

1 most likely to occur. With implementation of mitigation measures MM Hazards-Fire  
2 5 and MM Hazards-Fire 6, Project-specific potential impacts related to exposure of  
3 people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland  
4 fires is less than significant. Therefore, although County-wide development will  
5 result in cumulatively considerable increases in wildland fire risk, the proposed  
6 Project will not contribute significantly to this phenomenon and cumulative impacts  
7 related to wildland fire risk is considered less than significant. (EIR, p. 6.0-21; see  
8 also EIR Section 5.7.)

- 9 b. Alternative 7 - Alternative 7's impacts are similar to the proposed Project (EIR  
10 Section 6.0; pp. 7.0-56; 7.0-175.) and are not cumulatively considerable for the  
11 reasons set forth in the preceding discussion for the proposed Project and in the EIR.

#### 12 **H. Hydrology and Water Quality.**

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

- 14 a. Project – The geographic context for the Hydrology and Water Quality cumulative  
15 impact analysis is the San Jacinto Watershed and the Eastern Municipal Water  
16 District (EMWD) service area, including all anticipated cumulative growth within  
17 this geographic area as represented by full implementation of the General Plan and  
18 related projects. The Project is within the San Jacinto Watershed. The main drainage  
19 within the San Jacinto watershed is the San Jacinto River. As discussed in Section  
20 5.8, Hydrology/Water Quality, three future projects, both upstream and downstream  
21 of THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW, are in the planning stages which may have  
22 cumulative effects: the San Jacinto River Stage 4 Project (San Jacinto area), the San  
23 Jacinto River Stage 3 Project (Perris Valley area), and the San Jacinto River Gap  
24 Project (SJWA vicinity). These projects assess the alignments of the San Jacinto  
25 River to convey various level storm events while considering influences of several  
26 other factors such as biological resources, hydrologic conditions, and hydraulic  
27 requirements. (EIR, pp. 6.0-521–6.0-22; also see EIR Section 5.8.)  
28

1 Cumulatively, these three projects will address flooding problems, water quality,  
2 sedimentation, and erosion issues through the reaches of the San Jacinto River most  
3 directly related to the Project. Cumulatively, reduced flooding through agriculture,  
4 especially dairy lands, will reduce waste and pesticide contamination of local surface  
5 waters. Impacts of these river projects on sensitive plant and animal species are being  
6 evaluated through the environmental review process under CEQA and the MSHCP.  
7 Preliminary planning has been conducted for the Stage 3 and Gap projects, however  
8 project proponents are not actively moving forward with these projects including  
9 preparation of MSHCP compliance and CEQA documentation. (EIR, p. 6.0-22.)

10 Because none of the three river projects are complete at this time, the existing  
11 conditions of the San Jacinto River and its related watershed is used for evaluation  
12 of cumulative impacts of the proposed Project. Because the Project has designed its  
13 drainage and water quality management systems in such a way as to meet the current  
14 hydrological needs of the natural areas located north of the Project, the direction to  
15 which on-site drainage flows, while maintaining flexibility for the future should  
16 conditions change slightly as a result of these cumulative San Jacinto River projects,  
17 cumulative impacts to the San Jacinto River and SJWA are less than significant.  
18 (EIR, p. 6.0-22; see also EIR Section 5.8.)

19 With regard to cumulative impacts to water quality, the Santa Ana Regional Water  
20 Quality Control Board (SARWQCB) has issued a National Pollutant Discharge  
21 Elimination System (NPDES) permit (MS4 permit) to the Riverside County Flood  
22 Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD) for storm water discharges  
23 (Order No. 2010-0033, NPDES No. CAS 618033; Santa Ana Regional Water Quality  
24 Control Board). RCFC&WCD has prepared a storm water management program  
25 addressing requirements for meeting this NPDES permit. All development and future  
26 development must obtain coverage under the NPDES permit. RCFC&WCD reviews  
27 all plans and developments for compliance with existing ordinances (e.g., grading  
28

1 ordinance) and storm water management program requirements. A Water Quality  
2 Management Plan (WQMP) for Urban Runoff from New Development and  
3 Significant Redevelopment was adopted by the SARWQCB. This includes the  
4 preparation of a site-specific WQMP that will identify Best Management Practices  
5 (BMPs) to ensure that water quality of receiving waters is not degraded following  
6 development. Thus, while continued growth is anticipated to occur, new  
7 developments (and significant re-development) will have to comply with these  
8 regulations and implement construction and operational BMPs to minimize pollutant  
9 transport. BMPs are also required to minimize vectors. (EIR, p. 5.0-22; see also EIR  
10 Section 5.8.)

