

1 determining the significance of traffic impacts for CEQA purposes;  
2 identifying appropriate mitigation measures for new development; and  
3 mitigating traffic impacts via conditions of Project approval requiring the  
4 construction of improvements needed to meet level of service standards. The  
5 traffic analysis determined that even with the implementation of mitigation  
6 measures impacts will still be significant and unavoidable to certain roadway  
7 segments, roadway intersections and freeway segments. However, some of  
8 the significantly impacted facilities are outside the lead agency and Project  
9 proponent's jurisdiction and control. However, with implementation of  
10 mitigation measures MM Trans 1 through MM Trans 29 and adoption of GPA  
11 No. 721, the Project would be consistent with General Plan Policy C 2.1 as  
12 revised, and in turn would be consistent with General Plan Policies C 2.2,  
13 2.3, and 2.4 and impacts would be less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.9-61-5.9-  
14 62.)

15 The Project would be consistent with General Plan Land Use Policies LU  
16 4.1.h and LU 17.3 with implementation of mitigation measures; thus, impacts  
17 will be less than significant with Project Design Features and mitigation. The  
18 Project is consistent with General Plan Land Use Policies: LU 2.1, LU 6.1,  
19 LU 12.6, LU 17.2, LU 22.1, LU 22.3, LU 23.1, LU 23.7, LU 24.1, LU 25.4,  
20 LU 26.6; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan policy LNAP 8.2; and Circulation  
21 Element policies C 2.1, C 2.2, C 2.3, C 2.4. Thus, with the adoption of GPA  
22 No. 720 and GPA No. 721 impacts would be less than significant. (EIR, p.  
23 5.9-63.)

- 24 b. Alternative 7 – Despite the reduction in the values discussed for the proposed  
25 Project (e.g. reduced number of dwelling units; reduced numbers in  
26 population), Alternative 7's impacts continue to be the same as the proposed  
27 Project and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation  
28

1 measures for the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed  
2 Project and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-175.)

3 2. Mitigation:

4 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Land Use 1 and MM Land Use 2 were  
5 identified to reduce land use conflicts and MM Land Use 3 was identified to  
6 encourage public art. Additionally, mitigation measures MM Trans 1 and  
7 MM Trans 29 will improve consistency with transportation policies of the  
8 General Plan.

9 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Land Use 1 and MM Land Use 2  
10 were identified to reduce land use conflicts and MM Land Use 3 was  
11 identified to encourage public art. Additionally, mitigation measure MM  
12 Trans 1 will improve consistency with transportation policies of the General  
13 Plan. (EIR, pp. 7.0-119-7.0-122.)

14 **J. Noise.**

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

16 *Threshold B: Project construction and implementation would not result in a substantial [5*  
17 *dBA or greater] temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity*  
18 *above levels existing without the project, with the implementation of mitigation measures*  
19 *(refer to Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting*  
20 *Program).*

21 1. Project Impact(s):

22 a. Project – Construction on the Project site would comply with the County's  
23 permitted hours of construction, during which the noise from construction  
24 activity is exempt from the noise control ordinance. Similarly, construction  
25 on the Project site within the later phases would potentially impact the areas  
26 (e.g., residences and schools) that have been constructed and occupied during  
27 earlier phases. Construction on the later phases of the Project site, when  
28

1 complying with the County's permitted hours for construction, would not  
2 result in violation of the County's noise control ordinance. However,  
3 although impacts from construction noise are considered short-term since  
4 noise will cease upon completion of construction activity, construction of the  
5 proposed Project would occur for many years and would be potentially  
6 significant without mitigation. To reduce temporary construction noise  
7 impacts to less than significant, the proposed Project will be required to  
8 implement mitigation measures MM Noise 11 through MM Noise 17. (EIR,  
9 p. 5.10-40.)

10 The construction of the off-site utilities and recreational trails will be required  
11 to implement the same mitigation measures as those required of the proposed  
12 Project except those related to blasting activities (MM Noise 11 through MM  
13 Noise 15), because blasting is not required to construct the off-site utilities.  
14 With these mitigation measures, impacts associated with the construction of  
15 off-site utilities will be less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.10-41). With  
16 implementation of mitigation measure MM Bio 6, noise impacts to the San  
17 Jacinto Wildlife Area would be less than significant. Mitigation measure MM  
18 Bio 6 requires a nesting bird survey be conducted (by a qualified biologist)  
19 no more than three (3) days prior to any scheduled removals. If active nests  
20 are identified, the biologist will establish buffers around the vegetation  
21 containing the active nest (500 feet for raptors and 200 feet for non-raptors).  
22 The vegetation containing the active nest will not be removed, and no grading  
23 will occur within the established buffer until a qualified biologist has  
24 determined that the nest is no longer active (i.e., the juveniles are surviving  
25 independent from the nest). If clearing is not conducted within three days of  
26 a negative survey, the nesting survey must be repeated to confirm the absence  
27 of nesting birds. (EIR, pp. 5.10-41-5.10-42.)  
28



1 Construction of the Project may require blasting in portions of the Project site  
2 abutting the Lakeview Mountains. Blasting activities will be short in duration  
3 and will not be required throughout the entire construction period. Such noise  
4 occurrences are short in duration, but they can cause concern in adjacent  
5 residents who are unaware that construction activities are the cause of the  
6 associated noise and vibration. Compliance with mitigation measure MM  
7 Noise 17 will ensure that residents are notified of potential blasting activities.  
8 Based on the short-term duration of potential blasting, and with  
9 implementation of mitigation measure MM Noise 17, the Project's impacts  
10 from excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels will be  
11 less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.10-42.)

- 12 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project  
13 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for  
14 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and  
15 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-61; 7.0-176.)

16 2. Mitigation:

- 17 a. Project – To reduce groundborne vibration effects to a level below the  
18 significance threshold, mitigation measures MM Noise 11 through MM  
19 Noise 17 are provided.
- 20 b. Alternative 7 – To reduce groundborne vibration effects to a level below the  
21 significance threshold, mitigation measures MM Noise 11 through MM  
22 Noise 17 are provided. (EIR, pp. 7.0-121–7.0-122.)

23 **K. Public Services.**

24 *Impact: Fire Service Facilities.*

25 *Threshold A: Project construction and implementation would not result in substantial*  
26 *adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire*  
27 *service facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts,*  
28

1 *in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance*  
2 *objectives for sheriff services, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to*  
3 *Project Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

4 1. Project Impact(s):

5 a. Project – Nuvview Fire Station #3 currently provides service to the rural  
6 communities of Lakeview, Nuevo. The Project’s incremental impacts to the  
7 provision of fire service facilities will be offset by the payment of  
8 development impact fees as required by Riverside County Ordinance No.  
9 659. If the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) identifies the need for  
10 additional facilities, such facilities will be constructed on site. Mitigation  
11 measure MM Fire 1 requires that the Project pay development impact fees or  
12 other fees pursuant to applicable agreements with the County and RCFD as  
13 needed to ensure that RCFD will maintain sufficient capacity to serve the  
14 Specific Plan area. Additionally, mitigation measure MM Fire 2 ensures that  
15 on-site fire protection facilities will meet applicable standards. Potential  
16 Project impacts associated with the on-site construction of new or physically  
17 altered fire service facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response  
18 times, or other performance objectives are less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.12-  
19 7.)

20 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project  
21 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for  
22 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and  
23 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-64; 7.0-177.)

24 2. Mitigation:

25 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Fire 1 and MM Fire 2 have been identified  
26 to reduce Project impacts to fire service facilities.  
27  
28



1 Trans 30a would be required, which requires that the intersection of  
2 Lakeview Avenue and Ramona Expressway be maintained throughout the  
3 relocation of Ramona Expressway. A potentially significant effect on the  
4 circulation system would result due to having trucks drive through existing  
5 neighborhoods to access four-way signals to gain possible construction  
6 access from south of Ramona Expressway to north of Ramona Expressway  
7 after the earthwork is completed and while the development north of Ramona  
8 Expressway is under construction. However, implementation of mitigation  
9 measure MM Trans 31a would be required, which requires that all  
10 construction management, staging, and equipment parking areas shall be  
11 maintained in a location north of Ramona Expressway to avoid construction  
12 traffic driving through existing neighborhoods to get to existing signals, or  
13 causing traffic hazards by crossing at unsignalized locations. Thus, with  
14 implementation of mitigation measures MM Trans 30a and MM Trans 31a  
15 would reduce impacts to less than significant for Option A. (EIR, pp. 5.14-  
16 118-5.14-119.)

17 Regarding implementation of Option B, when the culvert or bridge is being  
18 constructed to accommodate the grading operation, a potential significant  
19 effect to the circulation system could result if traffic were disrupted by  
20 temporary closure of the Ramona Expressway. Mitigation measure MM  
21 Trans 30b will reduce this impact to less than significant levels through  
22 requiring at least one lane to remain open at all times during construction. In  
23 addition, the overcrossing (bridge) approach could create a hazard for  
24 motorists below due to dirt/debris falling onto the expressway. Road hazards  
25 caused by this option are reduced to less than significant with the  
26 implementation of MM Trans 31b, which requires bridge plans and  
27 specifications to include solid railings or other design features that would  
28



1 eliminate the risk of falling dirt and debris. Thus, implementation of MM  
2 Trans 30b and MM Trans 31b would reduce impacts from Option B to less  
3 than significant. (EIR, p. 5.14-119.)

4 Options C and D were considered, but for economic and environmental  
5 reasons have been rejected from further consideration (EIR, pp. 5.14-119–  
6 5.14-120).

- 7 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are less than the proposed Project and  
8 are less than significant without mitigation measure required for the reasons  
9 set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and in the EIR.  
10 (EIR, pp. 7.0-86; 7.0-177.)

11 2. Mitigation:

- 12 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Trans 30a, 31a, 30b, and 31b were  
13 identified to reduce the effect of construction on circulation.  
14 b. Alternative 7 – No mitigation is needed for Alternative 7. (EIR, pp. 7.0-86;  
15 7.0-127)

16 ***Impact: Increase Hazards or Incompatible Uses.***

17 ***Threshold D: Project construction and implementation will not substantially increase***  
18 ***hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible***  
19 ***uses; with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution***  
20 ***Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).***

21 1. Project Impact(s):

- 22 a. Project – Given that specific tract maps have not been completed for the  
23 Project, it is unknown whether roadways have specific design features that  
24 would potentially increase hazards in the study area. With the implementation  
25 of mitigation measures MM Trans 1 and MM Trans 2, which require the  
26 construction of roads to Riverside County’s standards and review and  
27 approval of sight distances and signing and striping plans, impacts related to  
28

1 design-feature hazards will be less than significant with mitigation. (EIR, p.  
2 5.14-121.)

- 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 paragraph and in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-  
6 83; 7.0-177.)

7 2. Mitigation:

- 8 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Trans 1 and MM Trans 2 were identified  
9 to reduce hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.  
10 b. Alternative 7 - Mitigation measures MM Trans 1 and MM Trans 2 were  
11 identified to reduce hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.  
12 (EIR, pp. 7.0-122.)

13 **M. Utilities**

14 ***Impact: Water Treatment Facilities.***

15 ***Threshold A: Project construction and implementation will not require or result in the***  
16 ***construction of new water treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the***  
17 ***construction of which would cause significant environmental effects with the implementation***  
18 ***of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring***  
19 ***and Reporting Program).***

20 1. Project Impact(s):

- 21 a. Project – The proposed Project will not construct or require the construction  
22 or expansion of water treatment facilities. EMWD will supply treated potable  
23 water to the Project area. Raw, untreated water supplies will be treated by  
24 EMWD in its Hemet or Perris water filtration plants to meet all applicable  
25 drinking water and other health and safety standards. The Project demand  
26 was accounted for in the projections used to develop the current EMWD 2010  
27 UWMP and EMWD prepared a WSA that determined there is sufficient  
28

1 water supply to serve the proposed Project. Potential Project impacts related  
2 to the construction of expansion of water treatment facilities will be less than  
3 significant (EIR, p. 5.15-25).

4 Currently, there are no local EMWD potable water facilities in the immediate  
5 area of the Project site to provide adequate supply for the Project as it develop  
6 and at build-out. Thus, the Project will construct approximately 31,590 linear  
7 feet (6 miles) of off-site potable water pipelines. (EIR, p.5.15-26.)

8 The Specific Plan area includes water facilities owned and operated by the  
9 MWD and EMWD. MWD-owned facilities consist of the Colorado River  
10 Aqueduct that traverses the Project site and is designated for public  
11 facility/open space in the Specific Plan. EMWD-owned facilities consist of  
12 an existing non-functional pump station. This pump station will not be used  
13 by the Project and will be left in place. Because Project construction could  
14 unintentionally affect these existing facilities, mitigation measure MM Util 1  
15 requires that the Project maintain MWD and EMWD access to the existing  
16 on-site facilities. Thus, after implementation of MM Util 1, the Project will  
17 not impact the operation of MWD's Colorado River Aqueduct or EMWD's  
18 non-functional on-site pump station. Potential Project impacts from the  
19 construction of new or expanded water treatment facilities and water  
20 conveyance facilities will be less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.15-27.)

- 21 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project  
22 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for  
23 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and  
24 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-86; 7.0-88; 7.0-177.)

25 2. Mitigation.

- 26 a. Project – Mitigation measure MM Util 1 would reduce Project impacts  
27 related to construction of water treatment facilities.  
28

- b. Alternative – Mitigation measure MM Util 1 would reduce potential impacts related to construction of water treatment facilities. (EIR, pp. 7.0-128.)

*Impact: Storm Water Drainage.*

*Threshold E: Project construction and implementation will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

1. Project Impact:

- a. Project – The proposed drainage facilities include an open channel and trail system that will be constructed under the Ramona Expressway and that will convey water towards the San Jacinto River in the northwest portion of the site. Traffic on Ramona Expressway could be temporarily affected by the construction of the channel. Mitigation measure MM Util 2 requires that the channel be constructed under the Ramona Expressway by using boring and tunneling techniques, if feasible, or that a traffic control plan be implemented to maintain two-way traffic at all times. Potential temporary traffic impacts related to channel construction under Ramona Expressway will be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure MM Util 2. (EIR, pp. 5.15-35–5.15-36.)

Additionally, certain interim drainage facilities may be required to avoid temporary drainage-related impacts, including to the Ramona Expressway, until the proposed drainage system is fully operational. Mitigation measure MM Hydro 1 requires that, prior to the approval of any Project tentative tract map submitted to the County before the drainage system is fully operational, hydrology studies be conducted to identify potential interim stormwater flow or water quality impacts that could be related to the development included in

1 the proposed map. If needed, interim measures must be implemented to  
2 reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. (EIR, p. 5.15-36.)

- 3 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are less than the proposed Project and  
4 are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for the  
5 reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and in  
6 the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-86; 7.0-88; 7.0-177.)

7 2. Mitigation:

- 8 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Util 2 and MM Hydro 1 will be  
9 implemented to reduce Project impacts from storm water drainage facilities.  
10 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Util 2 and MM Hydro 1 will be  
11 implemented to reduce potential impacts from storm water drainage facilities.  
12 (EIR, pp. 7.0-119; 7.0-128.)

13 ***Impact: Electrical Facilities.***

14 ***Threshold F: Project construction and implementation will not require or result in the***  
15 ***construction of new electrical facilities, or expansion of existing electrical facilities, the***  
16 ***construction of which would cause significant environmental effects with the implementation***  
17 ***of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring***  
18 ***and Reporting Program).***

19 1. Project Impact(s):

- 20 a. Project – Southern California Edison (SCE) has stated that it will serve the  
21 Project (see EIR Appendix M); however SCE may need to conduct utility  
22 studies, where applicable, to assess whether additions or modifications to the  
23 existing electric infrastructure are required to serve the Project. Based on the  
24 design components and Project generation estimates, it is anticipated the new  
25 Lakeview Substation will need to be completed and operational in order for  
26 SCE to adequately serve the Project as it develops and at Project build-out.  
27 SCE began construction on the approved Lakeview Substation in October  
28

1 2014 with completion of the substation anticipated in December 2015.  
2 Because the Lakeview Substation is reasonably anticipated to be online prior  
3 to the Project's development, impacts related to construction of new or  
4 expanded electrical generation facilities will be less than significant. (EIR, p.  
5 5.15-45.)

6 There are five on-site overhead transmission alignments that would be  
7 undergrounded for this Project and the Project will construct all on-site  
8 electrical distribution infrastructure to applicable County, California Public  
9 Utilities Commission (CPUC), state and SCE standards. Mitigation measure  
10 MM Util 3 requires that financial assurances be provided to SCE that  
11 electrical power utilities will be undergrounded in accordance with applicable  
12 standards prior to final map approval within the Specific Plan area. Mitigation  
13 measure MM Util 4 requires that all tentative tract maps approved for parcels  
14 within the Specific Plan area include a condition that electrical power utilities  
15 will be undergrounded. EIR Table 5.15-G summarizes the Project's  
16 construction related impacts, including electrical energy facilities, all of  
17 which will be less than significant or less than significant after mitigation  
18 except for agricultural resources, air quality, and population/housing. (EIR,  
19 p. 5.15-46).

20 Additionally, local power service could be temporarily interrupted during the  
21 construction of on-site facilities or undergrounding of the above-identified  
22 overhead transmission lines. Mitigation measure MM Util 5 requires that,  
23 subject to applicable local, state, and utility approval, local power lines be  
24 temporarily relocated to maintain electrical service for all existing customers  
25 in the event Project-related construction, such as utility undergrounding,  
26 would affect existing power distribution facilities and service. Potential  
27 Project impacts related to temporary, construction period electrical service  
28

1 interruptions will be less than significant with the implementation of  
2 mitigation measure MM Util 5. (EIR, pp.5.15-45-5.15-46.)

- 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. 7.0-89; 7.0-177.)

7 2. Mitigation:

- 8 a. Project – Mitigation Measures MM Util 3 through MM Util 5 will be  
9 implemented to reduce Project impacts from construction of new electrical  
10 facilities.  
11 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation Measures MM Util 3 through MM Util 5 will be  
12 implemented to reduce potential impacts from construction of new electrical  
13 facilities. (EIR, pp. 7.0-128–7.0-129.)

14 ***Impact: Natural Gas Facilities.***

15 ***Threshold G: Project construction and implementation will not require or result in the***  
16 ***construction of new natural gas facilities, or expansion of existing natural gas facilities, the***  
17 ***construction of which would cause significant environmental effects with the implementation***  
18 ***of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment “A”, Mitigation Monitoring***  
19 ***and Reporting Program).***

20 1. Project Impact:

- 21 a. Project – Construction of new or expanded natural gas production or regional  
22 transmission facilities to serve the proposed Project will be less than  
23 significant. Project natural gas facility construction could temporarily  
24 interrupt service to existing users and could affect the existing gas pressure  
25 control facility and existing gas mains. Mitigation measure MM Util 6  
26 requires that the Project implement reasonable and feasible measures to  
27 maintain existing gas service that could be affected during Project  
28

1 construction such as identifying existing gas lines on grading plans.  
2 Mitigation measure MM Util 7 requires that a fence or other barrier be placed  
3 around the pressure control facility for protection, and that Southern  
4 California Gas Company (SCGC) be provided access to the facility for  
5 maintenance or repair purposes during Project construction such as providing  
6 truck access to the facility. Potential Project impacts related to temporary gas  
7 service interruptions or impacts to the Davis Road pressure control facility  
8 and pipeline will be less than significant with the implementation of  
9 mitigation measures MM Util 6 and MM Util 7. (EIR, pp. 5.15-47-5.15-48.)

- 10 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project  
11 and are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures for  
12 the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion of the proposed Project and  
13 in the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-9; 7.0-177.)

14 2. Mitigation:

- 15 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Util 6 and MM Util 7 will be implemented  
16 to reduce Project impacts related to natural gas facilities.  
17 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Util 6 and MM Util 7 will be  
18 implemented to reduce potential impacts related to natural gas facilities.  
19 (EIR, pp. 7.0-129.)

20 **Impact:** *Wasteful, Inefficient and Unnecessary Energy Consumption.*

21 **Threshold H:** *Project construction and implementation will not develop land uses and*  
22 *patterns that cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy, Impacts*  
23 *may include: the project's energy requirements and its energy use efficiencies by amount*  
24 *and fuel type for each stage of the project including construction, operation, maintenance*  
25 *and/or removal; the effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies and on*  
26 *requirements for additional capacity; the effects of the project on peak and base period*  
27 *demands for electricity and other forms of energy; the degree to which the project complies*



1 *with existing energy standards; the effects of the project on energy resources; the project's*  
2 *projected transportation energy use requirements and its overall use of efficient*  
3 *transportation alternatives; with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project*  
4 *Resolution Attachment "A", Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).*

5 1. Project Impact:

6 a. Project – Fuel energy consumed during construction would be temporary in  
7 nature and would not represent a significant demand on energy resources.  
8 The Project will also implement mitigation measures MM AQ 1 through MM  
9 AQ 4, which require equipment to be properly maintained, minimize idling,  
10 utilize electricity from power poles instead of temporary generators, and  
11 utilizing cleaner, more efficient off-road equipment by requiring Tier 3  
12 certified equipment during the grading phases. (EIR, p. 5.15-49.)

