
11 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measure MM Land Use 2 was identified to reduce
12 land use incompatibility with surrounding land uses. (EIR, pp. 7.0-119.)

13 ***Impact: Compatibility with land use designations and policies of the General Plan.***

14 ***Threshold G: Project implementation would be compatible with the land use designations***
15 ***and policies of the General Plan with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to***
16 ***Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).***

17 1. Project Impact(s):

- 18 a. Project – The Project includes General Plan Amendment (GPA). 720, Change
19 of Zone (CZ) No. 7055, and Specific Plan (SP) No. 342, which propose to
20 amend the land use designations and densities of the General Plan Land Use
21 Map and the Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan Land Use Maps along with
22 changing the zone classifications of the Project site. If the Project's proposed
23 GPA No. 720, CZ No. 7055, and SP No. 342 are adopted, impacts would be
24 considered less than significant with the General Plan, as amended. (EIR, p.
25 5.9-52.)

26 Public art is encouraged in General Plan Policy LU 4.1h. Public art enhances
27 the environment and quality of public outdoor meeting areas. It can take
28

1 many forms, but provides an excellent opportunity for interpretation of the
2 local area and/or history. A Project of this size could accommodate and allow
3 for public art at the community scale. Mitigation measure MM Land Use 3
4 requires public art and therefore, the Project is consistent with this policy and
5 impacts are less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, p. 5.9-52.)

6 Land Use Policy LU 6.1 requires land uses to develop in accordance with the
7 General Plan and area plans to ensure compatibility and minimize impacts.
8 The proposed Project includes a General Plan Amendment that changes the
9 sites land use designation to Community Development Specific Plan which
10 is consistent with the development of a mix of residential housing types
11 totaling a maximum of 11,350 dwelling units, open space, a mixed-use town
12 center that integrates commercial and residential uses, public facilities
13 including K-8 schools, and parks. With the adoption of the proposed GPA
14 No. 720, the proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan. (EIR, p.
15 5.9-52.)

16 Land Use Policies LU 12.6, LU 17.2, LU 22.3, LU 23.7, LU 25.4, and LU
17 26.6 require adequate and available circulation facilities, water resources,
18 sewer facilities and/or septic capacity exist to meet the demands of the
19 proposed land use. At the present time there are not adequate facilities
20 available to meet future needs. However, through County regulations and
21 mitigation measures, which include the payment of development impact fees,
22 and the construction of utility facilities, such facilities can be constructed to
23 meet the needs of the proposed Project. (EIR, p. 5.9-52.)

24 Additionally, General Plan Policy LU 17.3 endeavors to ensure that
25 development does not adversely impact the open space and rural character of
26 the surrounding area. The proposed Project will preserve over 1,000 acres of
27 open space and includes design considerations, setbacks, etc. within the
28

1 Project and/or mitigation measures that transition from the rural community
2 to the higher density Project. For example, the Project will implement
3 mitigation measures MM Land Use 1 and MM Land Use 2 to facilitate the
4 transition from rural community to the Project. Mitigation measure MM Land
5 Use 2 requires evidence showing avoidance of views from proposed
6 residences into existing homes on Mike Lane. Mitigation measure MM Land
7 Use 1 requires the proposed Project to be set back 300 feet from existing
8 active agricultural uses of an offensive nature to reduce incompatibility with
9 existing agricultural uses. The proposed Project would potentially introduce
10 approximately 36,434 people in the community of Lakeview, which is
11 currently characterized by predominantly residential and agricultural uses.
12 The increased population would have indirect impacts on open space and the
13 rural character of the area surrounding the Project site due to increased human
14 activity associated with the residential, commercial, and recreational uses
15 within the proposed Project that would result in traffic, noise, biological
16 resources, and other impacts analyzed in this EIR. These impacts of the
17 proposed Project would indirectly impact the open space and rural character
18 of the surrounding area, however, because indirect impacts will be reduced
19 through Project design features and mitigation measures, the proposed
20 Project is consistent with this policy and therefore, impacts are considered
21 less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.9-53-5.9-54.) With the adoption of the
22 proposed GPA No. 721, the Project would be consistent with General Plan
23 Policy C 2.1 as revised, as well as with Policy LNAP 8.2, and would have
24 less than significant impacts. (EIR, p. 5.9-55.)

25 General Plan Circulation Element Policies C 2.2, C 2.3 and C 2.4 relate to:
26 achieving level of service standards through the establishment of traffic study
27 guidelines and the preparation of traffic studies to evaluate impacts;