11 The Project proposes all development-generated runoff generated west of the wildlife  
12 corridor to be conveyed along proposed curb and/or gutters to storm collection inlet  
13 points for further conveyance via proposed storm drain systems to the regional  
14 treatment control BMP Water Quality Basin (WQB) in the northwest portion of the  
15 Project site. The proposed WQB will address the management of the Project's on-  
16 site water quality to protect receiving waters and of the Project on-site runoff quality  
17 by functioning as a treatment control BMP to meet the requirements of the MS4  
18 permit at the Project site. (EIR, pp. 6.0-22-6.0-23; see also EIR Section 5.8.)

19 Runoff generated in the developed and undeveloped areas located east of the wildlife  
20 corridor will be collected in a similar fashion to the western areas of the Project, but  
21 will be treated to meet water quality standards within Planning Area 77. Thus,  
22 through implementation of the designed WQB and overall WQMP, other design  
23 considerations such as open space preservation, parks and tree planting, an increase  
24 of the floodplain storage capacity, and adherence to NPDES requirements, the  
25 Project will achieve infiltration rates to the maximum extent practicable, maintain  
26 historic storm flows, and take into consideration localized runoff as the Project builds  
27 out, thus minimization of runoff will be achieved. As analyzed in Section 5.8,  
28

1 potential exceedance of water quality standards and criteria, substantial contribution  
2 of pollutants to receiving waterbodies, and other potential causes of water quality  
3 degradation will be minimal and monitoring and reporting programs will ensure that  
4 the storm water management program is adequately protecting water quality or will  
5 be adjusted to meet water quality protection goals. Therefore, the Project's  
6 cumulative contribution related to impacts to water quality degradation, standards,  
7 and environmental effects, such as vectors and objectionable odors, either through  
8 direct pollutant loading or erosion, is not cumulatively considerable and is less than  
9 significant. (EIR, pp. 6.0-22-6.0-23.)

10 With regard to drainage, storm water flow and flood potential will increase as  
11 development results in greater amounts of impervious surfaces and channelization  
12 for conveyance of peak flows. However, RCFC&WCD's Lakeview/Nuevo Master  
13 Drainage Plan (MDP) guides and governs local and regional hydrology and hydraulic  
14 modifications and was planned assuming a full build-out scenario. All development  
15 within the County of Riverside and the San Jacinto Watershed must comply with the  
16 requirements of the NPDES permit, RCFC&WCD storm water management plan,  
17 Lakeview/Nuevo MDP, and other pertinent local drainage and conveyance  
18 ordinances. Existing regulations effectively minimize potential impacts to flow  
19 conveyance and flooding and have incorporated necessary elements in the  
20 Lakeview/Nuevo MDP. The Project proponents have also agreed with RCFC&WCD  
21 to construct the Lakeview Dam Lateral D line and training dike components of the  
22 Lakeview/Nuevo MDP. Accordingly, the Project-related contribution to impacts  
23 associated with storm water flow conveyance and flood potential would not be  
24 cumulatively considerable, and are not significant. (EIR, p. 6.0-23; see also EIR  
25 Section 5.8.)

26 With regard to a change in drainage patterns, after Project development, on-site  
27 generated runoff will be conveyed to the proposed finished surfaces along proposed  
28