13 Collectively, compliance with regulatory programs and implementation of  
14 Project Design Features and mitigation measures MM GHG 1 through MM  
15 GHG 5 would ensure that the Project would not result in the inefficient,  
16 unnecessary, or wasteful consumption of energy (EIR, p. 5.15-51). The  
17 effects of the Project on peak and base period demands for electricity and  
18 other forms of energy will be reduced with implementation of mitigation  
19 measures MM GHG 1 through MM GHG 3, which will also reduce energy  
20 demand during the base period. Energy conservation measures, MM GHG 1  
21 through MM GHG 5 will also ensure that the Project complies with existing  
22 energy standards. (EIR, p. 5.15-52.)

23 Implementation of mitigation measures MM GHG 1 and MM GHG 2 will  
24 ensure that the Project does not result in the inefficient, unnecessary, or  
25 wasteful consumption of energy. Also, mitigation measures MM GHG 4 and  
26 MM GHG 5 will ensure that the Project's projected transportation energy use  
27  
28

1 requirements are not significant and its overall use of efficient transportation  
2 alternatives is encouraged. (EIR, p. 5.15-53.)

- 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. 7.0-89; 7.0-178.)

7 2. Mitigation:

- 8 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM AQ 1 through MM AQ 4 and MM GHG  
9 1 through MM GHG 5 will be implemented to reduce Project impacts related  
10 to wasteful or inefficient use of energy resources.  
11 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM AQ 1 through MM AQ 4 and MM  
12 GHG 1 through MM GHG 5 will be implemented to reduce potential impacts  
13 related to wasteful or inefficient use of energy resources. (EIR, pp. 7.0-101;  
14 7.0-130–7.0-131.)

15 ***Impact: Land Fill Capacity.***

16 ***Threshold I: The construction or implementation of the project would be served by a landfill***  
17 ***with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs.***  
18 ***with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Project Resolution Attachment***  
19 ***“A”, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).***

20 1. Project Impact:

- 21 a. Project – Consistent with state law, Riverside County Waste Resources  
22 Department (RCWRD) will require that the Project develop and implement a  
23 Waste Recycling Plan to ensure that at least 50 percent of construction waste  
24 is recycled, reused, composted, and/or salvaged in lieu of landfill disposal.  
25 Mitigation measure MM Util 8 also requires at least a 50 percent reduction  
26 in construction waste. Project construction waste will not exceed the capacity  
27  
28

1 of landfills that would serve the Specific Plan area, and potential impacts are  
2 less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.15-60.)

3 During operation, the Project's impact to the remaining permitted daily intake  
4 at the landfills that will receive the Project's solid waste will be  
5 approximately 0.13-0.75 percent with 50 percent diversion rate, and 0.06-  
6 0.38 percent with 75 percent diversion rate. Mitigation measure MM Util 9  
7 requires that green waste composting be conducted on-site to reduce the  
8 amount of plant and related solid waste generated by the Project. Mitigation  
9 measure MM Util 10 requires green waste recycling collection. With  
10 mitigation, Project operational waste will not exceed the capacity of landfills  
11 that would serve the Specific Plan area, and potential impacts are less than  
12 significant.

- 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. 7.0-90–7.0-91; 7.0-93; 7.0-177.)

17 2. Mitigation:

- 18 a. Project – Mitigation measures MM Util 8 through MM Util 10 have been  
19 identified to reduce Project impacts to landfill capacity.  
20 b. Alternative 7 – Mitigation measures MM Util 8 through MM Util 10 have  
21 been identified to reduce potential impacts to landfill capacity. (EIR, pp. 7.0-  
22 129–7.0-130.)

23 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following impacts potentially  
24 resulting from the adoption of the EIR No. 471 cannot be fully mitigated and will be only partially avoided  
25 or lessened in consideration of existing regulations, Project Design Features or mitigation measures  
26 specified in Attachment A (Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, incorporated by reference into  
27 this document), for reasons documented in the Final EIR No. 471 and summarized below. Accordingly and  
28

1 as further explained below, the County makes the following findings as to each of the following impacts as  
2 allowed by State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a): “Changes or alterations [that might further reduce  
3 Project impacts] are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the [County].  
4 Such changes have been adopted by such other agency”; or Specific economic, legal, social, technological,  
5 or other considerations, make infeasible the mitigation measures or Project alternatives identified in the  
6 final EIR.” Therefore, a statement of overriding considerations consistent with State CEQA Guidelines  
7 sections 15093, 15216(b), and 15126.2(b) and discussed in the Final EIR Section 15132 is required and  
8 included herein:

9       **A.     Aesthetics.**

10           *Impact: Scenic Resources.*

11           ***Threshold B:*** *Project construction and implementation would substantially damage scenic*  
12 *resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings*  
13 *within a state scenic highway.*

14       1.     Project Impact(s):

- 15           a.     Project – Although there are no officially designated state highways within,  
16                   adjacent to, or located in areas that would be affected by the Project, the  
17                   Project site is visible from the Ramona Expressway, which has been  
18                   identified as a County Eligible Scenic Highway by Caltrans and in the LNAP.  
19                   (EIR, p. 5.1-23.)

20                   Potential Scenic Impacts North of the Ramona Expressway. The primary  
21                   scenic resource visible from the Ramona Expressway at this location is the  
22                   Bernasconi Hills to the northwest. Even though the structures in this portion  
23                   of the Specific Plan Area will be set back a minimum of 50 feet and the right  
24                   of way of Ramona Expressway along the Project’s frontage will be increased  
25                   to 220 feet when the Mid County Parkway (MCP) is constructed, views of  
26                   these hills could be obstructed by the trees required to implement mitigation  
27                   measure MM AQ 5 in addition to the additional rooftops resulting from  
28

1 Project implementation. Thus, the Project's potential impacts to scenic  
2 resources from development north of the Ramona Expressway may be  
3 potentially significant. (EIR, pp. 5.1-23–5.1-24.)

4 Potential Scenic Impacts Southeast of the Ramona Expressway. The Project  
5 borders the south side of the Ramona Expressway for more than three miles.  
6 The Lakeview Mountains are closer to the Expressway and have a substantial  
7 visual profile in the eastern area of the Project area. Potential adverse impacts  
8 to views of the Lakeview Mountain from Project activities (including  
9 implementation of mitigation measures MM AQ 5 and MM Noise 10) located  
10 southeast of the Expressway are potentially significant. (EIR, p. 5.1-24.)

11 Potential Scenic Impacts Southwest of the Ramona Expressway. Although  
12 views of the Lakeview Mountains are partially obscured by existing  
13 powerlines, the construction of 35-foot tall structures set back 50-feet from  
14 the Ramona Expressway could create a “wall effect” that might reduce the  
15 scenic character of the Expressway in the immediate vicinity. Views of the  
16 Lakeview Mountains could also be obscured by one or more, taller  
17 contiguous structures or trees located at the margin of the required setback  
18 from the Expressway. Mitigation measure MM Aesthetics 2 requires  
19 landscaping along the border of the proposed mixed use development areas  
20 and the Expressway, with tree gaps to allow for views of the Lakeview  
21 Mountains. Because the Project may not be able to preserve clear views of  
22 the Lakeview Mountains from Ramona Expressway along two of the three  
23 miles of Project bordering the south side of the Expressway, even if all  
24 structures are set back by a minimum of 50 feet consistent with the County  
25 General Plan, potential impacts to scenic resources from development  
26 southwest of the Ramona Expressway may be potentially significant. (EIR,  
27 pp. 5.1-24–5.1-25)

1                   Potential Scenic Impacts from Recycled Water Storage Tanks. Recycled  
2 water storage tanks would be located within approximately 15 acres of the  
3 Lakeview Mountains foothills in the location identified as planning area PA  
4 81. MM Aesthetics 1 requires that the tank(s) be screened with appropriate  
5 landscaping and paint colors to blend with the surrounding hills and reduce  
6 tank-related visual impacts to less than significant levels with mitigation.  
7 (EIR, p. 5.1-25)

8                   Potential Scenic Impacts from Retaining Walls. Mitigation measures MM  
9 Noise 9 and MM Noise 10 require sound walls of 6 to 14 feet in height for  
10 various Planning Areas located along the Ramona Expressway corridor.  
11 Although partial views of the Bernasconi Hills and Lakeview Mountains will  
12 be maintained after Project implementation, because the Ramona  
13 Expressway has been designated as a County Eligible Scenic Highway,  
14 potential impacts to scenic resources from Project sound walls is considered  
15 potentially significant. (EIR, p. 5.1-25.)

- 16                   b.       Alternative 7 – Alternative 7 would also develop along the same Ramona  
17 Expressway corridor as the Project and as such, would result in adverse  
18 impacts to the views of the Bernasconi Hills and Lakeview Mountains from  
19 Ramona Expressway, a County Eligible Scenic Highway. To reduce these  
20 impacts, mitigation measure MM Aesthetics 2 would be applicable to  
21 Alternative 7, which requires landscaping along the border of the  
22 development areas and Ramona Expressway, with tree gaps to allow for  
23 views of the Lakeview Mountains. However, this mitigation measure would  
24 need to be revised based on the village organization of Alternative 7.  
25 Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable, as with the  
26 proposed Project. Moreover, Alternative 7 would construct water storage  
27 tanks on site, as with the proposed Project, within the foothills of the  
28

1 Lakeview Mountains, which would be highly visible from Ramona  
2 Expressway and affect views of the Lakeview Mountains. As a result,  
3 mitigation measure MM Aesthetics 1 would be applicable to Alternative 7,  
4 which requires the tanks be screened with appropriate landscaping and paint  
5 colors to blend with the surrounding hills and reduce tank-related visual  
6 impacts. Additionally, the off-site improvements that are proposed by  
7 Alternative 7 would not damage scenic resources, similar to the proposed  
8 Project. (EIR, pp. 7.0-26; 7.0-174.)

9 2. Mitigation:

10 a. Project – The partial obstruction of views from the Ramona Expressway, a  
11 Riverside County Eligible Scenic Highway, cannot be mitigated to less than  
12 significant. The partial obstruction of views is the result of the increased  
13 density proposed by the Project, the planting of trees required by mitigation  
14 measure MM AQ 5, and the sound walls required by mitigation measure MM  
15 Noise 10. Further, even if all structures are set back by a minimum of 50 feet  
16 consistent with the County General Plan as required by mitigation measure  
17 MM Aesthetic 2, potential impacts to scenic resources from development  
18 southwest of the Ramona Expressway would be significant. (EIR, pp. 5.1-  
19 23–5.1-35 and 5.1-40.) Elimination of mitigation measures MM AQ 5 and  
20 MM Noise 10 would result in greater impacts to air quality and noise,  
21 respectively.

22 b. Alternative 7 – As with the proposed Project, implementation of MM  
23 Aesthetics 1 will reduce tank-related visual impacts. MM Aesthetics 2 – Alt  
24 7 reduces impacts to the views from the Ramona Expressway, a Riverside  
25 County Eligible Scenic Highway. Similar to the proposed Project,  
26 elimination of mitigation measures MM AQ 5 and MM Noise 10 would result  
27 in greater impacts to air quality and noise. Even with implementation of this  
28

1 mitigation measure, impacts to scenic resources would remain significant and  
2 unavoidable, similar to the proposed Project. (EIR, pp. 7.0-99.)

3 ***Impact: Visual Character and Quality of the Site.***

4 ***Threshold C: Project construction and implementation would substantially degrade the***  
5 ***existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.***

6 1. Project Impact(s):

- 7 a. Project – Although avoidance and permanent preservation of the Lakeview  
8 Mountains within the site will protect the existing visual character and quality  
9 of these mountains, and the Project will incorporate design considerations  
10 and mitigation measures to reduce aesthetic impacts, because Project  
11 implementation will change the visual character of the Project site from rural  
12 and agricultural to a mixed-use urban village, impacts are considered  
13 significant. (EIR, p. 5.1-36.)

14 Windrows and trees (not associated with the horse ranch). A Eucalyptus  
15 windrow is located in the western portion of the Project site, on the west side  
16 of Davis Road. Mature trees are located near the residences that were inside  
17 the Project boundary on Davis Road. A windrow is located adjacent to the  
18 MWD water retention basin in the Project area. Other trees occur in scattered  
19 locations within the site. Implementation of the Project may entail the  
20 removal of many of these trees. Because none of these resources have  
21 significant scenic value the Project's impacts would be less than significant.  
22 (EIR, p. 5.1-36.)

23 Trees and structures associated with the horse ranch. A horse ranch (formerly  
24 used as a thoroughbred farm) is currently located in the southwest portion of  
25 the Specific Plan area. The horse ranch facility includes mature trees, pastures  
26 and white split-rail fences that provide views with a rural character from  
27 adjacent locations. The Project could have an impact on the rural character  
28



1 and quality of the site in the vicinity of the horse ranch if the design of the  
2 park and landscape buffer differs substantially from the characteristics of the  
3 horse ranch, including the use of white split rail fencing and mature trees.  
4 MM Aesthetics 3 requires preservation of existing mature trees, to the extent  
5 feasible, and the use of white split rail fences in the proposed park near  
6 Hansen avenue, 1:1 mitigation for impacts to the 24 mature trees located at  
7 the existing horse ranch entrance, and tree spacing to preserve existing views  
8 and the use of white split rail fencing in the multipurpose community trail  
9 along Hansen and Wolfskill Avenues and Poppy Road. These measures will  
10 preserve the character and quality of the site in the vicinity of the horse ranch  
11 and reduce impacts to less than significant levels. (EIR, p. 5.1-36.)

12 Other views of the site. The northwestern corner of the Project north of the  
13 Ramona Expressway is currently vacant. Project development in this area  
14 would adversely affect existing views from north/south streets in the  
15 Lakeview community. Views of Bernasconi Hills from the Lakeview  
16 community are currently obstructed in part by an existing windrow. Proposed  
17 Project development will have approximately the same effect in the  
18 foreground and will not impact existing long-range views of the Bernasconi  
19 Hills. Due to distance and topography, existing Lakeview community streets  
20 do not afford views of Mystic Lake or the SJWA. Project development north  
21 of Ramona Expressway will not significantly impact existing views from  
22 public streets in the Lakeview community. No public spaces or roads are  
23 located near the southeast portion of the Project and north of the Lakeview  
24 Mountains. No views will be affected by development and potential impacts  
25 will be less than significant in this area. The Project will change existing land  
26 uses in the proposed area of development from rural and agricultural uses to  
27 urban uses. Although land uses within the proposed area of development will  
28

1 be urban in character, the Project will not significantly impact existing views  
2 from these locations on a regional scale. (EIR, p. 5.1-38.)

3 Off-site infrastructure. Many of the off-site infrastructure improvements  
4 (additional lanes, trails, storm drain, water and sewer pipelines) are located  
5 at grade or below ground along existing streets in developed areas and would  
6 not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the Project area. The  
7 storm water training dike, storm drain channel, booster and lift stations, and  
8 intersection signals are located above ground but due to limited size and  
9 height and generally being located in developed areas these improvements  
10 would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the Project  
11 area. (EIR, p. 5.1-38.)

- 12 b. Alternative 7 – As with the proposed Project, Alternative 7 could have an  
13 impact on the rural character and quality in the southwest vicinity of the  
14 Project site if the on-site development design were to differ substantially from  
15 the characteristics of the horse ranch, including the use of white split rail  
16 fencing and mature trees. Thus, Alternative 7, as with the proposed Project,  
17 would incorporate mitigation measure MM Aesthetics 3, which requires  
18 preservation of existing mature trees, to the extent feasible, and the use of  
19 white split rail fences in the proposed park near Hansen Avenue, 1:1  
20 mitigation for impacts to the 24 mature trees located at the existing horse  
21 ranch entrance, and tree spacing to preserve existing views and the use of  
22 white split rail fencing in the multi-purpose community trail along Hansen  
23 and Wolfskill Avenues and Poppy Road. While this mitigation measure  
24 would reduce impacts in the southwest vicinity of the Project site, overall  
25 Alternative 7 would adversely impact the existing visual character and quality  
26 of the site and surroundings as a result of the visual character of the Project  
27 site being changed from rural and agricultural to a mixed-use urban village.  
28

1 Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable, as with the  
2 proposed Project. (EIR, p. 7.0-26.)

3 2. Mitigation:

- 4 a. Project – The Project will implement mitigation measures MM Aesthetics 1  
5 (screening of permanent water tanks), MM Aesthetics 2 (landscaping to  
6 address foreground views from the Ramona Expressway), MM Aesthetics 3  
7 (landscaping within the Hansen Avenue Area and along trails), and MM  
8 Aesthetics 4 (grading along Wolfskill Avenue and Poppy Road) to reduce  
9 impacts with regard to degrading the existing visual character of the site and  
10 its surroundings. However, because short of a “No Project” alternative, any  
11 development of this agricultural and rural area would change the visual  
12 character and quality of the Site, resulting in a significant and unavoidable  
13 impact. As such, because the proposed Project will change the visual  
14 character of the Project site from rural and agricultural to a mixed-use urban  
15 village, these impacts cannot be fully mitigated below a level of significance.
- 16 b. Alternative 7 – Similar to the Project, Alternative 7 will implement mitigation  
17 measures MM Aesthetics 1 (screening of permanent water tanks), MM  
18 Aesthetics 2-Alt 7 (landscaping to address foreground views from the  
19 Ramona Expressway), MM Aesthetics 3 (landscaping within the Hansen  
20 Avenue Area and along trails), and MM Aesthetics 4 (grading along  
21 Wolfskill Avenue and Poppy Road) to reduce impacts with regard to  
22 degrading the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings.  
23 However, similar to the Project, because short of a “No Project” alternative,  
24 any development of this agricultural and rural area under Alternative 7 would  
25 change the visual character and quality of the site, resulting in a significant  
26 and unavoidable impact. As such, because Alternative 7 will change the  
27 visual character of the site from rural and agricultural to a mixed-use urban  
28

1 village, similar to the Project, these impacts cannot be fully mitigated below  
2 a level of significance.

3 **B. Agricultural Resources.**

4 *Impact: Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.*

5 *Threshold A: Project construction and implementation would convert Prime Farmland,*  
6 *Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps*  
7 *prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California*  
8 *Department of Conservation, to non-agricultural use.*

9 1. Project Impact(s):

- 10 a. Project – Development of the proposed Project will convert approximately  
11 915 acres of prime farmland, 316 acres of farmland of statewide importance,  
12 and 34 acres of unique farmland to non-agricultural use. The Project will  
13 result in the conversion of FMMP-mapped farmland, and the impacts  
14 associated with this conversion are considered significant. (EIR, pp.5.2-8-  
15 5.2-9.)
- 16 b. Alternative 7 – Development of Alternative 7 will convert approximately 827  
17 acres of prime farmland, 305 acres of farmland of statewide importance, and  
18 19 acres of unique farmland to non-agricultural use. Alternative 7 proposes  
19 the conversion of fewer acres of Farmland than the proposed Project, impacts  
20 associated with this conversion are still considered significant since  
21 Alternative 7 will still impact 1,343 acres. (EIR, pp.7.0-28: 7.0-174.)

22 2. Mitigation:

- 23 a. Project – Although the Project will preserve approximately 75 acres of prime,  
24 statewide important, and unique farmland and implement mitigation measure  
25 MM Ag 1, which requires conservation easements on 100 acres of  
26 agricultural land within 5 miles of the Project or within the Project  
27 boundaries, the proposed impacts to the loss of Farmland cannot be fully  
28

1 mitigated below a level of significance for this issue area and impacts would  
2 remain significant and unavoidable. (EIR, pp.5.2-8-5.2-9, 5.2-18.)

3 Potential mitigation measures that might reduce impacts resulting from the  
4 conversion of Farmland to less than significant levels include: (1) purchasing  
5 an agricultural easement to preserve existing FMMP-mapped farmland; (2)  
6 placing a Williamson Act contract on existing agricultural land; (3)  
7 purchasing offsite land for agricultural use; or (4) a mitigation fee or other in-  
8 lieu payment to the County or an agricultural land bank. However, these types  
9 of mitigation measures are infeasible due to the economic and land use  
10 conditions in western Riverside County, which has historically experienced,  
11 and is projected to continue to be influenced by, significant population and  
12 employment growth. Under these circumstances, land values will continue to  
13 rise above the levels that can be generated by agricultural activity, and  
14 agricultural landowners are not willing to encumber their properties with an  
15 agricultural easement or a Williamson Act contract funded by a Project  
16 applicant or through mitigation bank proceeds collected by the County or  
17 another entity. The fact that the economics of agriculture in other locations  
18 in California make the use of conservation easements and development  
19 limitations to protect or partially mitigate for impacts to agriculture, does not  
20 mean these mechanisms or programs are economically feasible in Riverside  
21 County. (EIR, pp. 5.2-13-5.2-17.)

- 22 b. Alternative 7 – Although the Alternative 7 will preserve approximately 214  
23 acres of prime, statewide important, and unique farmland and implement  
24 mitigation measure MM Ag 1, which requires conservation easements on 100  
25 acres of agricultural land within 5 miles of the Alternative 7 or within the  
26 Alternative 7 boundaries, the proposed impacts to the loss of Farmland cannot  
27  
28

1 be fully mitigated below a level of significance for this issue area and impacts  
2 will remain significant and unavoidable. (EIR, pp.7.0-27–7.0-34.)

3 Potential mitigation measures that might reduce impacts resulting from the  
4 conversion of Farmland to less than significant levels include: (1) purchasing  
5 an agricultural easement to preserve existing FMMP-mapped farmland; (2)  
6 placing a Williamson Act contract on existing agricultural land; (3)  
7 purchasing offsite land for agricultural use; or (4) a mitigation fee or other in-  
8 lieu payment to the County or an agricultural land bank. However, these types  
9 of mitigation measures are infeasible due to the economic and land use  
10 conditions in western Riverside County, which has historically experienced,  
11 and is projected to continue to be influenced by, significant population and  
12 employment growth. Under these circumstances, land values will continue to  
13 rise above the levels that can be generated by agricultural activity, and  
14 agricultural landowners are not willing to encumber their properties with an  
15 agricultural easement or a Williamson Act contract funded by a project  
16 applicant or through mitigation bank proceeds collected by the County or  
17 another entity. The fact that the economics of agriculture in other locations  
18 in California make the use of conservation easements and development  
19 limitations to protect or partially mitigate for impacts to agriculture, does not  
20 mean these mechanisms or programs are economically feasible in Riverside  
21 County. (EIR, pp.7.0-28–7.0-34.)

22 *Impact: Williamson Act contract or Riverside County Agricultural Preserve.*

23 *Threshold B: Project construction and implementation would conflict with existing*  
24 *agricultural use, or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or within a Riverside*  
25 *County Agricultural Preserve.*

26 1. Project Impact(s):  
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 – Much of the land that would be developed under the Specific Plan is currently farmed. Project development would displace and conflict with these existing agricultural uses, and the associated impacts are considered to be significant. mitigation measure MM Ag-1 will reduce the extent of Project impacts related to conflicts with existing agricultural use, but these impacts cannot be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels. Because there are no Williamson Act contracts or other agricultural preserve contracts within the Project site, implementation of the proposed Project will not directly conflict with said contracts. Although Project implementation will not directly impact Williamson Act contracted land, the Project will introduce new urban uses in the form of high and medium high density residential, and park uses adjacent to the western boundary of the Lakeview 5 agricultural preserve. Even though the General Plan includes policies and programs to address conflicts between urban and agricultural uses, because it is impossible to assess the effectiveness of these policies, the Project would result in a significant indirect impact to land subject to a Williamson Act contract. (EIR, p. 5.2-9.)

b. Alternative 7 – As with the Project, development of Alternative 7 would not directly conflict with an active Williamson Act contract or a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve because there are no Williamson Act contracted lands or agricultural preserves on the Alternative 7 site, and thus, no direct impact would result. Because Alternative 7 proposes a road and agricultural uses adjacent to the western boundary of the Williamson Act contracted property in the Lakeview 5 agricultural preserve north of Ramona Expressway, indirect impacts with regard to conflicts with Williamson Act contracts and agricultural preserves would be less than significant (whereas

1 the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts under this  
2 threshold). (EIR, p. 7.0-32.)

3 2. Mitigation:

- 4 a. Project – The Project will implement mitigation measures MM Ag 1, which  
5 requires conservation easements on 100 acres of agricultural land within 5  
6 miles or within the site boundaries. Even though the General Plan includes  
7 policies and programs to address conflicts between urban and agricultural  
8 uses, because it is impossible to assess the effectiveness of these policies, the  
9 Project would still result in a significant indirect impact to land subject to a  
10 Williamson Act contract. (EIR, p. 5.2-9.) Potential mitigation measures that  
11 might reduce impacts resulting from the conversion of Farmland to less than  
12 significant levels include: (1) purchasing an agricultural easement to preserve  
13 existing FMMP-mapped farmland; (2) placing a Williamson Act contract on  
14 existing agricultural land; (3) purchasing offsite land for agricultural use; or  
15 (4) a mitigation fee or other in-lieu payment to the County or an agricultural  
16 land bank. However, these types of mitigation measures are infeasible due to  
17 the economic and land use conditions in western Riverside County, which  
18 has historically experienced, and is projected to continue to be influenced by,  
19 significant population and employment growth. Under these circumstances,  
20 land values will continue to rise above the levels that can be generated by  
21 agricultural activity, and agricultural landowners are not willing to encumber  
22 their properties with an agricultural easement or a Williamson Act contract  
23 funded by a Project applicant or through mitigation bank proceeds collected  
24 by the County or another entity. The fact that the economics of agriculture  
25 in other locations in California make the use of conservation easements and  
26 development limitations to protect or partially mitigate for impacts to  
27  
28



1 agriculture, does not mean these mechanisms or programs are economically  
2 feasible in Riverside County. (EIR, pp. 5.2-13–5.2-17.)

- 3 b. Alternative 7 –Alternative 7 will implement mitigation measure MM Ag 1,  
4 which requires conservation easements on 100 acres of agricultural land  
5 within 5 miles or within the site boundaries and direct and indirect impacts  
6 with regard to conflicts with Williamson Act contracts and agricultural  
7 preserves would be less than significant (whereas the Project would result in  
8 significant and unavoidable impacts under this threshold). (EIR, p. 7.0-32.)

9 ***Impact: Conversion of Farmland.***

10 ***Threshold D: Project construction and implementation would involve other changes in the***  
11 ***existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of***  
12 ***Farmland to non-agricultural use, including Farmland of Local Importance.***

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

- 14 a. Project – Approximately 216 acres of farmland of local importance are  
15 identified within the Specific Plan area on the 2012 FMMP maps. Project  
16 development would convert 165 acres of farmland of local importance to  
17 non-agricultural use, and the associated impacts are considered to be  
18 significant. Mitigation measure MM Ag-1 will reduce the extent of Project  
19 impacts to farmland of local importance, but these impacts cannot be feasibly  
20 mitigated to less than significant levels. (EIR, p. 5.2-11.)

21 The Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) certified a final  
22 environmental impact report (FEIR) for, and adopted, the Lakeview/Nuevo  
23 Area Master Plan for Water, Sewer, and Recycled Water (Master Plan). The  
24 Project would marginally contribute towards the full implementation of the  
25 Master Plan and to the related growth that could convert farmland in region  
26 to other uses. As a result, as discussed in EIR Section 6, Cumulative Impacts  
27 in more detail, the Project would contribute towards a significant and  
28

1 unavoidable impact to regional farmland related to the buildout of the Master  
2 Plan. Mitigation measure MM Ag 1 will reduce the extent of Project impacts  
3 to agriculture related to the Master Plan, but these impacts cannot be feasibly  
4 mitigated to less than significant levels. (EIR, p. 5.2-12.)

5 The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), in April 2015,  
6 approved the Mid County Parkway project, which will expand the existing  
7 Ramona Expressway in and near the Project site. The certified EIR and  
8 federal environmental impact statement (EIS) found that the MCP will have  
9 a significant and unavoidable impact related to agricultural land conversion  
10 along the expanded roadway. Design of the Mid County Parkway is  
11 anticipated to begin in December 2016, and as such, the MCP will be  
12 implemented irrespective of whether this Specific Plan Project is approved  
13 by the County. Accordingly, the Project will not significantly contribute  
14 towards the agricultural impacts identified in the MCP EIR/EIS. (EIR, p. 5.2-  
15 12.)

- 16 b. Alternative 7 – Approximately 225 acres of farmland of local importance are  
17 identified within THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan, Alternative 7  
18 area on the 2012 FMMP maps. Development of Alternative 7 would convert  
19 192 acres of farmland of local importance to non-agricultural use, and the  
20 associated impacts are considered to be significant. Mitigation measure MM  
21 Ag-1 will reduce the extent of Alternative 7's impacts to farmland of local  
22 importance. Although Alternative 7 proposes to convert fewer acres of  
23 Farmland than the proposed Project, impacts associated with this conversion  
24 are still considered significant since Alternative 7 will still impact 1,343 acres  
25 of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland,  
26 and Farmland of Local Importance. (EIR, p. 7.0-28.)

1                   2.     Mitigation:

2                   a.     Project – Although the Project will preserve approximately 75 acres of prime,  
3                   statewide important, and unique farmland and implement mitigation measure  
4                   MM Ag 1, which requires conservation easements on 100 acres of  
5                   agricultural land within 5 miles of the Project or within the Project  
6                   boundaries, the proposed impacts to the loss of Farmland cannot be fully  
7                   mitigated below a level of significance for this issue area. Mitigation measure  
8                   MM Ag 1 requires a perpetual conservation easement for a minimum of 100  
9                   acres of “agricultural land” as defined by Public Resources Code Section  
10                  10123 within five miles of the Project or within the Project boundaries.  
11                  Implementation of this mitigation measure will lessen the Project impact on  
12                  farmland but not reduce the impact to less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.2-11,  
13                  5.2-18.)

14                  Potential mitigation measures that might reduce impacts resulting from the  
15                  conversion of Farmland to less than significant levels include: (1) purchasing  
16                  an agricultural easement to preserve existing FMMP-mapped farmland; (2)  
17                  placing a Williamson Act contract on existing agricultural land; (3)  
18                  purchasing offsite land for agricultural use; or (4) a mitigation fee or other in-  
19                  lieu payment to the County or an agricultural land bank. However, these types  
20                  of mitigation measures are infeasible due to the economic and land use  
21                  conditions in western Riverside County, which has historically experienced,  
22                  and is projected to continue to be influenced by, significant population and  
23                  employment growth. Under these circumstances, land values will continue to  
24                  rise above the levels that can be generated by agricultural activity, and  
25                  agricultural landowners are not willing to encumber their properties with an  
26                  agricultural easement or a Williamson Act contract funded by a Project  
27                  applicant or through mitigation bank proceeds collected by the County or  
28

1 another entity. Since the certification of the General Plan EIR in 2003, the  
2 County has consistently determined that a mitigation fee payment,  
3 agricultural land banking program, and other measures that would restrict  
4 development on agricultural properties are economically infeasible in  
5 Riverside County. (EIR, pp. 5.2-13–5.2-17.)

- 6 b. Alternative 7 – As with the proposed Project, Alternative 7 would implement  
7 mitigation measure MM Ag 1. Mitigation measure MM Ag 1 would require  
8 conservation easements on 100 acres of agricultural land within 5 miles of  
9 the site or within the Project boundaries so as to reduce the extent of impacts  
10 related to agricultural land conversion, but these impacts cannot be feasibly  
11 mitigated to less than significant levels. Therefore, impacts with regards to  
12 the conversion of designated Farmland are still considered significant and  
13 unavoidable under Alternative 7 as under the proposed Project. (EIR, p. 7.0-  
14 32.)

15 C. **Air Quality.**

16 *Impact: Applicable Air Quality Plan(s).*

17 *Threshold A: Project construction and implementation would conflict with or obstruct*  
18 *implementation of applicable air quality plan.*

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

- 20 a. Project – The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Air  
21 Basin (SCAB) sets forth a comprehensive program that will lead the SCAB  
22 into compliance with all federal and state air quality standards. Conformance  
23 with the AQMP for development projects is determined by demonstrating  
24 compliance with local land use plans and/or population projections and  
25 meeting the land use designation set forth in the local General Plan. Under  
26 the General Plan, the Project area is zoned for agricultural and residential  
27 (mostly low and medium density). The proposed Project involves the  
28

1 development of both residential (mostly medium and high to very high  
2 density) and commercial properties, which is not consistent with the land use  
3 envisioned in the Riverside County General Plan. Additionally, the Project  
4 proposes an increase of 10,039 total dwelling units within the Project  
5 boundary compared to the planned land uses. Therefore, the proposed  
6 Project's land use and population was not accounted for in the AQMP and  
7 thus may conflict with AQMP implementation. These impacts are considered  
8 significant and unavoidable. (EIR, p. 5.3-35.)

9 b. Alternative 7 – Like the proposed Project, Alternative 7 involves the  
10 development of both residential (mostly medium and high density) and  
11 commercial properties, which is not consistent with the land use envisioned  
12 in the Riverside County General Plan. Additionally, the Alternative 7  
13 proposes an increase of 7,414 total dwelling units within Alternative 7's  
14 boundary compared to the General Plan planned land uses. (EIR, pp. 5.9-26;  
15 7.0-15)Therefore, similar to the Project, Alternative 7's proposed land use  
16 and population was not accounted for in the AQMP and thus may conflict  
17 with AQMP implementation, although to a lesser degree than the Project  
18 because Alternative 7 includes less development than the Project.  
19 Accordingly, these impacts for Alternative 7 are considered significant and  
20 unavoidable, as with the proposed Project (EIR p. 7.0-174).

21 2. Mitigation:

22 a. Project – The proposed Project's land use and population was not accounted  
23 for in the AQMP and thus conflicts with the AQMP. Under the General Plan,  
24 the Project area is zoned for agricultural and residential (mostly low and  
25 medium density). The proposed Project involves the development of both  
26 residential (mostly medium and high to very high density) and commercial  
27 properties. The County cannot amend the AQMP. Therefore, impacts are  
28

1 considered significant and unavoidable.

- 2 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's land use and population were not accounted  
3 for in the AQMP and thus conflicts with the AQMP. Under the General Plan,  
4 the Alternative 7 area is zoned for agricultural and residential (mostly low  
5 and medium density). Alternative 7 involves the development of both  
6 residential (mostly medium and high density) and commercial properties. The  
7 County cannot amend the AQMP. Therefore, no feasible mitigation exists  
8 and impacts are considered significant and unavoidable. (EIR, p. 5.3-35; 5.9-  
9 26; 7.0-15; 7.0-174.)

10 ***Impact: Air Quality Standard Violations.***

11 ***Threshold B: Project construction and implementation would violate any ambient air***  
12 ***quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.***

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

- 14 a. **Project – Short Term Construction Impacts.** Project construction will  
15 generate short-term criteria pollutant emissions from material movement,  
16 building demolition, vehicles trips by workers, vendors, and haul vehicles,  
17 and off-road equipment. Emissions generated during Project construction  
18 would exceed the SCAQMD mass daily significance thresholds for VOC,  
19 NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and PM-2.5. (EIR, pp. 5.3-36–5.3-37.) This represents a  
20 potentially significant and unavoidable impact. Air quality impacts from  
21 construction will not exceed SCAQMD ambient air quality significance  
22 thresholds. (EIR, p. 5.3-43.)

23 **Project – Long-Term Operational Impact(s).** Long term operational emissions occur  
24 after construction and include area sources (i.e., hearths, stationary  
25 combustion emissions of natural gas used for space and water heating, yard  
26 and landscape maintenance, and consumer use of solvents and personal care  
27 products), energy usage (i.e. electricity and natural gas), and mobile sources  
28

1 (i.e., on-road vehicle use by residents, workers, customers, and delivery  
2 vehicles visiting the Project site). The estimated operational emissions show  
3 that the regional operational maximum daily emissions for the Project will  
4 exceed the SCAQMD mass daily significance thresholds for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO,  
5 PM-10 and PM-2.5. The primary source of the operational emissions is traffic  
6 mobile sources. The emissions from traffic mobile sources are expected to  
7 gradually decline in the future as cars become more fuel efficient due to  
8 existing regulations (i.e., Pavley Standard and the Advanced Clean Cars  
9 program). This analysis does not quantify emissions reduction from the  
10 Pavley Standard or the Advanced Clean Cars program. The Project has also  
11 incorporated TDM programs to help reduce trip generation, which will in turn  
12 reduce traffic-related mobile sources of air pollutant emissions. The mixed-  
13 use design of the Project will also help reduce total VMT, and in turn air  
14 pollutant emissions, by shortening potential trips. The VOC emissions are  
15 also due to the consumer products that are expected to be used by residents  
16 in the Project, which the Project cannot control. This represents a potentially  
17 significant and unavoidable impact. (EIR, pp. 5.3-37–5.3-39.) The Project  
18 does not contain any uses that would require a localized analysis from  
19 operations. Additionally, the proposed Project will not form any CO hot spots  
20 in the Project area. (EIR, pp. 5.3-43-5.3-45.)

- 21 b. Alternative 7 – Short Term Construction Impacts. As with the Project,  
22 construction of Alternative 7 will generate short-term criteria pollutant  
23 emissions from construction. Emissions generated during Alternative 7  
24 construction are similar to the proposed Project and would exceed the same  
25 SCAQMD mass daily significance thresholds (VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO), except  
26 for PM-2.5 if the wastewater treatment plant is constructed. (EIR, pp. 7.0-  
27 35–7.0-36.) Therefore the construction impacts are less than the Project but  
28

1 still significant and unavoidable. Like the Project, Alternative 7 does not  
2 result in localized impacts to sensitive receptors. In addition, Alternative 7  
3 would not create any CO hot spots because the amount of traffic on local  
4 roadways will still be lower than the values studied by SCAQMD in the  
5 AQMP and therefore has the same impacts as the proposed Project. (EIR, p.  
6 7.0-35.)

7 Alternative 7 – Long-Term Operational Impact(s). Alternative 7 will result  
8 in the same type of long term operational emissions as the Project. Like the  
9 Project, the estimated operational emissions show that the regional  
10 operational maximum daily emissions for Alternative 7 are less than the  
11 SCAQMD mass daily significance thresholds for SO<sub>2</sub>, and greater than the  
12 SCAQMD mass daily significance thresholds for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM-10  
13 and PM-2.5. While the emissions still exceed mass daily threshold for the  
14 same criteria pollutants, the quantity of emissions is less than the Project. The  
15 primary source of the operational emissions is the traffic-related mobile  
16 sources. The emissions from traffic-related mobile sources are expected to  
17 gradually decline in the future as cars become more fuel efficient due to  
18 existing regulations (i.e., Pavley Standard and the Advanced Clean Cars  
19 program). This analysis does not quantify emissions reduction from the  
20 Pavley Standard or the Advanced Clean Cars program. Alternative 7 has also  
21 incorporated TDM programs to help reduce trip generation, which will in turn  
22 reduce traffic-related mobile sources of air pollutant emissions. The mixed-  
23 use design of Alternative 7 will also help reduce total VMT, and in turn air  
24 pollutant emissions, by shortening potential trips. The VOC emissions are  
25 also due to the consumer products that are expected to be used by residents  
26 in Alternative 7, which cannot be controlled. Although the criteria pollutant  
27 emissions from Alternative 7 exceed daily thresholds for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO,  
28



1 PM-10, and PM-2.5, they do so to a slightly lesser degree than the proposed  
2 Project. These emissions include reductions from the existing McAnally  
3 chicken ranch and Nutrilite facility emissions are subtracted from the  
4 emissions generated from Alternative 7, but will not reduce emissions below  
5 SCAQMD thresholds and remain significant and unavoidable. (EIR, pp. 7.0-  
6 36-7.0-37.) The Project does not contain any uses that would require a  
7 localized analysis from operations. Additionally, Alternative 7 will not form  
8 any CO hot spots in the area. (EIR, p. 7.0-35.)

9 2. Mitigation:

- 10 a. Project – The Project will violate an air quality standard or contribute  
11 substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. In response to  
12 comments on the EIR, five new air quality and 33 new GHG mitigation  
13 measures were added to the EIR and will apply to the proposed Project.  
14 These represent all feasible mitigation of air quality impacts because no  
15 additional mitigation is technologically or economically feasible for the  
16 Project to provide, however, even with implementation of Project design  
17 features and mitigation measures MM AQ 1 through MM AQ 11 and MM  
18 GHG 1 through MM GHG 39, Project emissions will still exceed the  
19 SCAQMD mass daily significance thresholds during construction and  
20 operation, and the impacts will remain significant and unavoidable. (EIR, p.  
21 5.3-45.) (See EIR Appendix C, Air Quality Technical Report and EIR  
22 Appendix O, Greenhouse Gas Technical Report, dated May 2017,  
23 respectively.)
- 24 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7 will violate an air quality standard or contribute  
25 substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. In response to  
26 comments on the EIR, five new air quality and 33 new GHG mitigation  
27 measures were added to the EIR and will apply to Alternative 7. These  
28

1 represent all feasible mitigation of air quality impacts because no additional  
2 mitigation is technologically or economically feasible for Alternative 7.  
3 Regardless, even with implementation of design features and mitigation  
4 measures MM AQ 1 through MM AQ 4, MM AQ 5 – Alt 7, MM AQ 6 – Alt  
5 7, and MM GHG 1 through MM GHG 39, Alternative 7 emissions will still  
6 exceed the SCAQMD mass daily significance thresholds during construction  
7 and operation, and the impacts will remain significant and unavoidable. (EIR,  
8 p. 7.0-38.) (See EIR Appendix R, Air Quality Technical Report for  
9 Alternative 7 (May 2015) and Updated Analysis for Alternative 7 (June 2017)  
10 and EIR Appendix S, Greenhouse Gas Technical Report for Alternative 7  
11 (April 2016).)

12 ***Impact: Criteria Pollutants.***

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

17 1. **Project Impact:**

- 18 a. Project – SCAQMD considers the thresholds for Project-specific impacts and  
19 cumulative impacts to be the same. Therefore, projects that exceed project-  
20 specific significance thresholds are considered by SCAQMD to be  
21 cumulatively considerable. The SCAQMD mass daily significance  
22 thresholds for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and PM-2.5 are exceeded during construction.  
23 Thus, the Project would have a cumulatively considerable increase in  
24 emissions due to construction-related VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and PM-2.5. In terms  
25 of localized air quality impacts, construction of the Project would not have a  
26 cumulatively considerable impact due to criteria pollutant emissions. The  
27 Project's operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD's mass daily  
28

1 threshold for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM-2.5 and PM-10 emissions. Thus, the  
2 Project would have a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions due to  
3 operational-related VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM-2.5 and PM-10 emissions. (EIR, p.  
4 5.3-45.)