1 curb and/or gutters to storm collection inlet points for further conveyance via the  
2 proposed storm drain system. The low-flows from the WQB will have velocities  
3 below the levels that could cause significant scour or erosion of the downstream  
4 existing on-site channel. Although most surface runoff from the site under existing  
5 conditions eventually reaches the river channel, the Project's drainage system will  
6 deliver runoff more efficiently to the river. As a result, the total average annual  
7 volume discharged from the proposed Project area will increase from 812 acre-feet  
8 to 1,086 acre-feet, or by approximately 34 percent. The majority of the runoff  
9 volumes, including flows above current average levels, will be delivered to the San  
10 Jacinto River as low-velocity and volume flows from the WQB and will not cause  
11 any hydrologic conditions of concern (HCOCs). The Project site represents  
12 approximately 0.6 percent of the 728 square mile San Jacinto River watershed.  
13 Therefore, the Project's incremental increase in surface runoff will not have a  
14 significant effect on river erosion, siltation or other HCOCs. Because the Project's  
15 impacts to siltation and erosion are less than significant, the Project will also not  
16 contribute towards a cumulative impact related to siltation or erosion on- or off-site.  
17 (EIR, pp. 6.0-236.0-24; also see EIR Section 5.8.)

18 Within the Project area, surface runoff will be collected within the primary storm  
19 drain facilities which will be constructed as part of, and in conjunction with, the  
20 Project. The Project's Drainage Plan utilizes streets, underground storm drains, open  
21 channels, debris basins, and detention basins to collect the on-site and tributary off-  
22 site storm water, for conveyance north to the San Jacinto River floodplain area. These  
23 facilities are sized to accommodate developed 100-year storm runoff volumes to  
24 protect the Project site from potential flood risks. The proposed Project will not  
25 generate peak period off-site flows that would result in flooding on or off site. The  
26 proposed Project will not significantly affect existing drainage patterns and will  
27 continue to maintain approximately the same pre-development 100-year flow  
28

1 management capacity under post-development conditions. As a result, the Project  
2 will not significantly contribute to cumulative drainage impacts that could result in  
3 substantial flooding on- or off-site. Therefore, the Project will also not cumulatively  
4 contribute to changes in drainage absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface  
5 runoff in the region, and these potential impacts are less than significant. (EIR, p.  
6 6.0-24; also see EIR Section 5.8.)

7 Buildout of any of the General Plan scenarios would result in incremental  
8 development of vacant lands within Riverside County. The addition of impervious  
9 surfaces from such development would incrementally increase stormwater runoff  
10 within the affected watersheds. In some areas, existing drainage facilities may not be  
11 adequate to accommodate the increase, leading to cumulatively significant impacts  
12 to existing stormwater drainage facilities or triggering the need for new facilities.  
13 Thus, impacts at the General Plan level in this regard would be cumulatively  
14 considerable even with implementation of all applicable federal, State, and County  
15 regulations, laws, ordinances, General Plan policies, and all feasible mitigation.  
16 Although impacts will be cumulatively considerable at the County-level, Project-  
17 related impacts related to drainage and water quality will be less than significant for  
18 the reasons stated above and the proposed Project will not contribute cumulatively  
19 significant impacts to these issues. (EIR, p. 6.0-24; see also EIR Section 5.8.)

20 With regard to groundwater supply and recharge, EMWD monitors and manages  
21 groundwater in the Project area and has implemented measures designed to minimize  
22 groundwater use and impacts as development occurs in, near, and within the region  
23 surrounding the Project. The Project will result in reduced groundwater use and the  
24 closure of existing groundwater wells on the site currently used for agricultural  
25 irrigation. This reduction in groundwater demand within the Project area is consistent  
26 with EMWD groundwater management objectives, which generally seek to reduce  
27 the use of, and pumping from, regional aquifers to sustainable levels and to meet  
28

1 future demands by managing imported surface water supplies purchased from the  
2 Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). Most of the EMWD  
3 water supply will be provided from imported surface water, or banked imported  
4 water, and the Project will not be served by groundwater wells located near the site.  
5 Because the Project's water demand will have no impact on local groundwater wells  
6 and supplies, the Project will not contribute towards cumulatively significant  
7 depletion or degradation of local and regional groundwater supplies, However, the  
8 prolonged drought that the State is facing and the emergency mandates called for by  
9 Governor Brown and the reductions required for water suppliers including EMWD,  
10 at a cumulative level impacts to water supply are significant and unavoidable.(EIR,  
11 p. 6.0-24; see also EIR Section 5.8.)