- 5 b. Alternative 7 –The SCAQMD mass daily significance thresholds for VOC,  
6 NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO are exceeded during construction. Thus, Alternative 7 would  
7 have a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions due to construction-  
8 related VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM-2.5. In terms of localized air quality impacts,  
9 construction of Alternative 7 would not have a cumulatively considerable  
10 impact due to criteria pollutant emissions. Alternative 7's operational  
11 emissions would exceed the SCAQMD's mass daily threshold for VOC,  
12 NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM-2.5 and PM-10 emissions. Thus, Alternative 7 would have a  
13 cumulatively considerable increase in emissions due to operational-related  
14 VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM-2.5 and PM-10 emissions. (EIR, p. 7.0-37; EIR  
15 Appendix R, Air Quality Technical Report for Alternative 7 (May 2015), pp.  
16 74-75; and Updated Analysis for Alternative 7 (June 2017), pp. 3-4.)

17 2. Mitigation:

- 18 a. Project – In response to comments on the EIR, five new air quality and 33  
19 new GHG mitigation measures were added to the EIR and will apply to the  
20 proposed Project. These represent all feasible mitigation of air quality  
21 impacts as no other technologically or economically feasible measures can  
22 be imposed, however, even with implementation of Project design features  
23 and mitigation measures MM AQ 1 through MM AQ 11 and MM GHG 1  
24 through GHG 39, Project emissions will still exceed the SCAQMD mass  
25 daily significance thresholds during construction and operation. Thus, the  
26 Project would result in a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions  
27 during construction and operation. (EIR, pp. 5.3-54-5.3-56.)  
28

1                   b.       Alternative 7 – In response to comments on the EIR, five new air quality and  
2                                   33 new GHG mitigation measures were added to the EIR and will apply to  
3                                   Alternative 7. These represent all feasible mitigation of air quality impacts  
4                                   as no other technologically or economically feasible measures can be  
5                                   imposed, however, even with implementation of Project design features and  
6                                   mitigation measures MM AQ 1 through MM AQ 4, MM AQ 5 – Alt 7, MM  
7                                   AQ 6 – Alt 7 and MM GHG 1 through MM GHG 39, Alternative 7 emissions  
8                                   will still exceed the SCAQMD mass daily significance thresholds during  
9                                   construction and operation. Thus, Alternative 7 would result in a  
10                                  cumulatively considerable increase in emissions during construction and  
11                                  operation and impacts remain significant and unavoidable. (EIR, pp. 7.0-35–  
12                                  7.0-38.)

13       **D.       Cultural Resources.**

14       *Impact: Alter or Destroy an Archaeological Site.*

15       *Threshold B: Project Construction and implementation would alter or destroy an*  
16       *archaeological site and/or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an*  
17       *archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5.*

18       1.       Project Impact(s):

19                   a.       Project – There are 19 prehistoric sites recorded within the Project area: CA-  
20                                   RIV-394, CA-RIV-397, CA-RIV-806, CA-RIV-1842, CA-RIV-2585, CA-  
21                                   RIV-4155, CA-RIV-4156/H, CA-RIV-4158, CA-RIV-8698, CA-RIV-8699,  
22                                   CA-RIV-8700, CA-RIV-8702, CA-RIV-8703, CA-RIV-8704, CA-RIV-  
23                                   8705, CA-RIV-8706, CA-RIV-8707, CA-RIV-8711, and CA-RIV-8712 and  
24                                   one historical-period site CA-RIV-8710H. Implementation of the Project will  
25                                   result in direct and indirect impacts to these sites. Implementation of the  
26                                   Project will potentially result in direct adverse impacts to 7 entire prehistoric  
27                                   archaeological sites and direct adverse impacts to 11.7 acres, or 15 percent,  
28

1 of another prehistoric archaeological site. While the Project will not directly  
2 impact 11 prehistoric archaeological sites, with the introduction of  
3 approximately 36,434 people to the Project area, these indirect impacts could  
4 result in substantial adverse change in the significance of the resources over  
5 time, and as such, these potential indirect impacts are considered significant  
6 without mitigation. Implementation of mitigation measures MM Cultural 1e  
7 through 1n and MM Cultural 2 will reduce the Project's impact to on-site  
8 archaeological resources to a level that is less than significant with mitigation  
9 for all but three of the affected prehistoric resources. For sites CA-RIV-806,  
10 CA-RIV-397, and CA-RIV-8712 (Loci A and B), impacts cannot be fully  
11 mitigated and significant indirect adverse impacts will remain even after  
12 implementation of the CRMP, which is required in mitigation measures MM  
13 Cultural 1. For site CA-RIV-806, even with implementation of recommended  
14 mitigation measures, Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI) has determined that  
15 indirect impacts to the rockshelter at this site will result in a change to the  
16 integrity of the setting, feeling, and association, and also due to potential for  
17 possible vandalism and illicit artifact collection, impacts to CA-RIV-806  
18 cannot be fully mitigated and will remain a significant adverse impact even  
19 after implementation of the CRMP. For site CA-RIV-397, even with  
20 implementation of recommended mitigation measures, SRI has determined  
21 that indirect impacts to the rock art features at the site will result in a change  
22 to the integrity of the setting, feeling, and association, and also due to the  
23 potential for possible vandalism and illicit artifact collection, impacts to CA-  
24 RIV-397 cannot be fully mitigated and will remain a significant adverse  
25 impact even after implementation of the CRMP. For site CA-RIV-8712 (Loci  
26 A and B), even with implementation of recommended mitigation measures,  
27 SRI has determined that indirect impacts to the rock art features at the site  
28

1 will result in a change to the integrity of the setting, feeling, and association,  
2 and also due to the potential for possible vandalism and illicit artifact  
3 collection, impacts to CA-RIV-8712 (Loci A and B) cannot be fully mitigated  
4 and will remain a significant adverse impact even after implementation of the  
5 CRMP.(EIR, pp. 5.5-30-5.5-46.)

6 The off-site improvement area does not contain any archaeological resources  
7 that are eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR. Therefore, construction  
8 in the off-site improvement area would not result in any direct or indirect  
9 impacts to known archaeological resources and no mitigation is required for  
10 such impacts. However, prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources  
11 could be discovered in off-site improvement areas. Therefore, development  
12 within the off-site improvement area may result in the discovery of, and  
13 potential impacts to, a previously unknown archaeological resource.  
14 Development within the off-site improvement area may result in the  
15 discovery of, and potential impacts to, a previously unknown archaeological  
16 resource or Native American resource. Damage to significant archaeological  
17 or Native American resources would be a significant adverse impact. With  
18 implementation of mitigation measure MM Cultural 2, impacts to potential  
19 archaeological resources and Native American resources in the off-site  
20 improvement area will be less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.5-47.)

- 21 b. Alternative 7 –Alternative 7 would result in a significant and unavoidable  
22 indirect impact to the same three prehistoric archaeological sites and require  
23 the same mitigation measures as the Project except for sites CA-RIV-1842,  
24 CARIV-4156/H, CA-RIV-8698, CA-RIV-8702, CA-RIV-8706, and CA-  
25 RIV-8712. (EIR, p. 7.0-47.)

26 Under Alternative 7, Site CA-RIV-1842 would partially be preserved in place  
27 with an SPP prepared by the developer prior to ground-disturbing activities  
28

1 at the site, including provisions to safeguard the site from potential indirect  
2 impacts associated with activities within the fuel modification zone, and the  
3 remaining portion would require a DRP to be prepared to mitigate direct  
4 adverse impacts. (EIR, p. 7.0-45.)

5 Under Alternative 7, Sites CA-RIV-4156/H, CA-RIV-8698, and CA-RIV-  
6 8702 are located in Conservation Habitat planning areas, but may be subject  
7 to indirect adverse impacts due to recreational use of the nearby paseo,  
8 construction in the vicinity, increased human activity near the site with the  
9 potential for vandalism, inadvertent harm, increased domestic animal  
10 activity, and possible fuel modification activities adjacent to the site. Thus,  
11 the site would be preserved in place with an SPP prepared by the developer  
12 including provisions to safeguard the site from potential indirect impacts.  
13 (EIR, p. 7.0-45.)

14 Under Alternative 7, Site CA-RIV-8706 is located in a Recreation planning  
15 area, but may be subject to indirect adverse impacts due to recreational use  
16 of nearby trails, constructions in the vicinity, increased human activity near  
17 the site with potential for vandalism, inadvertent harm, increased domestic  
18 animal activity and possible fuel modification activities adjacent to the site.  
19 Thus, the site would be preserved in place with an SPP prepared by the  
20 developer including provisions to safeguard the site from potential indirect  
21 impacts. (EIR, p. 7.0-45.)

22 Under Alternative 7, 6.68 acres of CA-RIV-8712 would be located in a  
23 Medium High Density Residential planning area, and will be subject to direct  
24 adverse impacts, thus, a DRP would be prepared to mitigate this impact; and  
25 51 acres would be preserved in place in a Conservation Habitat planning area,  
26 and an SPP would be prepared to mitigate indirect adverse impacts by  
27 including provisions to safeguard this portion of the site. The remainder of  
28

1 site CA-RIV-8712 (19.54 acres) would not be subject to direct or indirect  
2 impacts associated with Alternative 7 due to either being already impacted  
3 by CRA and IFP within the Water-Aqueduct planning area or located outside  
4 the Alternative 7 boundary. (EIR, p. 7.0-45–7.0-46.)

5 2. Mitigation:

- 6 a. Project – Potential direct and indirect adverse impacts to historical-period site  
7 CA-RIV-8710H and all the identified prehistoric sites, including: CA-RIV-  
8 394, CA-RIV-1842, CA-RIV-2582, CA-RIV-4155, CA-RIV-4156/H, CA  
9 RIV 4158, CA-RIV-8699, CA-RIV-8700, CA-RIV-8702, CA-RIV-8703,  
10 CA-RIV-8704, CA-RIV-8705, CA RIV 8706, CA-RIV-8707, and CA-RIV-  
11 8711 will be mitigated to less than significant through implementation of  
12 mitigation measures MM Cultural 1e through 1n and MM Cultural 2 except  
13 for three prehistoric sites: CA-RIV-397, CA RIV 806, and portions of CA-  
14 RIV-8712. Mitigation measure MM Cultural 1 requires preparation of an  
15 addenda to the Master Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP)  
16 contained in Chapter 9 of the *Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation of*  
17 *The Villages of Lakeview Specific Plan* included in EIR Appendix E. Each  
18 addendum prepared in compliance with mitigation measure MM Cultural 1  
19 shall include Site Preservation Plans (SPPs) for site to be preserved in place  
20 and Data Recovery Plans (DRPs) for sites that cannot be avoided and require  
21 archaeological excavation as provided by CEQA Guidelines Section  
22 15126.4(b)(3). Paragraphs “e” through “n” of mitigation measure MM  
23 Cultural 1 identifies the specific requirements with regard site preservation  
24 and data recovery. (EIR, pp. 5.5-46, 5.5-50-5.5-55.)

25 Site CA-RIV-397. Site CA-RIV-397 will be preserved in place by planning  
26 construction to avoid the site, and incorporating the site into an Open Space  
27 Planning Area deeded to and managed through a conservation easement or  
28



1 other deed restriction. With respect to other means to accomplish  
2 preservation in place, covering the site with a layer of soil before building  
3 certain facilities is not feasible because the site includes an above-ground  
4 rockshelter with rock art (although the midden deposit may be below the  
5 surface enough to allow coverage), and no such facilities are proposed in the  
6 vicinity of the site because it will be located in an Open Space planning area.  
7 However, the area to be avoided would nevertheless be subject to indirect  
8 impacts from construction in the vicinity, increased human activity near the  
9 site with the potential for vandalism, illicit artifact collection, inadvertent  
10 harm, increased domestic animal activity, and changes in the integrity of  
11 setting, feeling, and association resulting from the proximity of the residential  
12 use. It is also possible that portions of the site could be indirectly affected by  
13 the Urban/Wildlife Edge Trail and activities within the fuel modification zone  
14 adjacent to the site, if such activities are conducted without cultural resource  
15 protections in place. Thus, potential unavoidable indirect impacts may occur.  
16 Therefore, mitigation measures MM Cultural 1f and MM Cultural 2 will be  
17 implemented to reduce impacts. The mitigation measures may have potential  
18 impacts. The graffiti removal may have impacts from scraping the surface of  
19 the rock features. Capping the deposits may cause damage to the deposits.  
20 Fencing and possible signage may cause impacts by disturbing the ground to  
21 construct the fence around the site, detracting from the natural setting of the  
22 site, increasing the potential for debris on the site from fencing and signage  
23 fragments, and increasing awareness by the public of the location and nature  
24 of the site. However, preservation in place pursuant to MM Cultural 1f and  
25 MM Cultural 2 are still the preferred option for this site, rather than data  
26 recovery. Even with implementation of recommended mitigation measures,  
27 SRI has determined that indirect impacts to the rock art features at the site  
28

1 will result in a change to the integrity of the setting, feeling, and association,  
2 and also due to the potential for possible vandalism and illicit artifact  
3 collection, impacts to CA-RIV-397 cannot be fully mitigated and will remain  
4 a significant adverse impact even after implementation of the CRMP. (EIR,  
5 pp. 5.5-31-5.5-32.)

6 Site CA-RIV-806. Site CA-RIV-806's overall integrity is not expected to be  
7 compromised by the proximity of other land uses. As such, it is not subject  
8 to direct adverse impacts from Project development and the site will be  
9 preserved in place by planning construction to avoid the site, and  
10 incorporating the site into an Open Space Planning Area deeded to and  
11 managed through a conservation easement or other deed restriction. With  
12 respect to other means to accomplish preservation in place, covering the site  
13 with a layer of soil before building certain facilities is not feasible because  
14 the site includes an above-ground rockshelter. The site could be exposed to  
15 indirect impacts from possible vandalism or illicit artifact collection  
16 associated with increased use of the Project area. Thus, potential unavoidable  
17 indirect impacts may occur. Therefore, mitigation measure MM Cultural 1g  
18 will be implemented to reduce impacts. The recommended mitigation  
19 measure may have potential impacts. The public education program may  
20 increase human activity and vandalism in the area from an increased  
21 awareness of the site. Fencing and possible signage may cause its own  
22 impacts from disturbing the ground to construct the fence around the site,  
23 detracting from the natural setting of the site, increasing the potential for  
24 debris on the site from fencing and signage fragments, and increasing  
25 awareness by the public of the location and nature of the site. However,  
26 preservation in place pursuant to MM Cultural 1g is still the preferred option  
27 for this site, rather than data recovery. Even with implementation of  
28

1 recommended mitigation measures, SRI has determined that indirect impacts  
2 to the rockshelter at this site will result in a change to the integrity of the  
3 setting, feeling, and association, and also due to potential for possible  
4 vandalism and illicit artifact collection, impacts to CA-RIV-806 cannot be  
5 fully mitigated and will remain a significant adverse impact even after  
6 implementation of the CRMP. (EIR, p. 5.5-32.)

7 CA-RIV-8711. The portions of Site CA-RIV-8711 containing the rock art  
8 and milling features, and having the highest surface artifact density, are  
9 within an Open Space planning area the covers nearly 52 acres of the site  
10 area. The conceptual trails map indicates that existing trails are not located  
11 within the portion of site CA-RIV-8712 that will be preserved in the Open  
12 Space planning area, although there is an existing trail to the east of the site.  
13 The portions of the site within Open Space planning areas will not be subject  
14 to direct impacts from grading; therefore, this portion of the site is preserved  
15 in place by planning construction to avoid the site, incorporating the site into  
16 an Open Space planning area deeded to and managed through a conservation  
17 easement or other deed restriction. With respect to other means to accomplish  
18 preservation in place, covering the site with a layer of soil is not feasible  
19 because the site includes above-ground rock art and milling features.  
20 Although it will be preserved in place, this portion of the site could be  
21 affected by habitat restoration activities, construction in the vicinity, and by  
22 indirect impacts from increased human activity near the site with the potential  
23 for vandalism and artifact collection, inadvertent harm, and increased  
24 domestic animal activity, and changes in the integrity of setting, feeling, and  
25 association resulting from the proximity of the residential use.  
26 Approximately 13 acres (17 percent) of the site are located in the Public  
27 Facilities/Open Space-Aqueduct planning area. Adverse impacts to the  
28

1 portions of CA-RIV-8712 located within the Public Facilities/Open Space-  
2 Aqueduct planning area have already occurred due to previous construction  
3 of the Aqueduct and the IFP and have been mitigated to the extent feasible  
4 by data recovery conducted at CA-RIV-6069 for the IFP. A very small  
5 portion of the site (0.40 acres, 0.005 percent) is outside of the Project area.  
6 This area will not be subject to impacts from the Project. The remaining  
7 western and northeastern portions of the site, covering approximately 11.7  
8 acres, or 15 percent of site, will be subject to direct adverse impacts from  
9 grading for High Density Residential land uses. Preservation in place is not  
10 feasible because: (1) the construction activities cannot avoid the northern  
11 margins of the site that will be traversed by two road rights-of way; (2) the  
12 site cannot be incorporated into a park, greenspace, or other open space  
13 without losing the integrity of the site. The adjacent green space is a habitat  
14 corridor that goes under the freeway and is therefore limited in size. The  
15 green space is surrounded by areas planned for residential uses, which are  
16 intentionally located along the expressway to take advantage of proximity to  
17 the existing transportation corridor. Given the location of this resource, it is  
18 already impacted and isolated by the freeway. Preserving these portions of  
19 the site by surrounding them with a park, greenspace, or other open space  
20 will isolate the features from each other and their surroundings. Also, even if  
21 these portions of the site were in a park, greenspace, or other open space, due  
22 to the proximity to residential uses and the expressway, the features would be  
23 subject to potential indirect effects from increased human activity in the area;  
24 (3) covering the site with a layer of chemically stable soil before building  
25 tennis courts, parking lots, or similar facilities on the site is not feasible as  
26 these portions of the site will require cuts during grading; and (4), for the  
27 reasons discussed above, deeding the site into a permanent conservation  
28

1 easement is not feasible due to the site's location within a proposed road right-  
2 of-way. Therefore, data recovery through a DRP serves the interests protected  
3 by CEQA better than preservation in place. The DRP will allow analysis of  
4 this resource and will ensure that the collections and information gained  
5 through data recovery shall be curated in perpetuity. Following data recovery  
6 from the site areas subject to direct impact, the remaining approximately 52  
7 acres of the site preserved in Open Space planning areas will continue to have  
8 good integrity and the potential to yield information important to prehistory.  
9 Thus, potential unavoidable direct and indirect impacts may occur to certain  
10 portions of site CA-RIV-8712. Therefore, mitigation measures MM Cultural  
11 1n and MM Cultural 2 will be implemented to reduce impacts. The  
12 recommended mitigation measures may have potential impacts. With respect  
13 to the SPP, the flagging will be temporary but will draw attention to the site,  
14 increasing the possibility of vandalism or inadvertent harm. Fencing and  
15 possible signage may cause its own impacts from disturbing the ground to  
16 construct the fence around the site, detracting from the natural setting of the  
17 site, increasing the potential for debris on the site from fencing and signage  
18 fragments, and increasing awareness by the public of the location and nature  
19 of the site. However, preservation in place pursuant to MM Cultural 1n for  
20 the 51.9-acre portion of the site that will be covered by the SPP is still the  
21 preferred option for this site, rather than data recovery. Even with  
22 implementation of recommended mitigation measures, SRI has determined  
23 that indirect impacts to the rock art features at the site will result in a change  
24 to the integrity of the setting, feeling, and association, and also due to the  
25 potential for possible vandalism and illicit artifact collection, impacts to CA-  
26 RIV-8712 (Loci A and B) cannot be fully mitigated and will remain a  
27  
28

1 significant adverse impact even after implementation of the CRMP. (EIR,  
2 pp. 5.5-39-5.5-41.)

- 3 b. Alternative 7 –Alternative 7 would result in a significant and unavoidable  
4 indirect impact to the same three prehistoric archaeological sites and require  
5 the same mitigation measures as the Project, with revisions for the 6 resources  
6 that would be impacted differently under Alternative 7 due to the different  
7 Land Use Plan. However, these impacts of Alternative 7 would be less than  
8 the proposed Project as 4 resources (CA-RIV-4156/H, -8698, -8702, -8706)  
9 would be preserved in place in their entirety with an SPP, instead of being  
10 directly impacted and requiring a DRP as under the Project; 1 resource (CA-  
11 RIV-1842) would be partially preserved in place with an SPP, instead of the  
12 full site being directly impacted requiring a DRP as under the Project; and as  
13 fewer acres of CA-RIV-8712 would be directly impacted (6.68 acres directly  
14 impacted under Alternative 7 instead of 11.7 acres under the proposed  
15 Project). It should be noted that preservation in place is the preferred  
16 mitigation as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(A).  
17 (EIR, p. 7.0-47.) Even though Alternative 7 will have fewer impacts to  
18 cultural resources than the proposed Project and will implement mitigation  
19 measures MM Cultural 1 – Alt 7, and MM Cultural 2, impacts are still  
20 considered significant and unavoidable. (EIR, p. 7.0-46.)

21 **E. Noise**

22 ***Impact: Noise Level Standards and Ambient Noise Levels.***

23 ***Thresholds A and C: Project construction and operation would result in a substantial***  
24 ***[5dBA or greater] permanent increase in noise levels in the project vicinity above levels***  
25 ***existing without the project and would expose persons to and generate noise levels in excess***  
26 ***of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable***  
27 ***standards of other agencies.***

1           1.     Project Impact(s):

2           a.     Project – Off-Site Traffic Noise Impacts. Implementation of the proposed  
3           Project would generate new vehicle trips on area roadways that would  
4           potentially result in more than a 5 dBA increase in traffic noise levels along  
5           the following off-site roadway segments in the Project vicinity under the  
6           Existing (2013) with Proposed Project scenario: 10th Street from Lakeview  
7           Avenue to Yucca Avenue (8.1 dBA increase); 10th Street from Yucca  
8           Avenue to Hansen Avenue (8.9 dBA increase); Reservoir Avenue from 10th  
9           Street to Nuevo Road (10.7 dBA increase); Hansen Avenue from 10th Street  
10          to Contour Avenue (6.7 dBA increase); and Bridge Street from Ramona  
11          Expressway to Gilman Springs Road (8.0 dBA increase). Thus, off-site  
12          traffic noise impacts under the Existing (2013) with Proposed Project  
13          scenario are potentially significant. (EIR, p. 5.10-17.)

14          Project-related traffic would contribute to potentially significant long-term  
15          noise impacts to a roadway segment if there is a 5 dBA or greater increase  
16          from the Existing (2013) condition to the Future (2035) condition (even if the  
17          Project's contribution is less than 5 dBA). The following roadway segments  
18          will experience such an increase: Ramona Expressway from Lakeview  
19          Avenue to Hansen Avenue (1.2 dBA increase from Project-related traffic);  
20          Ramona Expressway from Hansen Avenue to 5th Street (1.2 dBA increase  
21          from Project-related traffic); Ramona Expressway from 5th Street to 3rd  
22          Street (1.1 dBA increase from Project-related traffic); Ramona Expressway  
23          from 3rd Street to Bridge Street (0.5 dBA increase from Project-related  
24          traffic); Ramona Expressway from Bridge Street to Warren Road (0.7 dBA  
25          increase from Project-related traffic); 9th Street from Lakeview Avenue to  
26          Yucca Avenue (1.3 dBA increase from Project-related traffic); 10th Street  
27          from Reservoir Avenue to Lakeview Avenue (1.6 dBA increase from Project-

1 related traffic); Reservoir Avenue from 9th Street to 10th Street (0.7 dBA  
2 increase); and Bridge Street from Ramona Expressway to Gilman Springs  
3 Road (1.5 dBA increase from Project-related traffic). Thus, off-site traffic  
4 noise impacts under Future (2035) with Proposed Project scenario are  
5 considered potentially significant. (EIR, p. 5.10-23)

6 Project – Long-Term On-Site Traffic Noise Impacts. Implementation of the  
7 Project has the potential to expose the future residents or other sensitive  
8 receptors to noise levels in excess of the County’s 65 dBA exterior standard.  
9 With regards to the County’s 45 dBA interior noise standard, Riverside  
10 County Department of Public Health allows a 20 dBA noise reduction for the  
11 windows closed condition, based on construction practices common in  
12 California. Therefore, the Project has potential to expose future residents or  
13 other sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the County’s 45 dBA  
14 interior standard. Long term noise impacts from on-site traffic will be  
15 reduced to less than significant levels for all planning areas within the Project  
16 with implementation of mitigation measures MM Noise 1 through MM Noise  
17 9. These mitigation measures will reduce noise through the use of barriers,  
18 berms or soundwalls (MM Noise 1, MM Noise 4, MM Noise 5, MM Noise  
19 8, and MM Noise 9); enhanced building facades (MM Noise 2, MM Noise 4,  
20 and MM Noise 6); mechanical ventilation systems (MM Noise 3, MM Noise  
21 4, MM Noise 7); or a combination of the above. (EIR, p. 5.10-30-5.10-36.)

22 Long-Term Traffic Noise Impacts to San Jacinto Wildlife Area. Noise  
23 impacts from the proposed Project to the SJWA would not result in a  
24 substantial increase of 5 dBA or greater or noise levels in excess of County  
25 standards. Therefore, noise impacts from the proposed Project to the SJWA  
26 would be less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.10-36-5.10-37.)



1 Project – Long-Term Stationary Noise. Because the exact type of  
2 retail/commercial uses that will be occupying the commercial land use sites  
3 is not known at this time, the types of noise generated by the on-site  
4 businesses cannot be determined. Future commercial uses, when proposed,  
5 will be required to comply with the County’s noise standards for stationary  
6 sources. Because future uses will be required to comply with existing  
7 regulations and standards, on-site noise-generated by the proposed Project  
8 would not expose people within the Project or in the vicinity to noise levels  
9 in excess of applicable standards. Therefore this impact is less than  
10 significant. (EIR, p. 5.10-37.)

11 Project – Long-Term Stationary Noise Impacts to San Jacinto Wildlife Area.

12 Because no potential noise-generating land uses such as schools or  
13 commercial uses would be located near the SJWA, no on-site stationary noise  
14 sources would result in significant noise impacts to the SJWA, and no  
15 mitigation measures would be required. No other on-site uses, such as schools  
16 or commercial/retail uses, would result in any significant noise impacts to the  
17 SJWA, and no mitigation measures would be required. Long-term stationary  
18 noise impacts to the SJWA will be less than significant. (EIR, p. 5.10-37.)

19 Project – Long-Term Noise Impacts from San Jacinto Wildlife Area.

20 Impacts from the San Jacinto Wildlife Area were analyzed under Thresholds  
21 A and C, which consider whether the Project would result in a substantial [5  
22 dBA or greater] permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project  
23 vicinity above levels existing without the Project and/or exposure of persons  
24 to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local  
25 general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.  
26 Because Upland Game Hunting is allowed at the SJWA from July 1 through  
27 January 31, future residents in planning areas site adjacent to the SJWA may  
28

1 be exposed to hunting-related noise for 7 months of the year. However,  
2 compliance with the County's requirement does not mean that the gunshots  
3 from hunters at the SJWA will not be audible. Such intermittent, loud,  
4 explosion-type sounds can be startling and cause concern to uninformed  
5 persons, and as such are potentially significant. To assure that both future  
6 residents and the hunting community which currently uses the SJWA are not  
7 impacted negatively, MM Noise 10 shall be implemented to inform residents  
8 prior to purchase that such noises are expected and allowable during the  
9 hunting season. Therefore, with mitigation, the impact from the SJWA to the  
10 proposed Project is less than significant with design considerations,  
11 regulations, and mitigation. (EIR, p. 5.10-38.) Notwithstanding the EIR's  
12 analysis, it is noted that in *California Building Industry Association v. Bay*  
13 *Area Air Quality Management District* (2015) (62 Cal.4th 369) ("CBIA  
14 case"), discussed in detail on pages 5.3-14 to 5.3-15, 5.3-28 and 5.3-46 of the  
15 EIR, the Court stated, "CEQA analysis is concerned with a project's impact  
16 on the environment, rather than with the environment's impact on a project  
17 and its users or residents." (62 Cal.4th 369, 378.)

- 18 b. Alternative 7 – Off-Site Traffic Noise Impacts. Implementation of  
19 Alternative 7 would generate new vehicle trips on area roadways that would  
20 potentially result in more than a 5 dBA increase in traffic noise levels along  
21 the following off-site roadway segments in the Project vicinity under the  
22 Existing (2013) with Alternative 7 scenario: Yucca Avenue from 9<sup>th</sup> Street to  
23 Hansen Avenue (6.0 dBA increase unique to Alternative 7); 10th Street from  
24 Lakeview Avenue to Yucca Avenue (5.0 dBA increase); 10th Street from  
25 Yucca Avenue to Hansen Avenue (5.8 dBA increase); Reservoir Avenue  
26 from 10th Street to Nuevo Road (9.6 dBA increase); Hansen Avenue from  
27 10th Street to Contour Avenue (6.1 dBA increase); and Bridge Street from  
28

1 Ramona Expressway to Gilman Springs Road (6.5 dBA increase). Thus, off-  
2 site traffic noise impacts under the Existing (2013) with -Alternative 7  
3 scenario are potentially significant. (EIR, pp. 7.0-58-.7.0-59)

4 Alternative 7-related traffic would contribute to potentially significant long-  
5 term noise impacts to a roadway segment if there is a 5 dBA or greater  
6 increase from the Existing (2013) condition to the Future (2035) condition  
7 (even if Alternative 7's contribution is less than 5 dBA). The following  
8 roadway segments will experience such an increase: Ramona Expressway  
9 from Lakeview Avenue to Hansen Avenue (1.0 dBA increase from  
10 Alternative 7-related traffic); Ramona Expressway from Hansen Avenue to  
11 5th Street (1.0 dBA increase from Alternative 7-related traffic); Ramona  
12 Expressway from 5th Street to 3rd Street (0.9 dBA increase from Alternative  
13 7 -related traffic); Ramona Expressway from 3rd Street to Bridge Street (0.4  
14 dBA increase from Alternative 7-related traffic); Ramona Expressway from  
15 Bridge Street to Warren Road (0.7 dBA increase from Alternative 7-related  
16 traffic); 9th Street from Lakeview Avenue to Yucca Avenue (2.5 dBA  
17 increase from Alternative 7-related traffic); 10th Street from Reservoir  
18 Avenue to Lakeview Avenue (1.2 dBA increase from Alternative 7-related  
19 traffic); Reservoir Avenue from 9th Street to 10th Street (0.5 dBA increase  
20 from Alternative 7-related traffic); and Bridge Street from Ramona  
21 Expressway to Gilman Springs Road (1.3 dBA increase from Alternative 7-  
22 related traffic). While Alternative 7 would result in a higher ambient noise  
23 increase to one roadway segment than the Project (9th Street from Lakeview  
24 Avenue to Yucca Avenue), the remaining roadway segments that would be  
25 significantly impacted by both the Project and Alternative 7 would  
26 experience a lesser degree of ambient noise increase under Alternative 7.  
27 Therefore, Alternative 7 would result in potentially significant off-site traffic  
28

1 impacts under the Future (2035) with Alternative 7 scenario. (EIR, pp. 7.0-  
2 58-7.0-60.)

3 Alternative 7 – Long-Term On-Site Traffic Noise Impacts. Implementation  
4 of the Alternative 7 has the potential to expose the future residents or other  
5 sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of the County’s 65 dBA exterior  
6 standard and the County’s 45 dBA interior standard. The proposed on-site  
7 residential uses adjacent to Ramona Expressway (part of the future Mid  
8 County Parkway freeway) and other major arterials (near or within the  
9 Alternative 7 site boundary) would require noise mitigation measures,  
10 specifically mitigation measures MM Noise 1 through MM Noise 9 which  
11 are also required for the Project. These mitigation measures include sound  
12 barriers, air conditioning systems, and building façade enhancements. (EIR,  
13 p. 7.0-60.)

14 Alternative 7 – Long-Term Stationary Noise. Potential on-site noise-  
15 generating sources would be maintained so that noise associated with  
16 activities in these outdoor active use areas would comply with the County’s  
17 noise standards. Because the exact type of retail/commercial uses that will be  
18 occupying the commercial land use sites is not known at this time, the types  
19 of noise generated by the on-site businesses cannot be determined. Future  
20 commercial uses, when proposed, will be required to comply with the  
21 County’s noise standards for stationary sources. Because future uses will be  
22 required to comply with existing regulations and standards, on-site noise-  
23 generated by Alternative 7 would not expose people within the Project or in  
24 the vicinity to noise levels in excess of applicable standards. Therefore this  
25 impact is less than significant. (EIR, p. 7.0-60.)

26 Alternative 7 – Long-Term Noise Impacts from San Jacinto Wildlife Area.  
27 Compliance with the County’s requirements does not mean that the gunshots  
28

1 from hunters at the SJWA would not be audible, which may startle or cause  
2 concern to uninformed persons. Thus, as with the proposed Project, long-term  
3 stationary-source mitigation measure MM Noise 10, which requires potential  
4 residential buyers be informed of the legal hunting activities at the SJWA  
5 prior to purchase, is also required for Alternative 7. (EIR, p. 7.0-60.)

6 2. Mitigation:

7 a. Project – The most common way to mitigate noise impacts when the noise  
8 source cannot be relocated is to place a barrier between the source and the  
9 receiver. Thus, mitigation from traffic noise is generally achieved by the use  
10 of walls (or some other barrier) between the road and the receiver. Long term  
11 noise impacts from on-site traffic will be reduced to less than significant  
12 levels for all planning areas within the Project with implementation of  
13 mitigation measures MM Noise 1 through MM Noise 9. (EIR, p. 5.10-36.)  
14 However, there are existing residential and non-residential land uses located  
15 along the affected off-site roadway segments with driveway access that must  
16 be maintained. Thus it is not feasible to install any type of wall or barrier that  
17 would block access. Since there is no feasible or practical way of mitigating  
18 Project-related off-site traffic noise impacts in either the Existing (2013) with  
19 Proposed Project or Future (2035) with Proposed Project scenarios,  
20 implementation of the proposed Project would result in a significant and  
21 unavoidable off-site traffic noise impact with regard to existing uses. (EIR,  
22 pp. 5.10-17, 5.10-23.)

23 b. Alternative 7 – With the implementation of the mitigation measure MM  
24 Noise 1 through MM Noise 17, most of Alternative 7's potential noise  
25 impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance, except for the  
26 following: (1) traffic noise impacts under the Existing (2013) with  
27 Alternative 7 scenario that would have 5 dBA or more in Alternative 7-related  
28

1 increases, and (2) Future (2035) with Alternative 7 scenario to roadway  
2 segments where there would be a 5 dBA or greater increase in noise levels  
3 from the Existing (2013) to Future (2035) scenarios to which Alternative 7  
4 would contribute traffic noise impacts, which would remain significant and  
5 unavoidable. While Alternative 7 would result in generally similar impacts,  
6 it would impact one additional roadway segment in the Existing (2013) with  
7 Alternative 7 scenario than the Project, but result in lesser ambient noise  
8 increases for the remaining roadway segments than the Project. Alternative 7  
9 would also require the same mitigation measures as those required of the  
10 Project. Therefore, Alternative 7's noise impacts would be similar to that of  
11 the proposed Project and remain significant and unavoidable. (EIR, p. 7.0-  
12 61.)

13 **F. Population and Housing.**

14 *Impact: Exceed Population Projections – Regional and/or Local.*

15 *Threshold A: Project implementation would cumulatively exceed official regional and local*  
16 *population projections.*

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

- 18 a. Project – Implementation of the proposed Project would result in 11,350  
19 dwelling units, a population of 36,434 persons, 16,344 workers, and 1,190  
20 new jobs. (EIR, p. 5.11-11–5.11-12.)

21 **Regional Projections.** Official regional growth forecasts are prepared and  
22 updated by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).  
23 Because the Project's population of 36,434 persons would account for  
24 approximately 1.1 percent of the 2035 population forecasted by SCAG for  
25 Riverside County; 4.4 percent of the forecasted population for Western  
26 Riverside County per the 2003 General Plan and 3.9 percent of the forecasted  
27 population for Western Riverside County per the 2015 GP; 6.3 percent of the  
28

1 forecasted population for the nearby cities of Hemet, Moreno Valley, Perris,  
2 and San Jacinto; and 2.2 percent of the forecasted population within a 20-  
3 mile radius of the Project site, the Project would have a significant impact  
4 with regard to exceeding SCAG population projections for the region and  
5 areas that include the Project site. (EIR, p. 5.11-12.)

6 Area Projections. Both the 2003 LNAP and the 2015 LNAP include  
7 Community Development Overlays that would allow for more intense  
8 development on 843 acres and 840 acres, respectively. With regard to the  
9 2003 LNAP projections (assuming development per its Community  
10 Development Overlay), the Project would account for approximately 43  
11 percent of the projected population, 40 percent of the projected households,  
12 43 percent of its projected workforce, and 5 percent of its projected  
13 employment opportunities. Under the 2015 LNAP (assuming development  
14 per its Community Development Overlay), the Project would account for  
15 approximately 41 percent of the projected population, 39 percent of the  
16 projected households, 41 percent of its projected workforce, and 4 percent of  
17 its projected employment opportunities. Comparing the Project to the LNAP  
18 projections without the Community Development Overlay, the Project would  
19 increase the site's population, housing, and workforce by approximately 766  
20 percent and increase employment opportunities by approximately 109  
21 percent from those amounts anticipated by both the 2003 and 2015 General  
22 Plans and 2003 and 2015 LNAPs. Because the proposed Project would  
23 exceed the projections in both the 2003 and 2015 General Plans and the 2013  
24 and 2015 LNAPs, impacts with regard to exceeding official regional  
25 population projections are considered significant. The Project would  
26 similarly have a significant impact with respect to exceeding local population  
27 projections. Therefore, the Project would contribute to cumulatively  
28 exceeding the official regional and local population projections and impacts  
are considered significant. (EIR, pp.5.11-12-5.11-16.)

The jobs/household ratio for the Project would be 0.11:1. Project construction would also generate demand for approximately 17,700 person-

1 years' worth of work, and many Project residents may telecommute in the  
2 future. The Project would result in a decrease in the jobs/household balance  
3 for the surrounding area of approximately 23 percent, which is below current  
4 and projected jobs/household balance levels for the local and regional areas,  
5 which are 0.89:1 for the local area (i.e., the area within a 20-mile radius of  
6 the Project site) and 0.93:1 for Western Riverside County. Because the  
7 Project results in a very low jobs/household ratio in an area that is less than  
8 balanced, the Project will contribute to the area's overall jobs/housing  
9 imbalance and therefore would have a significant impact with respect to  
10 exceeding employment projections for the region. As a result, the Project  
11 would have a significant effect with respect to regional and local employment  
12 projections for the region. (EIR, pp. 5.11-16-5.11-17.)

- 13 b. Project – Implementation of the Alternative 7 would result in 8,725 dwelling  
14 units, a population of 28,007 persons, 12,564 workers, and 3,286 new jobs.  
15 (EIR, p. 7.0-61.)

16 When compared to the proposed Project, development of Alternative 7 would  
17 result in approximately 8,427 fewer persons; 2,625 fewer dwelling units;  
18 3,780 fewer workers; 880,000 square feet more of commercial uses; and  
19 2,096 more employment opportunities from the increased commercial square  
20 footage. While Alternative 7 would result in decreased amounts of an on-site  
21 resident population and workforce participants from the decreased amount of  
22 residential dwelling units, the increase of commercial square footage would  
23 result in 2,096 more employment opportunities on site. However, as with the  
24 proposed Project, a substantial increase of population, dwelling units,  
25 workers, and employment opportunities would occur on site, thus resulting  
26 in a significant impact on local projections under both the 2003 General Plan  
27 and Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan and 2015 General Plan and Lakeview/Nuevo  
28 Area Plan. As with the proposed Project, Alternative 7 would require a



1 General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone to permit the proposed land  
2 use plan at the site. (EIR, pp. 7.0-61–7.0-62.)

3 Build-out of Alternative 7 would result in the equivalent of approximately 33  
4 percent and 31 percent of the population growth and approximately 32 and  
5 30 percent of the housing growth projected at build-out of the 2003 and 2015  
6 Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plans, respectively, and approximately 1.9 percent  
7 and 1.6 percent of the growth projected at build-out of the 2003 and 2015  
8 General Plans, respectively. (EIR, p. 7.0-62.)

9 While Alternative 7 represents a 23 percent reduction in population and  
10 housing compared to the Project, which results in 8,427 fewer persons and  
11 2,625 fewer dwelling units, this reduction is not enough to reduce the  
12 significant exceedance of growth projections projected under the Project.  
13 Specifically, the Project will exceed local population and housing build-out  
14 forecasts in the 2003 Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan by approximately 32,229  
15 persons and 10,040 dwellings, which results in an approximately 35 percent  
16 increase over the Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan population forecasts assuming  
17 development per the Community Development Overlay. Thus, the reduction  
18 of 8,427 persons and 2,625 dwelling units that would result with  
19 implementation of Alternative 7, in comparison to the Project, would still  
20 substantially exceed growth forecasts, albeit to a lesser degree, and therefore  
21 would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

22 The jobs/resident worker ratio for Alternative 7 would be 0.36:1. Alternative  
23 7 construction would also generate demand for approximately 13,600 person-  
24 years' worth of work (whereas the Project would require 17,700 person-  
25 years' worth of work.) Significant additional employment would be required  
26 to build the 1.38 million SF of commercial uses. (EIR, p. 7.0-63.)

27 Alternative 7 allows for a much higher level of commercial development (by  
28 176 percent) and a lower level of residential development (by 23 percent),  
which would bring the project to within 35 percent of a job-housing balance  
at full build-out rather than 23 percent as under the Project. (EIR, p. 7.0-63.)  
Even so, because Alternative 7, as with the Project, would result in a low

1 jobs/household ratio, albeit one that is improved over the Project, in an area  
2 that is less than balanced, Alternative 7 would contribute to the area's overall  
3 jobs/housing imbalance and impacts are considered to be significant. (EIR,  
4 p. 7.0-64.)

5 Alternative 7 would also directly result in substantial population growth in  
6 the area, as with the proposed Project. Moreover, development of Alternative  
7 7 could potentially influence the timing and extent of development within  
8 adjacent properties from the improvements of off-site roadways and  
9 extension of water and sewer service to the area, and thus, would indirectly  
10 induce substantial population growth in the area as with the proposed Project.  
11 The direct and indirect impact from Alternative 7 is therefore considered  
12 significant and unavoidable, as with the Project. (EIR, p. 7.0-64.)