12 Future development accommodated by the land use and policy changes associated  
13 with the 2015 GP would increase the County population, triggering an increased  
14 reliance on groundwater sources. The combination of increased demand for water  
15 associated with the growth envisioned by the 2015 GP, uncertainty and cost of  
16 imported water supply, uncertainty of long-term supply scenarios in non-adjudicated  
17 basins, exploitation of new groundwater sources and the continuing pattern of basin  
18 overdraft would all result in or contribute incrementally to substantially decreasing  
19 water supplies. Thus, even with incorporation of General Plan policies, cumulative  
20 impacts to groundwater and groundwater recharge would remain significant and  
21 unavoidable. (EIR, pp. 6.0-24–6.0-25.)

22 The proposed Project will maintain the same or greater amount of recharge area  
23 within the floodplain of the San Jacinto River as currently exists and will not  
24 contribute to a cumulatively significant loss of groundwater recharge land within the  
25 river floodplain. As discussed the Section 5.8, Hydrology/Water Quality, the Project  
26 will also not adversely affect the water quality of runoff that would percolate into the  
27 regional aquifer primarily in the river floodplain recharge areas. Therefore, the  
28

1 Project will not contribute towards a cumulatively significant impairment of  
2 groundwater recharge water quality. (EIR, p. 6.0-25; see also EIR Section 5.8.)

3 With regard to flood and inundation risks, the proposed Project will not affect the  
4 flood retention capacity of the 100-year floodplain area within the Project area and  
5 will not contribute towards cumulatively significant regional flood flow restrictions  
6 or changes in the direction or location of flooding flows that could expose people or  
7 structures to a significant risk of flood-related impacts. The Project proponents have  
8 agreed with RCFC&WCD to implement certain portions of the MDP for the San  
9 Jacinto watershed that will contribute towards improved flood risk management  
10 within the region. (EIR, p. 6.0-25; see also EIR Section 5.8.)

11 A portion of the Project site is located within the dam inundation zone for the East  
12 Dam of the Diamond Valley Reservoir. This potential inundation zone is based on  
13 the assumed instantaneous failure of the dam, an event that is highly unlikely to  
14 occur. The engineering and risk analysis for the dam determined that the annual  
15 probability of an instantaneous failure and associated inundation risk is 1 in 100  
16 million under an assumed seismic load that would exceed the maximum credible  
17 earthquake intensity for the region. As a result, the Project does not cumulatively  
18 contribute towards a significant dam inundation risk. (EIR, p. 6.0-25; see also EIR  
19 Section 5.8.)

- 20 b. Alternative 7 - Alternative 7's impacts are similar to the proposed Project (EIR,  
21 Section 6.0; pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176) and are not cumulatively considerable for the  
22 reasons set forth in the preceding discussion for the proposed Project and in the EIR.

23 **I. Land Use and Planning.**

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

- 25 a. Project – Under the 2015 GP, the Project site's land use designations are the same as  
26 under the previously adopted 2003 GP. Additionally, the surrounding land use  
27 designations under the 2015 GP are the same as under the previously adopted LNAP  
28



1 with the exception of the proposed Northeast Business Park Overlay, which abuts  
2 the eastern Project site boundaries located north of Ramona Expressway as discussed  
3 in Section 5.9 – Land Use of this EIR. (EIR, p. 6.0-25; see also EIR Section 5.9.)

4 Without mitigation, potential significant adverse impacts related to adjacent cities,  
5 zoning on site, consistency with General Plan Land Use Element intent, and dividing  
6 an existing community, were found to be less than significant. With the  
7 implementation of mitigation measures, potential significant adverse impacts related  
8 to compatibility between the Project and surrounding agricultural land and rural  
9 residences (MM Land Use 1 and Land Use 2), and the inclusion of public art in the  
10 Project (MM Land Use 3), are reduced to less than significant. (EIR, p. 6.0-25; see  
11 also EIR Section 5.9.)