13 2. Mitigation:

- 14 a. Project – The Project's population and housing impacts, including regional  
15 and local growth projection exceedances and direct and indirect growth  
16 inducement, are primarily generated by proposed residential development at  
17 a level that would be higher than anticipated in the 2003 and 2015 Riverside  
18 County General Plans. Potential mitigation measures that could reduce these  
19 impacts would be related to Project alternatives that could feasibly be  
20 developed, result in a level of growth consistent with regional and local  
21 projections, and that do not generate other potentially significant impacts.  
22 Project alternatives are discussed in detail in the EIR in Section 7,  
23 Alternatives to the Proposed Project, including development consistent with  
24 the General Plan land use designations (Alternative 2). Alternative 2 would  
25 be consistent with regional and local growth projections, and would reduce  
26 the Project's growth inducing impacts. The analysis in EIR Section 7 shows  
27 that development under the General Plan land use designations could result  
28 in other significant environmental impacts. Consequently, no feasible

1 mitigation measures that do not result in other potentially significant impacts  
2 are available to reduce the Project's housing and population impacts to less  
3 than significant levels. (EIR, p. 5.11-18.)

4 The Project would contribute to the cumulative exceedance of official  
5 regional or local population projections for the Project site and would  
6 cumulatively increase the level of growth inducement in the area, both  
7 directly, by proposing new homes and businesses, and indirectly through  
8 extension of roads or other infrastructure. No feasible mitigation measures  
9 are available to reduce these cumulative population and housing impacts.  
10 Therefore, the Project will have a significant unavoidable cumulative impact  
11 to population and housing. (EIR, p. 5.11-18.)

- 12 b. Alternative 7 – There are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce the  
13 impact of Alternative 7, or of the Project, to less than significant. Thus, under  
14 Alternative 7 a Statement of Overriding Consideration would be required as  
15 with the proposed Project. Therefore, as the exceedances to growth forecasts  
16 would be lessened and jobs/housing balance improved under Alternative 7 in  
17 comparison to the proposed Project, impacts would be less than that of the  
18 Project, although still significant and unavoidable. (EIR, p. 7.0-64.)

19 ***Impact: Growth Inducement.***

20 ***Threshold B: Project implementation would induce substantial population growth in an***  
21 ***area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly***  
22 ***(for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).***

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

- 24 a. **Project – Direct Impacts.** The Project would result in the construction of  
25 11,350 dwelling units and a build-out population of approximately 36,434  
26 persons. The Project also includes 500,000 square feet of commercial  
27 development which has the potential to create approximately 1,190 jobs. The  
28

1 number of new dwelling units and employment opportunities associated with  
2 the Project will directly induce substantial population growth and moderate  
3 business and employment growth in the area. The Project will directly result  
4 in substantial population growth in the area and this impact is considered  
5 significant without mitigation. Refer to EIR Section 6.3 – Growth  
6 Inducement for further discussion regarding the Project’s growth inducing  
7 impacts. (EIR, p. 5.11-17.)

8 Indirect Impacts. Project development could potentially influence the timing  
9 or extent of development within adjacent properties by expanding local  
10 roadway, water and sewer service, and other utility service and infrastructure  
11 capacity and indirectly reduce potential constraints for future development in  
12 the vicinity of the Project. As discussed in EIR Section 5.14,  
13 Transportation/Traffic, and EIR Section 5.15, Utilities, the Project will result  
14 in roadway and utility construction within the site. Certain improvements to  
15 the Ramona Expressway per the Mid County Parkway Project and regional  
16 water, sewer and recycled water utilities have been planned by the County,  
17 some of which will occur with or without the Project. Project-related  
18 infrastructure improvements inside and outside of the site will generally  
19 occur incrementally as the Project is constructed over time, but would  
20 contribute significantly to eliminating constraints to development in the area.  
21 Additionally, the proposed number of dwelling units will introduce  
22 substantial numbers of persons into the Project area and remove obstacles to  
23 growth. The Project will indirectly induce substantial population growth in  
24 the area and this impact is considered significant without mitigation. Refer to  
25 EIR Section 6.3 – Growth Inducement for further discussion regarding  
26 indirect growth inducing impacts resulting from Project-related off-site  
27 transportation, water, and sewer infrastructure. (EIR, p. 5.11-17.)  
28

1 b. Alternative 7 – Direct Impacts. Alternative 7 would result in the construction  
2 of 8,725 dwelling units and a build-out population of approximately 28,007  
3 persons. Alternative 7 also includes 1.38 million square feet of commercial  
4 development which has the potential to create approximately 3,280 jobs. The  
5 number of new dwelling units and employment opportunities associated with  
6 the Alternative 7 will directly induce substantial population growth in the  
7 area and this impact is considered significant without mitigation. (EIR, pp.  
8 7.0-61–7.0-64.)

9 Indirect Impacts. Development of Alternative 7 could potentially influence  
10 the timing and extent of development within adjacent properties from the  
11 improvements of off-site roadways and extension of water and sewer service  
12 to the area, and thus, would indirectly induce substantial population growth  
13 in the area as with the Project. The indirect impact from Alternative 7 is  
14 therefore considered significant and unavoidable, as with the Project. (EIR,  
15 p. 7.0-64.)

16 2. Mitigation:

17 a. Project – Development of the proposed Project would induce substantial  
18 population growth in the area, both directly, by proposing new homes and  
19 businesses, and indirectly through extension of roads or other infrastructure.  
20 Potential mitigation measures that could reduce these impacts would be  
21 related to Project alternatives that could feasibly be developed, result in a  
22 level of growth consistent with regional and local projections, and that do not  
23 generate other potentially significant impacts. Project alternatives are  
24 discussed in detail in EIR Section 7, Alternatives to the Proposed Project,  
25 including development consistent with the General Plan land use  
26 designations (Alternative 2). Alternative 2 would be consistent with regional  
27  
28

1 and local growth projections, and would reduce the Project's growth inducing  
2 impacts. The analysis in Section 7 shows that development under the General  
3 Plan land use designations could result in other significant environmental  
4 impacts. Consequently, no feasible mitigation measures that do not result in  
5 other potentially significant impacts are available to reduce the Project's  
6 housing and population impacts to less than significant levels. (EIR, p. 5.11-  
7 18.)

- 8 b. Alternative 7 – There are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce the  
9 impacts of Alternative 7 to less than significant and as discussed above for  
10 the proposed Project, the impacts will remain significant and unavoidable.  
11 (EIR, p. 7.0-64.)

12 **G. Transportation/Traffic**

13 *Impact: Exceed Level of Service Standards.*

14 *Threshold A: Project construction and implementation would exceed, either individually*  
15 *or cumulatively, a level of service standard for designated roads or highways and/or cause*  
16 *an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity*  
17 *of the street system, based on the LOS threshold established by the relevant jurisdiction.*

18 1. Project Impact(s):

- 19 a. Project – Project implementation will result in the generation of new  
20 vehicular trips that will use roadways, intersections, and freeways.

21 **Impacts on Roadway Segments and Intersections**

22 Caltrans. Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable  
23 impacts to the following roadway segments under Existing Plus Proposed  
24 Project scenario: Beaumont Avenue (SR-79) from 1st Street to California  
25 Avenue and from California Avenue to Gilman Springs Road; Ethanac Road  
26 (SR-74) from Menifee Road to Briggs Road; Florida Avenue (SR-79/74)  
27 from San Jacinto Avenue to State Street, from State Street to Lyon Avenue,  
28

1 from Lyon Avenue to Sanderson Avenue, and from Winchester Road to  
2 California Avenue; and Winchester Road (SR-79) from Domenigoni  
3 Parkway to Scott Road and from Scott Road to Thompson Road. (EIR, pp.  
4 5.14-55-5.14-60.)

5 Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to  
6 the following roadway intersections under Existing Plus Proposed Project  
7 scenario: California Ave / Florida Ave (SR-74, SR-79); I-215 Northbound  
8 Ramps at Nuevo Rd; and Menifee Rd / Ethanac Rd (SR-74); I-215  
9 Southbound Ramps / Ramona Expwy; I-215 Southbound Ramps at Nuevo  
10 Rd; Juniper Flats Rd / SR-74; SR-79 Southbound Ramps at Gilman Springs  
11 Rd; and SR-79 Northbound Ramps at Gilman Springs Rd. Project  
12 implementation will result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation to  
13 the following roadway intersections under Existing Plus Proposed Project  
14 scenario: I-215 Northbound Ramps / Ramona Expwy (MM Trans 28);  
15 Beaumont Ave (SR-79) / California Ave (MM Trans 28); and State Street  
16 (SR-79) / Ramona Expwy (MM Trans 28). (EIR, pp. 5.14-68-5.14-74.)

17 City of Hemet. Project implementation will result in significant and  
18 unavoidable impacts under Existing Plus Proposed Project scenario to the  
19 intersection of Warren Rd / Esplanade Ave. (EIR, p. 5.14-75.)

20 City of Moreno Valley. Project implementation will result in significant and  
21 unavoidable impacts to the following roadway segments under Existing Plus  
22 Proposed Project scenario: Gilman Springs Road from the SR-60 Freeway to  
23 Alessandro Boulevard (MM Trans 33), and from Alessandro Boulevard to  
24 Bridge Street (MM Trans 33). (EIR, pp. 5.14-60–5.14-61.)

25 Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to  
26 the following roadway intersection under Existing Plus Proposed Project  
27 scenario: Gilman Springs Rd / Alessandro Blvd. (EIR, p. 5.14-76.)  
28

1 City of Perris. Project implementation will result in significant and  
2 unavoidable impacts to the following roadway segments under Existing Plus  
3 Proposed Project scenario: Nuevo Rd from Redlands Ave to Murrieta Rd and  
4 from Murrieta Rd to Evans Rd. (EIR, p. 5.14-61.)

5 Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable impacts  
6 under Existing Plus Project scenario to the following intersections: Evans Rd  
7 / Ramona Expwy; Murrieta Rd / Nuevo Rd. Project implementation will  
8 result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation under Existing Plus  
9 Proposed Project scenario to the following intersections: Perris Blvd /  
10 Ramona Expwy (MM Trans 29); Lake Perris Dr at Ramona Expwy (MM  
11 Trans 29); and Perris Blvd at Nuevo Rd (MM Trans 29). (EIR, pp. 5.14-77-  
12 5.14-79.)

13 Riverside County. Project implementation will result in significant and  
14 unavoidable impacts to the following roadway segments under Existing Plus  
15 Proposed Project scenario: Gilman Springs Rd from Warren Rd to Sanderson  
16 Ave (SR-79) (MM Trans 33) and from Bridge Street to Warren Rd (MM  
17 Trans 33). Project implementation will result in less-than-significant impacts  
18 with mitigation to the following roadway segments under Existing Plus  
19 Proposed Project scenario: Cajalco Rd from El Sobrante Rd to Wood Rd  
20 (MM Trans 33) and from Carpinus Dr to Harvill Ave (MM Trans 33); Hansen  
21 Ave from 10th Street to Contour Ave (MM Trans 4); Lakeview Ave from  
22 10th Street to North Dr (MM Trans 5); Nuevo Rd from Dunlap to Foothill  
23 Ave (MM Trans 6), from Foothill Ave to Antelope Rd (MM Trans 7), from  
24 Antelope Rd to Menifee Rd (MM Trans 8) and from Menifee Road to  
25 Lakeview Ave (MM Trans 9); and Ramona Expwy from Rider St to  
26 Lakeview Ave (MM Trans 10), from Lakeview Ave to Hansen Ave (MM  
27 Trans 11), from Hansen Ave to 5th Street (MM Trans 12), from 3rd Street to  
28



1 Bridge Street (MM Trans 13) and from Bridge Street to Warren Rd (MM  
2 Trans 14); and Van Buren Blvd from Washington Street to Wood Rd (MM  
3 Trans 33). (EIR, pp. 5.14-62-5.14-67.)

4 Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable impacts  
5 under Existing Plus Project scenario to the following intersections:  
6 Bernasconi Rd / Ramona Expwy; and Foothill Dr / Nuevo Rd. Project  
7 implementation will result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation  
8 under Existing Plus Project scenario to the following intersections: Hansen  
9 Ave / Ramona Expwy (MM Trans 15); Hansen Ave / Lakeview Ave (MM  
10 Trans 16); Yucca Ave / 10th Street (MM Trans 18); North Dr / Lakeview Ave  
11 (MM Trans 20); Hansen Ave / Wolfskill Ave (MM Trans 19); Hansen Ave /  
12 Contour Ave (MM Trans 21); Bridge Street / Ramona Expwy (MM Trans  
13 22); Lakeview Ave / Nuevo Rd (MM Trans 24); Lakeview Ave / 10th Street  
14 (MM Trans 17); Bridge Street / Gilman Springs Rd (MM Trans 21a); Menifee  
15 Rd / Nuevo Rd (MM Trans 23); Menifee Rd / San Jacinto Ave (MM Trans  
16 25); Menifee Rd / Ellis Ave (MM Trans 26); and Menifee Rd / Mapes Rd  
17 (MM Trans 27). (EIR, pp. 5.14-80-5.14-86.)

#### 18 **Off-Site Improvements**

19 Off-site roadway improvements will be constructed by the Project at 23  
20 locations. All of these improvements can be accomplished within existing  
21 right-of-way and most are within already disturbed right-of-way. Potential  
22 impacts from these improvements that could be associated with the  
23 construction of these facilities are considered in the applicable substantive  
24 sections of this EIR for the Project, including Section 5.16, Greenhouse Gas;  
25 Section 5.2, Agricultural and Forestry Resources; Section 5.3, Air Quality;  
26 Section 5.4, Biological Resources; Section 5.5, Cultural and Paleontological  
27 Resources; Section 5.6, Geology and Soils; Section 5.7, Hazards; Section 5.8,

1 Hydrology/Water Quality; and Section 5.10, Noise. (EIR, pp. 5.14-115-5.14-  
2 117.)

- 3 b. Alternative 7 –Implementation of Alternative 7 will result in the generation  
4 of new vehicular trips that will use roadways, intersections, and freeways.

5 **Impacts on Roadway Segments and Intersections**

6 Caltrans. Alternative 7 implementation will result in significant and  
7 unavoidable impacts to the following roadway segments under Existing Plus  
8 Alternative 7 scenario: Florida Avenue (SR-79/74) from San Jacinto Avenue  
9 to State Street, from State Street to Lyon Avenue, from Lyon Avenue to  
10 Sanderson Avenue, and from Winchester Road to California Avenue; and  
11 Winchester Road (SR-79) from Domenigoni Parkway to Scott Road and from  
12 Scott Road to Thompson Road. (EIR, p. 7.0-69.)

13 Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to  
14 the following roadway intersections under Existing Plus Alternative 7  
15 scenario: California Ave / Florida Ave (SR-74, SR-79); I-215 Northbound  
16 Ramps at Nuevo Rd; and Menifee Rd / Ethanac Rd (SR-74); I-215  
17 Southbound Ramps / Ramona Expwy; I-215 Southbound Ramps at Nuevo  
18 Rd; Juniper Flats Rd / SR-74; SR-79 Southbound Ramps at Gilman Springs  
19 Rd; and SR-79 Northbound Ramps at Gilman Springs Rd. (EIR, p. 7.0-70-  
20 71.) Roadway segments and intersections that would operate at an  
21 unacceptable LOS as a result of Alternative 7 which are outside Riverside  
22 County's jurisdiction are therefore considered significant and unavoidable  
23 without mitigation available, as with the Project. (EIR, p. 7.0-81.)

24 City of Hemet. Alternative 7 implementation will result in significant and  
25 unavoidable impacts under Existing Plus Alternative 7 scenario to the  
26 intersection of Warren Rd / Esplanade Ave. (EIR, p. 7.0-71.) Roadway  
27 segments and intersections that would operate at an unacceptable LOS as a  
28

1 result of Alternative 7 which are outside Riverside County's jurisdiction are  
2 therefore considered significant and unavoidable without mitigation  
3 available, as with the Project. (EIR, p. 7.0-81.)

4 City of Moreno Valley. Alternative 7 implementation will result in significant  
5 and unavoidable impacts to the following roadway segments under Existing  
6 Plus Alternative 7 scenario: Gilman Springs Road from the SR-60 Freeway  
7 to Alessandro Boulevard (MM Trans 33), and from Alessandro Boulevard to  
8 Bridge Street (MM Trans 33). (EIR, pp. 7.0-69, 86, and 127.)

9 Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to  
10 the following roadway intersections under Existing Plus Alternative 7  
11 scenario: Gilman Springs Rd / Alessandro Blvd and Gilman Springs Rd /  
12 Bridge St. (EIR, p. 7.0-71.) Roadway segments and intersections that would  
13 operate at an unacceptable LOS as a result of Alternative 7 which are outside  
14 Riverside County's jurisdiction are therefore considered significant and  
15 unavoidable without mitigation available, as with the Project. (EIR, p. 7.0-  
16 81.)

17 City of Perris. Alternative 7 implementation will result in significant and  
18 unavoidable impacts to the following roadway segments under Existing Plus  
19 Alternative 7 scenario: Nuevo Rd from Redlands Ave to Murrieta Rd and  
20 from Murrieta Rd to Evans Rd. (EIR, p. 7.0-69.)

21 Alternative 7 implementation will result in significant and unavoidable  
22 impacts under Existing Plus Alternative 7 scenario to the following  
23 intersection: Perris Blvd / Nuevo Rd. (EIR, p. 7.0-71.) Roadway segments  
24 and intersections that would operate at an unacceptable LOS as a result of  
25 Alternative 7 which are outside Riverside County's jurisdiction are therefore  
26 considered significant and unavoidable without mitigation available, as with  
27 the Project. (EIR, p. 7.0-81.)  
28

1 Riverside County. Alternative 7 implementation will result in significant and  
2 unavoidable impacts to the following roadway segments under Existing Plus  
3 Alternative 7 scenario: Gilman Springs Rd from Warren Rd to Sanderson Ave  
4 (SR-79) (MM Trans 33) and from Bridge Street to Warren Rd (MM Trans  
5 33). Alternative 7 implementation will result in less-than-significant impacts  
6 with mitigation to the following roadway segments under Existing Plus  
7 Alternative 7 scenario: Cajalco Rd from El Sobrante Rd to Wood Rd (MM  
8 Trans 33) and from Carpinus Dr to Harvill Ave (MM Trans 33); Hansen Ave  
9 from 10th Street to Contour Ave (MM Trans 4 – Alt 7); Lakeview Ave from  
10 10th Street to North Dr (MM Trans 5 – Alt 7); Nuevo Rd from Menifee Road  
11 to Lakeview Ave (MM Trans 9 – Alt 7); and Ramona Expwy from Rider St  
12 to Lakeview Ave (MM Trans 10 – Alt 7), from Lakeview Ave to Hansen Ave  
13 (MM Trans 11 – Alt 7), from Hansen Ave to 5th Street (MM Trans 12 – Alt  
14 7), from 3rd Street to Bridge Street (MM Trans 13 – Alt 7) and from Bridge  
15 Street to Warren Rd (MM Trans 14 – Alt 7); and Van Buren Blvd from  
16 Washington Street to Wood Rd (MM Trans 33). (EIR, pp. 7.0-69–7.0-70;  
17 7.0-83; 7.0-123 and 127.)

18 Alternative 7 implementation will result in significant and unavoidable  
19 impacts under Existing Plus Alternative 7 scenario to the following  
20 intersection: Bernasconi Rd / Ramona Expwy. Alternative 7 implementation  
21 will result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation under Existing  
22 Plus Alternative 7 scenario to the following intersections: Hansen Ave /  
23 Ramona Expwy (MM Trans 15 – Alt 7); Hansen Ave / Lakeview Ave (MM  
24 Trans 16 – Alt 7); Yucca Ave / 10th Street (MM Trans 18 – Alt 7); North Dr  
25 / Lakeview Ave (MM Trans 20 – Alt 7); Hansen Ave / Wolfskill Ave (MM  
26 Trans 19 – Alt 7); Hansen Ave / Contour Ave (MM Trans 21 – Alt 7); Bridge  
27 Street / Ramona Expwy (MM Trans 22); Lakeview Ave / Nuevo Rd (MM  
28

1 Trans 24 – Alt 7); Lakeview Ave / 10th Street (MM Trans 17); Bridge Street  
2 / Gilman Springs Rd (MM Trans 21a – Alt 7); Menifee Rd / Nuevo Rd (MM  
3 Trans 23– Alt 7); Menifee Rd / San Jacinto Ave (MM Trans 25 – Alt 7);  
4 Menifee Rd / Ellis Ave (MM Trans 26 – Alt 7); and Menifee Rd / Mapes Rd  
5 (MM Trans 27 – Alt 7). (EIR, pp. 7.0-71–7.0-72, 7.0-83–7.0-84.)

#### 6 **Off-Site Improvements**

7 Off-site roadway improvements will be constructed by Alternative 7 at 18 of  
8 the 23 locations identified for the Project. Under Alternative 7, roadway  
9 widening of Nuevo Road between Dunlap Drive and Menifee Road and  
10 improvements to the intersections of Yucca Avenue & 10th Street and  
11 Ramona Expressway & Bridge Street would not be required. Alternative 7  
12 would also require off-site roadway improvements to 3 intersections that are  
13 not needed for the Project. The three off-site intersections that require  
14 improvements to implement Alternative 7 are: (1) Lakeview Avenue &  
15 Ramona Expressway, (2) Lakeview Avenue & 9th Street, and (3) Hansen  
16 Avenue & Yucca Avenue. (EIR, p. 7.0-16.)

17 All of these improvements can be accomplished within existing right-of-way  
18 and most are within already disturbed right-of-way. Potential impacts from  
19 these improvements that could be associated with the construction of these  
20 facilities are considered in the applicable substantive sections of this EIR for  
21 the Project, including Section 5.16, Greenhouse Gas; Section 5.2,  
22 Agricultural and Forestry Resources; Section 5.3, Air Quality; Section 5.4,  
23 Biological Resources; Section 5.5, Cultural and Paleontological Resources;  
24 Section 5.6, Geology and Soils; Section 5.7, Hazards; Section 5.8,  
25 Hydrology/Water Quality; and Section 5.10, Noise. (EIR, pp. 5.14-115-5.14-  
26 117.)

1                   2.     Mitigation:

2                   a.     Project – Riverside County, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction over  
3                   all the segments that require improvements, and thus, neither Riverside  
4                   County nor the Project proponent or implementing developer can guarantee  
5                   that these improvements will be made within these other jurisdictions. Where  
6                   the affected roadway segment is within the lead agency’s jurisdiction, the  
7                   improvements are required as mitigation measures for this Project.  
8                   Nonetheless, as there are roadway segments that will operate at an  
9                   unacceptable LOS with implementation of the proposed Project, and the lead  
10                  agency cannot condition all the above-identified improvements be made to  
11                  all roadway segments and intersections, impacts are considered significant  
12                  and unavoidable. (EIR, pp. 5.14-86–5.14-87.)

13                b.     Alternative 7 – As with the Project, Riverside County, as lead agency, does  
14                not have jurisdiction over all the segments that require improvements.  
15                Therefore, roadway segments and intersections that would operate at an  
16                unacceptable LOS as a result of Alternative 7 which are outside Riverside  
17                County’s jurisdiction are therefore considered significant and unavoidable.  
18                See prior discussion above regarding all applicable mitigation measures.  
19                (EIR, p. 7.0-81.)

20                   **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

21                   *Impact: Significant Greenhouse Gas Emissions.*

22                   *Threshold A: Project construction and implementation would generate greenhouse gas*  
23                   *emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the*  
24                   *environment*

25                   1.     Project Impact(s):

26                   a.     Project – Once the Project is built-out GHG emissions from mobile and area  
27                   sources and indirect emissions from energy and water use, wastewater, as  
28

1 well as waste management, would occur every year after build out. Taking  
2 into account all the sources of GHG emissions along with the reductions due  
3 to Project Design Features/mitigation measures, the Project will emit 217,356  
4 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr). The Project  
5 is consistent with GHG regulations designed to reduce GHG emissions and  
6 with the reduction called for by CARB's original Scoping Plan to meet AB  
7 32's 2020 target. (EIR, pp.5.16-51-5.16-74; 5.16-81.)

- 8 b. Alternative 7 – Once the Alternative 7 is built-out GHG emissions from  
9 mobile and area sources and indirect emissions from energy and water use,  
10 wastewater, as well as waste management, would occur every year after build  
11 out. Taking into account all the sources of GHG emissions along with the  
12 reductions due to Project Design Features/mitigation measures, the Project  
13 will emit 181,474 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr with the On-site Wastewater Plant and  
14 182,030 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr without the On-site Wastewater Plant. (EIR, pp. 7.0-  
15 95–7.0-96.) Alternative 7 will be subject to a number of statewide and local  
16 regulatory programs designed to reduce GHG emissions consistent with AB  
17 32. Like the Project, Alternative 7 would be consistent and compliant with  
18 these regulatory programs, and thus would help to achieve AB 32's goals.  
19 (EIR, p. 7.0-94.)

20 2. Mitigation:

- 21 a. Project – In response to comments on the EIR, 33 new GHG mitigation  
22 measure were added to the EIR and will apply to the proposed Project.  
23 However, although the proposed Project will implement Project design  
24 features and mitigation measures MM GHG 1 through MM GHG 39, global  
25 climate change cannot be addressed through efforts by Riverside County  
26 alone or even by the State of California alone. Because of the breadth of  
27 climate change regulation, many efforts to reduce GHG emissions that are set  
28

1                    forth in AB 32 are outside of the County's jurisdiction and control. These  
2                    other agencies at the regional, state, national, and international level can and  
3                    should adopt requirements to ensure GHG reductions. (

4                    For example, much of the reduction required to achieve the state's AB 32  
5                    goals is from vehicle emissions which are outside the jurisdiction and control  
6                    of Riverside County, such as measures by the CARB to improve vehicle  
7                    emission fuel standards, or measures to increase the use of renewable energy  
8                    by public utilities to reduce emissions associated with the generation of  
9                    electricity and control emissions from major emission sources (like  
10                    refineries), which have been and should continue be adopted by such other  
11                    public agencies. Some of these measures have been adopted but require  
12                    further actions by third party agencies. As such, their operation is outside the  
13                    jurisdiction and control of the County.

14                    The Project is consistent with GHG regulations designed to reduce GHG  
15                    emissions and with the reduction called for by CARB's original Scoping Plan  
16                    to meet AB 32's 2020 target. However, due to the County's limited  
17                    jurisdiction over many GHG reduction measures, the County lacks the  
18                    requisite level of jurisdiction and control to assure that all such measures will  
19                    be fully implemented as planned by third party agencies. Thus, GHG  
20                    emissions impacts related to climate change remain significant and  
21                    unavoidable. (EIR, pp. 5.16-76-5.16-81.)

- 22                    b.                    Alternative 7 – Although Alternative 7 will implement mitigation measures  
23                    MM GHG 1 through MM GHG 39 and its overall GHG emissions are less  
24                    than the Project, similar to the proposed Project impacts remain significant  
25                    and unavoidable under Alternative 7. (EIR, p. 7.0-97.)

26                    ***Impact: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Plan, Policy, Regulation.***



1                   **Threshold B:** *Project construction and implementation would conflict with an applicable*  
2 *plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse*  
3 *gas emissions.*

4           1.     Project Impact(s):

5                   a.     Project – As discussed in the EIR on pages 5.16-74 through 5.16-76, the  
6                   Project is consistent with the 2012-2035 SCAG's RTP/SCS (SB 375).  
7                   Additionally, SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS was approved on April 7, 2016.  
8                   The Project is also consistent with the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. The Project's  
9                   significance with respect to GHG emissions is also evaluated based on its  
10                  consistency with the County of Riverside Climate Action Plan (CAP).  
11                  Projects that garner at least 100 points will be consistent with the reduction  
12                  quantities anticipated in the County's GHG Technical Report. The Project's  
13                  points are shown in Tables 31, 32, and 33 of the *Greenhouse Gas Technical*  
14                  *Report*. The results of the screening analysis shows that the Project would  
15                  exceed 100 points under the CAP analysis. (EIR, pp.5.16-74-5.16-76.)

16                  b.     Alternative 7 – Alternative 7 reduces the emissions and therefore the  
17                  screening analysis shows that Alternative 7 is consistent with the County of  
18                  Riverside CAP by meeting the minimum number of points required.  
19                  Alternative 7 is also consistent with SCAG's 2012-2035 RTP/SCS because it  
20                  espouses smart growth principles such as compact building design,  
21                  integration of uses and walkability, thereby reducing vehicle miles travelled  
22                  on freeways, in addition to meeting the GHG reductions called for in the  
23                  RTP/SCS on a per capita basis. Per the Alternative 7 Greenhouse Gas  
24                  Technical Report (Appendix S), Alternative 7 2020 per capita emissions is  
25                  18.3 lbs/day, which is less than the 19.5 lb/day reduction called for in SB 375  
26                  for the SCAG region (Appendix S, Table 39). Also, SCAG's 2016-2040  
27                  RTP/SCS is in the planning process and the TAZ areas that include the

1 Alternative 7 site include 5,200 households, which more than covers  
2 projected build out of Alternative 7 into Phase 3. Thus, the 2016 RTP/SCS  
3 will include projections for the project well past when it will again be updated  
4 in 2021. Finally, like the Project, Alternative 7 would meet the AB 32  
5 reduction targets of both the original and updated Scoping Plan, 28.5 and 15.3  
6 percent respectively. Under CARB's original Climate Change Scoping Plan,  
7 the reduction in GHG emissions for the Alternative 7 relative to the No  
8 Action Taken (NAT) 2020 scenario "with" and "without" an on-site  
9 wastewater treatment plant is 33.8 and 33.7 percent, respectively, as seen in  
10 EIR Tables 7-Y and 7-Z. Thus, like the Project, both exceed the reduction  
11 target of 28.5 percent set forth in the original Scoping Plan. (EIR, p. 7.0-94.)

12 2. Mitigation:

- 13 a. Project – The Project is consistent with both SCAG's 2012-2035 RTP/SCS  
14 and 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and with the County's CAP. However, while the  
15 County does control the CAP, the County has limited jurisdiction over many  
16 GHG reduction measures under SCAG's RTP/SCS and the County lacks the  
17 requisite level of jurisdiction and control to assure that all such measures will  
18 be fully implemented as planned by third party agencies. Thus, GHG  
19 emissions impacts related to climate change remain significant and  
20 unavoidable. (EIR, p. 5.16-81.)
- 21 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7 is consistent with both SCAG's 2012-2035  
22 RTP/SCS and 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and with the County's CAP. (EIR, p.  
23 7.0-95.) However, while the County does control the CAP, the County has  
24 limited jurisdiction over many GHG reduction measures under SCAG's  
25 RTP/SCS and the County lacks the requisite level of jurisdiction and control  
26 to assure that all such measures will be fully implemented as planned by third  
27  
28

1 party agencies. Thus, GHG emissions impacts related to climate change  
2 remain significant and unavoidable.

3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered, consistent with  
4 CEQA's requirements, the impacts of the Project together with all other pending or approved projects within  
5 the affected area for each resource area, , for reasons documented in the Final EIR No. 471 and summarized  
6 below, and finds that:

7 **A. Aesthetics Cumulative Impacts.**

8 **Cumulative Impact Finding: Cumulatively Significant.**

9 a. Project – The geographic context for aesthetic impacts is the area surrounding the  
10 Project site and Ramona Expressway in the vicinity of the Project Site.  
11 Implementation of the proposed Project will convert hundreds of acres of agricultural  
12 open space to urban uses and may block some views of the Lakeview Mountains  
13 from the Ramona Expressway. Thus, the Project may also result in potentially  
14 significant impacts to scenic highways due to the site's proximity to the Ramona  
15 Expressway, a County Eligible Scenic Highway, as discussed in Section 5.1 of this  
16 EIR. Even with implementation of mitigation measure MM Aesthetics 2, which  
17 requires suitable landscaping and enhancement of foreground views from Ramona  
18 Expressway, significant scenic impacts from Ramona Expressway to the north and  
19 south due to Project development along this roadway corridor, as well as from  
20 retaining walls in various Planning Areas, will still result. Because the Project will  
21 contribute significantly to this conversion of land in the vicinity of the Ramona  
22 Expressway, the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project are considered  
23 cumulatively significant.

24 Consequently, the Project's significant impacts to aesthetics are also cumulatively  
25 considerable as the existing rural character of the Project site will be converted to a  
26 mixed-use urban village. Therefore, because the proposed Project will contribute  
27 cumulatively to a significant and unavoidable change in visual character through  
28

1 conversion of open space to urban uses, as defined in the County General Plan EIR,  
2 cumulative impacts will remain significant and unavoidable after consideration of  
3 mitigation measures and alternatives. (EIR, pp. 6.0-8–6.0-9; see also EIR Section  
4 5.1, Aesthetics.)

5 Regarding light and glare impacts, adherence by all proposed development projects  
6 in the Project area to Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 will ensure that  
7 cumulatively projects avoid interfering with nighttime astrological observations at  
8 the Mt. Palomar Observatory. The proper shielding of lights, limitation on hours and  
9 the use of lighting types as identified in Ordinance No. 655 will ensure that the  
10 proposed Project will have a less than significant cumulative impact on activities at  
11 the Observatory with the implementation of required regulations. (EIR, p. 6.0-9; see  
12 also EIR Section 5.1, Aesthetics.)

- 13 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project and are  
14 cumulatively significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding paragraph and in  
15 the EIR. (EIR, pp. 7.0-26; 7.0-174.)

16 **B. Agriculture and Forestry Resources**

17 **Cumulative Impact Finding:** Cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

- 18 a. Full build-out of the proposed Project will result in the conversion of the existing  
19 agricultural uses to non-agricultural uses. Such conversion of farms and agricultural  
20 operations is occurring throughout the Lakeview/Nuevo area. The Project site  
21 currently contains a chicken ranch containing approximately 682,000 egg layers, a  
22 150-acre horse farm, and approximately 950 acres of productive row crops or fallow  
23 land. The Lakeview/Nuevo planning area as a whole is characterized by its  
24 agriculturally productive lands, and there are several dairies, row crops, and other  
25 chicken ranches adjacent to the Project. The Project does not accommodate the  
26 continuation of these commercial agricultural activities. (EIR, p. 6.0-10; see also EIR  
27 Section 5.2, Agricultural and Forestry Resources.)

1 Development of the Project will convert Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide  
2 Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance to non-  
3 agricultural uses.

4 To achieve the objectives of the Project and bring in needed housing, which is  
5 consistent with planned land uses, the cumulative loss of farmland cannot be avoided.  
6 Mitigation measure MM Ag 1 addresses preservation of agricultural land both on  
7 and off site, but direct impacts are not reduced to less than significant. As discussed  
8 in Section 5.2, the EIR identifies mitigation measures and alternatives to the Project  
9 (Section 7.0) which will lessen but not reduce the significance of the potential  
10 impacts of the Project with respect to Designated Farmland of importance to the state  
11 and County, therefore cumulative impacts will remain significant and unavoidable.

12 Other mitigation measure strategies have been considered, but none were determined  
13 to be feasible. Riverside County General Plan policies attempt to retain, protect, and  
14 encourage agricultural uses. These policies require the County to seek out available  
15 funding for farmland conservation, encourage conserving productive agricultural  
16 lands and preserve prime agricultural lands, and encourage the combination of  
17 agriculture with other compatible open spaces in order to provide an economic  
18 advantage to agriculture. Even if these actions are implemented and in place today,  
19 development pressure within Western Riverside County is causing agricultural land  
20 to be used for providing homes and businesses. According to the California  
21 Department of Conservation's California Farmland Conversion Report 2015,  
22 Riverside County has been in the top two urbanizing counties for the 2008-2010 and  
23 2010-2012 Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) update cycles. The  
24 County has already determined, and this Project EIR concludes, that there are no  
25 additional feasible mitigation measures or policies listed in the Riverside County  
26 General Plan available to reduce direct or indirect adverse impacts to less than  
27 significant levels because a net loss of agricultural uses and Designated Farmland

1 will occur if the Project is approved. Therefore, because the proposed Project will  
2 contribute cumulatively to the loss of agricultural uses and Designated Farmland  
3 through conversion to non-agricultural uses, impacts are significant and unavoidable.  
4 (EIR, pp. 6.0-10–6.0-11; see also EIR Section 5.2.)

- 5 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7 will result in the conversion of fewer acres of Farmland  
6 than the proposed Project; however impacts with regard to the loss and conversion  
7 of Farmland and existing agricultural uses are cumulatively significant. (EIR Section  
8 6.0; pp. 7.0-32; 7.0-174.) Mitigation to reduce these impacts to less than significant  
9 is not feasible for the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion for the proposed  
10 Project and in the EIR; thus Alternative 7's impacts with regard to agricultural  
11 resources are cumulatively significant.

12 **C. Air Quality.**

13 **Cumulative Impact Finding:** Cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

- 14 a. Project – The geographical context for the analysis of air quality impacts is the South  
15 Coast Air Basin. The cumulative air quality impacts analysis is based on the guidance  
16 provided by SCAQMD. “As Lead Agency, SCAQMD uses the same significance  
17 thresholds for Project specific and cumulative impacts for all environmental topics  
18 analyzed in an Environmental Assessment or EIR. The only case where the  
19 significance thresholds for Project specific and cumulative impacts differ is the  
20 Hazard Index (HI) significance threshold for toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions.  
21 Projects that exceed the Project-specific significance thresholds are considered by  
22 the SCAQMD to be cumulatively considerable. This is the reason Project-specific  
23 and cumulative significance thresholds are the same. Conversely, projects that do not  
24 exceed the project-specific thresholds are generally not considered to be  
25 cumulatively significant.” (EIR, p. 6.0-13.)

26 With regard to construction impacts, because Project construction will result in an  
27 exceedance of SCAQMD mass daily significance thresholds for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO,  
28

1 and PM-2.5; the Project will have a cumulatively considerable impact for these  
2 emissions. (EIR, p. 6.0-13; see also EIR Section 6.0.)

3 With regard to operational emissions, because the Project exceeds the SCAQMD's  
4 recommended significance thresholds for VOC, NOx, CO, PM-10, and PM-2.5  
5 emissions, the Project will have a cumulatively considerable increase in these and  
6 impacts from Project operations are considered cumulatively significant. (EIR, p.  
7 6.0-14; see also EIR Section 5.3.)

8 With regard to toxic air contaminants (TACs), A Health Risk Assessment (HRA)  
9 was prepared for the Nutrilite facility and potential cancer health risks associated  
10 with the operations of the Nutrilite plant were found to be 3.92 in one million,  
11 significantly less than the 10 in one million threshold, and impacts are less than  
12 significant. These emissions will contribute to the overall cancer risk in the area but  
13 do not represent a cumulatively considerable contribution. Once the facility is closed,  
14 this cancer risk will cease to exist. Further, the analysis of estimated cancer risk  
15 impacts of the Ramona Expressway/Mid County Parkway on the Project site for the  
16 year 2035 indicate the areas within 900 feet of the northern edge and 1,300 feet of  
17 the southern edge of Ramona Expressway/Mid County Parkway are estimated to  
18 have a cancer risk greater than the SCAQMD significance threshold of ten in a  
19 million. However, the cancer risk is lower at the proposed school locations. These  
20 cancer risk values range from 8.8 in a million to 1.7 in a million at the proposed  
21 school sites. After implementation of MM AQ 5 and MM AQ 6, the diesel particulate  
22 matter (DPM) emissions from Ramona Expressway will be below the SCAQMD  
23 cancer risk threshold of 10 in one million. Therefore, the cumulative impact related  
24 to TACs is not considerable or significant. (EIR, p. 6.0-14; see also EIR Section 5.3.)

25 Because of the increased densities planned on the General Plan land use maps and  
26 stated desire for residential land uses to be developed close to both transit and  
27 commercial centers (to reduce vehicle miles travelled in the County), it can be  
28

1 assumed that both the construction and operation of commercial and industrial  
2 sources would occur relatively close to sensitive receptors. On a cumulative basis,  
3 impacts to sensitive receptors could be cumulatively considerable where more than  
4 one source emitter occurs in proximity to a sensitive receptor. Although this impact  
5 is considered cumulatively significant on a County-level, the specific Project  
6 conditions and design will not contribute significantly to health risks associated with  
7 toxic air contaminants. This is because potential cancer and non-cancer health risks  
8 associated with the Project can be reduced to a less than significant level. (EIR, pp.  
9 6.0-14-6.0-15; see also EIR Section 5.3.)

10 The General Plan's incremental contributions would also result in cumulatively  
11 considerable conflicts with the regional air quality plans (Res. 2015-259, p. 195).  
12 Thus, although implementation of greenhouse gas reduction measures would afford  
13 additional reductions in criteria air pollutants from the proposed Project, these  
14 measures would not reduce criteria pollutant impacts to below regulatory thresholds.  
15 For these reasons, impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project  
16 would remain significant and unavoidable with respect to regional air quality plans.  
17 (EIR, p. 6.0-15; see also EIR Section 5.3.)

- 18 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are less than the proposed Project and exceed  
19 the SCAQMD mass daily thresholds. (EIR Section 6.0; pp. 7.0-35–7.0-37; 7.0-174.)  
20 Alternative 7's impacts are cumulatively significant for the reasons set forth in the  
21 preceding discussion for the proposed Project and in the EIR.

22 **D. Biological Resources.**

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

- 24 a. Project – The geographical context for the analysis of cumulative biological impacts  
25 includes Western Riverside County and accounts for all anticipated cumulative  
26 growth within this geographic area as represented by full implementation of the  
27 County of Riverside General Plan and the related projects list in the EIR and includes  
28



1 a planning horizon through the next eleven to twenty years, which is within the  
2 twenty-five year planning horizon for the Western Riverside County Multiple  
3 Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). (EIR, p. 6.0-15; see also EIR Section  
4 5.4.)

5 Cumulative direct impacts from the Project include the loss of raptor foraging  
6 habitat, the loss of actual or potential burrowing owl habitat, the loss of habitat for  
7 Stephens' kangaroo rat and Los Angeles pocket mouse, impacts to jurisdictional  
8 waters, and impacts to wildlife movement. In particular, the Project has the potential  
9 to contribute to cumulative impacts on regional wildlife movement between the  
10 Lakeview Mountains and the San Jacinto Wildlife Area (SJWA). The Project will  
11 provide a minimum 1,500-foot-wide wildlife corridor that will be in compliance with  
12 MSHCP Proposed Constrained Linkage 20. The on-site corridor will extend from  
13 conserved portions of the Lakeview Mountains to the Ramona Expressway, west of  
14 Bridge Street. By providing this corridor, the Project will be consistent with the  
15 MSHCP goals for regional wildlife movement pertaining to PCL-20. As such,  
16 cumulative impacts to regional movement will be less than significant with the  
17 implementation of the on-site corridor. It is also the responsibility of the RCA and  
18 County to ensure that in conjunction with the proposed Project, other projects, and  
19 landowners the Proposed Constrained Linkage 20 is assembled in a manner that  
20 supports wildlife movement. (EIR, pp. 6.0-15–6.0-16; see also EIR Section 5.4.)