12 Cumulatively, THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Project is one of several proposed  
13 development projects that will impact existing and proposed land uses and  
14 potentially result in land use compatibility issues within the Lakeview/Nuevo area  
15 and along the Ramona Expressway corridor between the cities of San Jacinto and  
16 Perris. Similar impacts will result from these projects as from the proposed Project  
17 with respect to changes caused to existing land uses, loss of agriculture, and impacts  
18 to open space and rural character. Those other projects that are located closer to the  
19 I-215, will have lesser commutes than the Project. THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW  
20 includes 11,350 dwelling units, and represents approximately 40 percent of the total  
21 build-out projections for the 2015 Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan without accounting  
22 for the Community Development Overlay, and 39 percent with the Community  
23 Development Overlay. As a result, VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW will contribute  
24 considerably to the overall new development along the Ramona Expressway corridor  
25 and in the general vicinity. The VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW would be consistent with  
26 the General Plan if the proposed General Plan amendments being processed as part  
27 of proposed Project are adopted. (EIR, pp. 6.0-25–6.0-26; see also EIR Section 5.10.)

1 SCAG has also determined the Project is consistent with the regional growth  
2 objectives of the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities  
3 Strategy. Because the Project is consistent with the General Plan, as amended, the  
4 Project's contribution to cumulative impacts is considered less than significant. (EIR,  
5 p. 6.0-26; see also EIR Section 5.9.)

- 6 b. Alternative 7 - Alternative 7's impacts are similar to the proposed Project (EIR  
7 Section 6.0; pp. 7.0-57; 7.0-176) and are not cumulatively considerable for the  
8 reasons set forth in the preceding discussion for the proposed Project and in the EIR.

9 **J. Noise.**

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

- 11 a. Project – Cumulative noise impacts result when the vehicles and human activity of  
12 this Project's residents are added to the other reasonably foreseeable projects in the  
13 area. The analysis of traffic noise in the Future (2035) Condition and Future (2035)  
14 with Proposed Project scenarios (except for the Existing [2013] with Proposed  
15 Project scenario) includes data from cumulative projects that were provided by  
16 Riverside County and the various cities within the Project study area (i.e., cities of  
17 Hemet, Moreno Valley, Perris, Riverside, and San Jacinto). Thus, the anticipated  
18 noise increases reflect the Project and cumulative projects. (EIR, p. 6.0-26; see also  
19 EIR Section 5.10.)

20 Future development accommodated by the General Plan would result in cumulatively  
21 considerable increases in ambient noise levels and in the number of people and noise-  
22 sensitive land uses exposed to substantial noise levels. It would also incrementally  
23 increase ambient noise levels throughout the County to cumulatively considerable  
24 levels in some places where regulatory and mitigation measures are insufficient to  
25 reduce noise impacts. These measures would likely be sufficient when applied to  
26 new development, such as the proposed Project. (EIR, p. 6.0-26; see also EIR Section  
27 5.10.)

1 No roadway segments will experience a noise increase greater than 5 dBA in 2035  
2 after Project build-out. However, the proposed Project would have potentially  
3 significant long-term traffic noise impacts if there is a 5 dBA or greater increase from  
4 Existing (2013) Condition to Future (2035) Condition, and the Project makes a noise  
5 contribution to that segment (even if the Project's contribution is less than 5 dBA).  
6 Based on that parameter, the following segments will experience such an increase  
7 (the Project's contribution ranges from 0.5 dBA to 1.6 dBA): Ramona Expressway  
8 from Lakeview Avenue to Hansen Avenue; Ramona Expressway from Hansen  
9 Avenue to 5th Street; Ramona Expressway from 5th Street to 3rd Street; Ramona  
10 Expressway from 3rd Street to Bridge Street; Ramona Expressway from Bridge  
11 Street to Warren Road; 9th Street from Lakeview Avenue to Yucca Avenue; 10th  
12 Street from Reservoir Avenue to Lakeview Avenue; Reservoir Avenue from 9th  
13 Street to 10th Street; and Bridge Street from Ramona Expressway to Gilman Springs  
14 Road. (EIR, p. 6.0-26; see also EIR Section 5.10.)

15 As the Project plus the cumulative projects data have already been analyzed, and it  
16 was determined that no feasible or practical mitigation measures can be implemented  
17 to reduce the cumulative off-site traffic noise impact to a less than significant level,  
18 cumulative impacts will be significant and unavoidable regarding a substantial  
19 permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity. It should be noted  
20 that significant and unavoidable cumulative on-site traffic noise impacts will not  
21 result as the Project will incorporate façade enhancements and sound walls, where  
22 appropriate, to ensure exterior and interior noise levels are not substantial at noise-  
23 sensitive receptors and outdoor living areas as required by mitigation measures MM  
24 Noise 1 through MM Noise 9. These measures were developed taking into account  
25 cumulative projects. Moreover, cumulative impacts to long-term stationary noises  
26 will not be significant as other projects are required to comply with applicable noise  
27  
28

1 standards for stationary sources as the proposed Project. (EIR, pp. 6.0-26–6.0-27; see  
2 also EIR Section 5.10.)

3 With regard to cumulative impacts to a substantial temporary or periodic increase in  
4 ambient noise levels, the proposed Project’s contribution to this impact will be  
5 experienced during construction. However, mitigation measures MM Noise 11  
6 through MM Noise 17 will ensure temporary construction noise impacts will not be  
7 significant. Moreover, it is highly unlikely that construction of other projects in the  
8 vicinity will occur simultaneously with the Project’s construction so as to  
9 cumulatively contribute to a substantial noise impact. Thus, cumulatively  
10 considerable impacts to this threshold will not result even though the 2015 GP EIR  
11 determined that development pursuant to the General Plan would result in  
12 cumulatively considerable temporary increases in ambient noise in some locations  
13 throughout the County. (EIR, p. 6.0-27; see also EIR Section 5.10.)

14 Additionally, regarding cumulative impacts to noise levels in excess of established  
15 noise standards, all development projects are required to comply with applicable  
16 noise standards. Therefore, approved projects will be required to demonstrate  
17 compliance with applicable noise standards including, as needed, the implementation  
18 of mitigation measures. Thus, cumulatively considerable impacts associated with  
19 exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established  
20 in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies,  
21 will not result. (EIR, p. 6.0-27 see also EIR Section 5.10.)

22 With regard to cumulative impacts associated with exposure of persons to or  
23 generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels, the  
24 proposed Project’s contribution to this impact will occur during construction.  
25 However, due to the nature of ground-borne vibration and noise, which attenuates  
26 rapidly with distance from the source, and that such impacts in the Project area would  
27 be generated from construction activities as no trains are in proximity, it is reasonably  
28

1 anticipated that construction of other projects in the vicinity will not occur  
2 simultaneously with the Project's construction so as to cumulatively contribute to a  
3 substantial vibratory noise impact. The proposed Project will also implement  
4 mitigation measures MM Noise 11 through MM Noise 17 to address construction  
5 noise which will reduce the Project's potential vibratory impacts to less than  
6 significant. Thus, cumulatively considerable impacts associated with exposure of  
7 persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise  
8 levels will not result. (EIR, p. 6.0-27; see also EIR Section 5.10.)

- 9 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7 would contribute to increased cumulative traffic noise  
10 levels for off-site sensitive receptors along the following roadway segments that  
11 would have more than a 5 dBA increase in future cumulative traffic noise levels due  
12 to growth in the Project area under the Future (2035) with or without the Alternative  
13 7 scenario: Ramona Expressway from Lakeview Avenue to Hansen Avenue;  
14 Ramona Expressway from Hansen Avenue to 5th Street; Ramona Expressway from  
15 5th Street to 3rd Street; Ramona Expressway from 5th Street to 3rd Street; Ramona  
16 Expressway from Warren Road to Sanderson Avenue; 9th Street from Lakeview  
17 Avenue to Yucca Avenue; 10th Street from Reservoir Avenue to Lakeview Avenue;  
18 Reservoir Avenue from 9th Street to 10th Street; Bridge Street from Ramona  
19 Expressway to Gilman Springs Road.

20 It should be noted that this same list of roadway segments will be significantly  
21 impacted by the proposed Project. While Alternative 7 would result in a higher  
22 ambient noise increase to one roadway segment than the proposed Project (9th Street  
23 from Lakeview Avenue to Yucca Avenue), the remaining roadway segments that  
24 would be significantly impacted by both would experience a lesser degree of ambient  
25 noise increase under Alternative 7. Alternative 7 would also require the same  
26 mitigation measures as those required of the proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative  
27 7's noise impacts would be similar to that of the proposed Project and remain  
28

1 significant and unavoidable. (EIR Section 6.0; pp. 7.0-58–7.0-61; 7.0-176.) For the  
2 reasons set forth above and in the preceding paragraphs and in the EIR, noise impacts  
3 are not cumulatively considerable.