21 As public and private development, including construction of buildings, structures,  
22 infrastructure, and all alterations of the land that are implemented within areas that  
23 are outside of the Criteria Area are permitted under the Plan (see MSHCP Section  
24 2.3.7.1), cumulative impacts would be less than significant provided that the terms  
25 of the MSHCP are fully implemented. As discussed in Section 5.4, Biological  
26 Resources, completion of the HANS and JPR review processes, and the RCA and  
27 County EPD determinations that the Project complies with the Criteria Area and  
28

1 "Other Plan Requirements" of the MSHCP, including Sections 6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.3.2 and  
2 6.1.4, ensures that the Project will be consistent with the MSHCP. Section 5.4 (of  
3 this EIR) concludes that through compliance with the MSHCP, which includes  
4 payment of the MSHCP mitigation fees, the proposed Project will have less-than-  
5 significant cumulative impacts to MSHCP-covered species or related habitats. The  
6 Project complies with the requirements of the MSHCP and, thus, would not conflict  
7 with its adopted policies. Cumulative impacts to the 146 special-status species,  
8 including: sensitive natural communities and raptor foraging habitat, are fully  
9 addressed within the MSHCP and are considered less than significant. Therefore,  
10 because the Project implements the MSHCP and based on the above, the Project's  
11 contribution to cumulative impacts to MSHCP-covered resources is less than  
12 significant. (EIR, pp. 6.0-16; see also EIR Section 5.4.)

13 The only special status species that could be affected by the Project and that are not  
14 covered by the MSHCP include the paniculate tarplant, the coast patch-nosed snake,  
15 Rosy boa, San Bernardino ringneck snake, silvery legless lizard, western mastiff bat,  
16 California gull (winter), long-eared owl, short-eared owl, American badger, southern  
17 grasshopper mouse, and western yellow bat. Impacts to paniculate tarplant are  
18 considered cumulatively less than significant due to the low sensitivity of the species,  
19 its broad representation throughout the region surrounding the Project site, the  
20 species' low sensitivity (as indicated by the fact that a permit is not required for  
21 incidental take), and the Project's negligible impact relative to the larger population.  
22 (GLA1, pp. 52, 103) Impacts to the coast patch-nosed snake, Rosy boa, San  
23 Bernardino ringneck snake, silvery legless lizard, western mastiff bat, California gull  
24 (winter), long-eared owl, short-eared owl, American badger, southern grasshopper  
25 mouse, and western yellow bat are considered cumulatively less than significant  
26 because: (i) the majority of potentially suitable live in habitat for these species is  
27 located in the areas of the Lakeview Mountains designated as open space and (ii)  
28

1 these species are generally abundant in the region and there are no locally or  
2 regionally significant populations within the development footprint. For these  
3 reasons, direct impacts to Non-Covered MSHCP species are considered cumulatively  
4 less than significant. (EIR, pp. 6.0-16; see also EIR Section 5.4.)

5 Indirect impacts resulting from habitat modifications (i.e., vandalism, unauthorized  
6 trails, etc.) on any covered endangered, or threatened species, or on any species  
7 identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species through introduction of  
8 people from the Project and cumulative projects in the area are considered less than  
9 significant because the Project is consistent with the MSHCP and is subject to  
10 mitigation measures (MM Bio 1, 2, 3, 9, and 11) and conditions of approval which  
11 will ensure the indirect effects are mitigated. (EIR, pp. 6.0-17; see also EIR Section  
12 5.4.)

13 Cumulative indirect impacts to non-MSHCP covered resources are considered less  
14 than significant because the Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface,  
15 set forth in Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP that will also address indirect impacts to the  
16 non-covered species by ensuring that: (1) the quantity and quality of runoff  
17 discharged off the Project site is not altered in an adverse way when compared with  
18 existing conditions; (2) chemicals or bioproducts such as manure are used in such a  
19 way as to not affect off-site vegetation; (3) night lighting will not be directed off-  
20 site; (4) invasive species will not be used; (5) unauthorized public access will be  
21 minimize and (6) grading and land development will not extend into the Project's  
22 designated open space areas. (EIR, p. 6.0-17; see also EIR Section 5.4.)

23 With regard to the SKR HCP, the Project site is located within the boundary of the  
24 adopted SKR HCP but outside the established Core Reserves. Because the SKR HCP  
25 mitigates impacts from development on the SKR by establishing a network of  
26 preserves and a system for managing and monitoring them, projects outside of a Core  
27 Reserve obtains coverage under the HCP by payment of SKR fees. The MSHCP,  
28

1 through its goals for SKR, reaffirms the conservation goals of the SKR HCP, while  
2 expanding the coverage area outside of the original coverage boundaries of the SKR  
3 HCP. Since the SKR HCP is a regional program, payment of the appropriate SKR  
4 Fees provides mitigation for direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to the SKR.  
5 Thus, the Project's cumulative impacts are less than significant with regard to the  
6 SKR. (EIR, p. 6.0-17; see also EIR Section 5.4.)

7 The proposed Project, together with future improvements to the Ramona Expressway  
8 and Bridge Street, and additional landowner activities north of the Ramona  
9 Expressway located outside of the Project site, will have cumulative effects on  
10 wildlife movement between the Lakeview Mountains and Existing Core H. These  
11 projects and landowners, in conjunction with the proposed Project, are required to  
12 comply with the MSHCP, which will ensure that the Proposed Constrained Linkage  
13 20 is assembled in a manner that supports wildlife movement. The placement of this  
14 corridor coincides with a wildlife under-crossing proposed as part of the future  
15 County of Riverside's Mid County Parkway project. Connection from the northeast  
16 corner of the Project site to existing Core H would occur via PCL-20. The MSHCP  
17 acknowledges that the existing linkage is constrained due to existing agriculture and  
18 proposed road projects. However, the corridor proposed as part of this Project,  
19 combined with the under crossing proposed as part of the future Mid County Parkway  
20 project, relieves existing and future constraints for this linkage south of Ramona  
21 Expressway. Because the Project would contribute to assemblage of PCL-20,  
22 cumulative impacts to PCL-20 are less than significant. (EIR, p. 6.0-17; see also EIR  
23 Section 5.4.)

24 Although PCL-20 will provide a route for animal species to travel between the  
25 Lakeview Mountains and the San Jacinto River once assembled within the Project  
26 area, the corridor will be located adjacent to housing developments both within and  
27 outside the Project site. Development along the on-site PCL-20 corridor will have  
28

1 indirect effects on wildlife movement, such as drainage, toxics, lighting, noise,  
2 invasive species, barriers, and grading/land development. The Project will implement  
3 measures following the MSHCP urban/wildland interface guidelines to address  
4 indirect effects on wildlife movement, which may include barrier placement, sign  
5 erection, lighting restrictions, and vegetation restrictions, as required in mitigation  
6 measures MM Bio 1, MM Bio 2, MM Bio 3, Mm Bio 9, MM Bio 10, and MM Bio  
7 11. Compliance with the urban/wildland interface guidelines and conditions of  
8 approval, implementation of mitigation measures, and assemblage of the planned  
9 wildlife corridor with future projects, will reduce cumulative impacts to wildlife  
10 movement. Therefore, indirect cumulative edge effects from Project impacts are  
11 considered less than significant. (EIR, p. 6.0-17; see also EIR Section 5.4.)

12 The Project will contribute to cumulative effects on the San Jacinto River and the  
13 SJWA due to edge effects such as lighting, noise, invasive species, and barriers. The  
14 Project will implement measures following the urban/wildland interface guidelines  
15 which include barrier placement along Marvin Road and between park and  
16 conservation areas on-site, signs, lighting restrictions, and vegetation restrictions, as  
17 required by mitigation measures MM Bio 1, MM Bio 2, MM Bio 3, MM Bio 9, MM  
18 Bio 10 and MM Bio 11. With compliance with the urban/wildland interface  
19 guidelines, development of the planned wildlife corridor with future development  
20 Project compliance, compliance with conditions of approval, and implementation of  
21 mitigation measures, cumulative impacts to the SJWA will be reduced to less than  
22 significant. (EIR, p. 6.0-18.)

23 With respect to nesting birds, the take permit for the MSHCP also constitutes a  
24 Special Purpose Permit for take of those Covered Species Adequately Conserved that  
25 are listed as threatened or endangered under the Federal ESA and protected by the  
26 MBTA. Species not covered by the MSHCP are still protected by the MBTA.  
27 Through compliance with the MHSCP and MBTA and implementation of mitigation  
28

1 measures MM Bio 5 and MM Bio 6, which require surveys for nesting species as  
2 well as a restriction on construction activities if nests are found during the breeding  
3 season, cumulative impacts to nesting migratory birds would be reduced to less than  
4 significant. (EIR, p. 6.0-18; see also EIR Section 5.4.)

5 The proposed Project will avoid all state and federal jurisdictional waters and will  
6 impact approximately 1.37 acres of unvegetated ephemeral watercourses.  
7 Construction of offsite infrastructure may affect roadside and agricultural ditches that  
8 could be subject to the jurisdiction of the USACE, Regional Board, and/or CDFW.  
9 The Project will mitigate on-site impacts to jurisdictional waters at a minimum 3:1  
10 ratio and off-site impacts at a minimum 1:1 ratio as required by mitigation measure  
11 MM Bio 8. Mitigation measure MM Bio 7 requires authorization from the  
12 appropriate regulatory agencies (i.e., Section 404 permit from the US Army Corps  
13 of Engineers, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Board,  
14 and/or a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from California Department  
15 of Fish and Wildlife) prior to issuance of a grading permit for any parcel that will  
16 impact jurisdictional resources. Through the regulatory permitting process,  
17 mitigation will be identified and made a condition of the permits so impacts to  
18 jurisdictional features will be reduced to less than significant levels. Mitigation  
19 measure MM Bio 9 requires that the detention basin adjacent to the MWD aqueduct  
20 be designed to closely mimic the existing conditions to the wetland area. Through  
21 permit conditions and the design of the on-site detention basin, the Project's  
22 cumulative impacts to jurisdictional waters will be reduced to less than significant.  
23 (EIR, p. 6.0-15; see also EIR Section 5.4.)

- 24 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7 has a reduced development footprint north of Ramona  
25 Expressway, which reduces impacts from new development and increases the  
26 amount of Conservation Habitat (47 acres) in comparison to the proposed Project (29  
27 acres) and would not increase the length of the future wildlife crossing at Ramona  
28

1 Expressway for Proposed Constrained Linkage (PCL) 20 in comparison to the  
2 proposed Project. Alternative 7 would impact fewer acres of MSHCP  
3 riparian/riverine areas, biological resources than the proposed Project. Alternative  
4 7's impacts with regard to LAPM, CAPSSA species, SKR, and other special-status  
5 wildlife species are similar to the proposed Project and less than significant.  
6 Cumulative impacts to raptor foraging would be similar to the proposed Project.  
7 Overall, impacts to biological resources on the Alternative 7 site will be similar to or  
8 less than the proposed Project and are mitigated to below the level of significance  
9 through participation in the MSHCP, project-specific mitigation pursuant to  
10 MSHCP, and mitigation measures. MM Bio 1 through MM Bio 11 (except for MM  
11 Bio 3b), MM Bio 11a, 11b, and MM Bio 12 through 15. (EIR Section 6.0; pp. 7.0-  
12 38-7.0-42; 7.0-174.) Therefore, impacts to biological resources resulting from  
13 Alternative 7 are not cumulatively considerable.

14 **E. Cultural and Paleontological Resources.**

15 **Cumulative Impact Finding:** Cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

- 16 a. Project – Cultural resources impacts are site-specific with respect to any given  
17 resource. Cumulatively, then, impacts that may be considered cumulative simply  
18 relate to the loss of cultural resources in general over time throughout the region.  
19 Since most cultural resources occur below ground (particularly paleontological  
20 resources, which are heavily geology-dependent), most cultural resources remain  
21 unknown and undiscovered until uncovered by ground-disturbing activity.  
22 Cumulatively considerable impacts will occur as Riverside County grows pursuant  
23 to the General Plan and the removal or destruction of cultural resources cannot be  
24 guaranteed to be reduced to less than significant levels even with mitigation due to  
25 the unknown nature of the extent, location, and cultural significance of such  
26 resources. Therefore, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors found in approving  
27 the General Plan EIR that “there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives  
28

1 that the Board could adopt at this time which would reduce this impact to a less-than-  
2 significant level. This impact, therefore, remains significant and immitigable.” (EIR,  
3 p. 6.0-18–6.0-19.)

4 As discussed in EIR Section 5.5, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, the  
5 proposed Project will have some impacts related to cultural resources. Specifically,  
6 with implementation of the mitigation measures recommended, potential direct and  
7 indirect adverse impacts to historical-period site RIV-8710H and all but three of the  
8 identified prehistoric sites (CA-RIV-397, CA-RIV-806, and portions of CA-RIV-  
9 8712) will be mitigated to below a level of significance. Indirect adverse impacts to  
10 rock art features at CA-RIV-397, CA-RIV-8712 (Loci A and B), and rock shelter at  
11 CA-RIV-806 resulting from changes in the integrity of setting, feeling, and  
12 association, as well as indirect impacts such as possible vandalism and illicit artifact  
13 collection from preservation areas, cannot be fully mitigated and will remain as  
14 significant adverse impacts to cultural resources even after implementation of the  
15 CRMP which is required in MM Cultural 1. (EIR, p. 6.0-19; see also EIR Section  
16 5.5.)

17 Additionally, indirect impacts resulting from human activity, such as theft,  
18 disturbance, or vandalism can be cumulative in the sense that population growth in  
19 an area places more people in proximity to such resources. Potential future  
20 development projects within the vicinity of the Project and in adjacent cities and  
21 unincorporated county will increase human activity in and through the Project area.  
22 (EIR, p. 6.0-19; see also EIR Section 5.5.)

23 Paleontological resources may be considered cumulative simply as they relate to the  
24 loss of resources in general over time throughout the region. No fossils have been  
25 found or recorded from the Project site. However, fossil remains have been found  
26 approximately 15 feet below the surface at least one mile from the site. Grading is  
27 expected to be below 4 feet of depth to almost 25 feet of depth. Therefore, potential  
28



1 to find fossils within portions of the site is high. Impacts related to destroying unique  
2 paleontological resources or sites are potentially significant. However, by  
3 implementing mitigation measures MM Paleontology 1 and MM Paleontology 2,  
4 potential impacts related to finding unknown paleontological resources will be  
5 reduced to a less than significant level. (EIR, p. 6.0-16; see also EIR Section 5.5.)  
6 Implementation of the proposed Project, build-out of the General Plan, and other  
7 related projects would have cumulative effects similar to the cumulative impacts  
8 described by the County in approving the 2015 GP. The proposed Project will  
9 introduce approximately 36,434 new residents and 1,190 employment opportunities  
10 at the Project site. With buildout of the General Plan, other development projects in  
11 the Lakeview/Nuevo area will generate residents and employment opportunities. As  
12 mentioned previously, the Project will also have significant affects to a few cultural  
13 sites, even with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, because cumulative impacts to  
14 cultural resources from this growth are potentially significant, and because the  
15 General Plan also identified such impacts as cumulatively significant with only the  
16 build-out of the General Plan land uses taken into consideration, the Project's  
17 contribution to cumulative resources is considerable and therefore significant and  
18 unavoidable. (EIR, p. 6.0-18–6.0-19; see also EIR Section 5.5.)

- 19 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7 would result in a significant and unavoidable indirect  
20 impact to the same three prehistoric archaeological sites and require the same  
21 mitigation measures as the proposed Project, with revisions for the 6 resources that  
22 would be impacted differently under Alternative 7 due to the different Land Use Plan.  
23 However, these impacts of Alternative 7 would be less than the proposed Project as  
24 4 resources (CA-RIV-4156/H, -8698, -8702, -8706) would be preserved in place in  
25 their entirety with an SPP, instead of being directly impacted and requiring a DRP as  
26 under the proposed project; 1 resource (CA-RIV-1842) would be partially preserved  
27 in place with an SPP, instead of the full site being directly impacted requiring a DRP  
28

1 as under the proposed Project; and as fewer acres of CA-RIV-8712 would be directly  
2 impacted (6.68 acres directly impacted under Alternative 7 instead of 11.7 acres  
3 under the proposed Project). Even though Alternative 7 will have fewer impacts to  
4 cultural resources than the proposed Project, these impacts are still considered  
5 significant and unavoidable. (EIR Section 6.0; pp. 7.0-42–7.0-53; 7.0-175.) Thus,  
6 Alternative 7's cumulative impacts are significant.

7 **F. Geology and Soils.**

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

9 a. Project – Geologic hazards are localized by nature, as they are related to the soils and  
10 geologic character of a particular site. Cumulative impacts could occur related to an  
11 earthquake, if the magnitude of the quake and location of the fault(s) traversed the  
12 region. The proposed Project site is not located within a state-designated or county-  
13 designated fault zone and the closest fault is the Casa Loma Fault, approximately 0.5  
14 miles to the north and northeast of the Project site's eastern boundary. Additionally,  
15 the proposed Project will be constructed in accordance with all applicable building  
16 codes to incorporate measures to guard against ground shaking hazards. Therefore,  
17 although cumulative impacts due to groundshaking associated with General Plan  
18 buildout will be significant and unavoidable, the Project will not significantly  
19 contribute to these risks due to its location and incorporation of earthquake safety  
20 measures to reduce risks due to groundshaking to less than significant on a Project-  
21 specific level. (EIR, pp. 6.0-19–6.0-20; see also EIR Section 5.6.)

22 Similarly, there is a low risk of landslides in the proposed Project development area  
23 and the Project will include a buffer zone between proposed development areas and  
24 slopes in the Project vicinity. Thus, there is a low risk that landslides could extend  
25 from the mountains and through the buffer zone into proposed residential,  
26 commercial, or related Project locations. Therefore, although cumulative County-  
27 wide buildout of the General Plan will result in significant and unavoidable impacts  
28

1 due to landslide risks, the proposed Project will not contribute significantly to these  
2 impacts. (EIR, p. 6.0-20; see also EIR Section 5.6.)

3 Subsurface methane generation is possible in some locations within the proposed  
4 Specific Plan area and methane accumulation is a concern after grading activities.  
5 However, pursuant to the County of Riverside protocol, post grading sampling and  
6 analysis would be conducted no sooner than 30 days after grading in order to fully  
7 understand the impacts of methane accumulation on site. This protocol is applied to  
8 all other projects in the area. Therefore, this potential impact can be mitigated to less  
9 than significant levels through implementation of mitigation measures and these  
10 Project-specific impacts will not contribute to a cumulatively significant impact.  
11 (EIR, p. 6.0-20; see also EIR Section 5.6.)

- 12 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are similar to the proposed Project and are  
13 less than significant for the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion for the  
14 proposed Project and in the EIR. (EIR Section 6.0; pp. 7.0-54; 7.0-175.) Thus,  
15 impacts are not cumulatively considerable.

16 **G. Hazards and Hazardous Waste.**

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

- 18 a. Project – Cumulative impact analysis for hazards and hazardous waste considers  
19 development of the proposed Project in conjunction build-out of the Riverside  
20 County General Plan and impacts analyzed in the certified General Plan EIR. Other  
21 than transport and groundwater contamination, risks associated with hazardous  
22 materials are largely site specific and localized, and are thus limited to the Project  
23 site. Additionally, site-specific investigations would be conducted at sites where  
24 contaminated soils or groundwater could occur to minimize the exposure of workers  
25 to hazardous substances. Due to prohibitions on development (and/or strict  
26 remediation requirements) for contaminated sites, the incremental effects would not  
27 be cumulatively considerable for any of the 2015 GP buildout scenarios. As such,  
28

1 the potential for cumulative impacts to occur is limited. (EIR, pp. 6.0-20-21; see also  
2 EIR Section 5.7.)

3 Although each development site has potentially unique hazardous materials  
4 considerations, it is expected that future growth will generally comply with the range  
5 of federal, state, and local statutes and regulations applicable to hazardous materials,  
6 and will be subject to existing and future programs of enforcement by the appropriate  
7 regulatory agencies. Thus, the Project will not be subject to existing impacts nor will  
8 it be exposed to future impacts. For these reasons, cumulative impacts resulting from  
9 the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials, would be less than significant.  
10 Consequently, because the Project and all cumulative projects within the County and  
11 surrounding jurisdictions must comply with federal, state and local regulations, the  
12 proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts associated with hazards and  
13 hazardous materials would be less than cumulatively considerable, and thus, less than  
14 significant. (EIR, p. 6.0-20; see also EIR Section 5.7.)

15 With regard to the risk of wildfire threat, build out according to the 2015 GP would  
16 reduce the amount of developed uses within interface/wildland areas and increase  
17 the amount of vacant and open space land. These changes, however, would be offset  
18 by increased development of urban/suburban and public facility uses in state  
19 responsibility areas (SRAs) and local responsibility areas (LRAs). The incremental  
20 contributions of each of these increases are individually minor. However, given the  
21 significant wildland fire hazards already associated with GP buildout, even these  
22 increases would be cumulatively considerable despite implementation of mitigation.  
23 (EIR, p. 6.0-21.)

24 As discussed in Section 5.7 of this EIR, the proposed Project does not include areas  
25 where residences are intermixed with wildlands and is designed to include substantial  
26 setbacks from the Lakeview Mountains and the SJWA, which decrease proposed  
27 development area exposure to locations near sites where wildland fires would be  
28