4 **K. Population and Housing.**

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

6 a. Project – The urban population would more than double as a result of buildout  
7 pursuant to the 2015 GP, a cumulatively considerable substantial increase. Compared  
8 to existing levels, the additional homes and population accommodated by the 2015  
9 GP would contribute substantially to significant direct and indirect population  
10 growth. (EIR, p. 6.0-27; see also EIR Section 5.11.)

11 Official regional growth forecasts for the region are proposed and updated by SCAG  
12 based on current land use designations in applicable county and city general plans.  
13 When compared to SCAG’s 2016 RTC/SCS Countywide forecasts (assuming full  
14 buildout by 2035 would be 3,055,100 persons), the Project’s 36,434 persons would  
15 account for approximately 1.1 percent of the population forecasted by SCAG. The  
16 Project would also account for 2.0 percent of the forecasted County population per  
17 the 2015 General Plan, 3.9 percent of the forecasted population for Western  
18 Riverside County per the 2015 General Plan; 6.3 percent of the forecasted population  
19 for the nearby cities of Hemet, Moreno Valley, Perris and San Jacinto, and 1.7  
20 percent of the forecasted population within a 20-mile radius of the Project site. (EIR,  
21 p. 6.0-27; see also EIR Section 5.11.)

22 Within a 20-mile radius of the Project site the current jobs/household ratio is  
23 approximately 0.89:1. The jobs/household balance for buildout of the Project will be  
24 0.11:1. Additionally, construction of the Project’s proposed land uses will generate  
25 17,700 person-years’ work of work, and many Project residents may telecommute in  
26 the future. Even so, because the Project results in a very low jobs/household ratio in  
27 an area that is less than balanced, it is deemed to have a cumulatively significant  
28

1 impact with respect to regional and local population and employment projections for  
2 the region. (EIR, p. 6.0-28; see also EIR Section 5.11.)

3 Further, as the Project at buildout will consist of 11,350 dwelling units, a population  
4 of 36,434 persons, 500,000 square feet of commercial development and 1,190 jobs  
5 within an area currently characterized with rural and agricultural uses,  
6 implementation of the Project will directly result in substantial population growth in  
7 the area. Moreover, Project development could potentially influence the timing and  
8 extent of development within adjacent properties from the expansion of off-site local  
9 roadways, and extension of water and sewer service to the Project area, and thus, will  
10 also indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area. These direct and  
11 indirect impacts, therefore, are considered significant and unavoidable. Moreover,  
12 these impacts are also cumulatively significant. (EIR, p. 6.0-28; see also EIR Section  
13 5.11.)

14 Approximately 1.36 jobs per household are required in the region to achieve a  
15 jobs/household balance. The current ratio in the region is 1.03 jobs per household,  
16 which is 76 percent (1.03 divided by 1.36) of the level required to achieve a  
17 jobs/household balance. Over time, the jobs/household balance in Riverside County  
18 is expected to improve as a result of the proportionately higher rate of job growth  
19 related to household growth. However, the Project would result in a jobs/household  
20 balance of approximately 23 percent, which is below current and projected  
21 jobs/household balance levels for the local and regional areas, which are 0.89:1 for  
22 the local area (i.e. the area within a 20-mile radius of the Project site) and 93:1 for  
23 Western Riverside County. Thus the Project is contributing to a cumulative  
24 significant impact with regard to jobs/housing balance. (EIR, p. 6.0-28; see also EIR  
25 Section 5.11.)  
26  
27  
28

1 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project (EIR  
2 Section 6.0; pp 7.0-63–7.0-64; 7.0-176.) and cumulatively considerable for the  
3 reasons set forth in the preceding discussion for the proposed Project and in the EIR.

4 **L. Public Services.**

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

6 a. Project – The geographical context for public services is Western Riverside County.  
7 Potential impacts upon public facilities and services related to build-out of the  
8 Riverside County General Plan were evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The General  
9 Plan EIR determined that build-out of unincorporated areas of Riverside County will  
10 create a substantial increase in population and residential and non-residential  
11 structures. As a result, a need for additional fire protection services, healthcare  
12 services, libraries, schools, and law enforcement services will result. General Plan  
13 build-out will substantially contribute to significant cumulative impacts to these  
14 services. (EIR, p. 6.0-28; see also EIR Section 5.12.)

15 With regard to landfill impacts, due to the continued implementation of waste  
16 diversion and other measures, as well as effective long-range planning and the stable  
17 funding of its programs, the incremental contribution of future development arising  
18 from buildout of the 2015 GP would not result in cumulatively significant impacts  
19 on existing or future landfills. However, because of existing environmental  
20 constraints, landfill siting difficulties, and the long-term environmental impacts  
21 inherent in landfill operations (particularly emissions from trucks hauling wastes),  
22 cumulative impacts will be significant for existing waste disposal facilities. (EIR, pp.  
23 6.0-28–6.0-29.)

24 With regard to fire services, cumulative impacts are particularly significant due to  
25 the extensive incremental expansion of urban fringes and rural development into  
26 interface/wildland and open, undeveloped areas that are at greater risk for wildland  
27 fires and also more remote, which results in longer response times and greater  
28



1 difficulty in providing services. Regarding the cumulative impact on fire protection  
2 services, the Project will have a less than significant contribution to these impacts  
3 through implementation of mitigation measure MM Fire 1 to ensure RCFD capacity  
4 will be maintained by Project fee payments as required. Moreover, project  
5 proponents of other development in Riverside County are also subject to the  
6 Development Impact Fee program to mitigate impacts, which provides funding for  
7 capital improvements and land acquisitions, equipment purchases, and fire station  
8 construction. Therefore, implementation of the Project will not contribute to any  
9 cumulative impacts to fire station construction or services as the Project-generated  
10 needs will be met as required by the above-reference mitigation. Cumulative impacts  
11 from the proposed Project are considered less than significant with mitigation. (EIR,  
12 p. 6.0-29; see also EIR Section 5.12.)

13 When this Project is taken into consideration with all other proposed projects in the  
14 area, additional health services will be needed in this area. Taking into consideration  
15 that the Project allows for the development of medical offices or clinics on-site and  
16 the Master Developer is promoting healthy living education programs and providing  
17 space for health clinics, and that adequate medical facilities exist within 10 miles of  
18 the Project site. Although impacts to health services associated with buildout of the  
19 General Plan are considered cumulatively considerable, the Project will not  
20 significantly contribute to this impact for the reasons listed above. (EIR, p. 6.0-29;  
21 see also EIR Section 5.12.)

22 With regard to cumulative library impacts, because the proposed Project will provide  
23 library facilities that will be accessible to the existing local community and potential  
24 future cumulative development, cumulative impacts are considered less than  
25 significant. Moreover, the proposed Project, as well as project proponents of other  
26 developments in Riverside County, are subject to library impact fees, which will help  
27  
28

1 to offset the demand placed upon the Riverside County library system. (EIR, p. 6.0-  
2 29; see also EIR Section 5.12.)

3 With regard to cumulative impacts on school services, the proposed Project, in  
4 conjunction with other projects anticipated within the area will generate students in  
5 excess of what the local schools will accommodate. The payment of school impact  
6 fees is considered, by law, an adequate fair share contribution to cumulative impacts  
7 associated with development; however, to the extent that financial resources  
8 generated pursuant to statute are not sufficient to satisfy demand, cumulatively  
9 significant impacts would result as a result of development throughout Riverside  
10 County pursuant to the General Plan. Nonetheless, because the Project proponent  
11 will pay all required school fees and incorporate three K-8 schools within the Specific  
12 Plan boundary, the Project will have a less than significant impact to school facilities  
13 and will not contribute significantly to Countywide cumulatively significant impacts  
14 to school facilities. (EIR, p. 6.0-29; see also EIR Section 5.12.)

15 With regard to cumulative impacts to law enforcement services, cumulative impacts  
16 on the Riverside County Sheriff's Department services will be mitigated by the  
17 proposed Project's proponent and the project proponents of other developments in  
18 Riverside County through the required payment of impact fees to the Sheriff's  
19 Department. These fees can be used by the Sheriff's Department for the acquisition  
20 of land, buildings, and equipment in order to mitigate impacts on their services from  
21 growth in the area. However, where the incremental increase in demand exceeds  
22 available services, this impact would be cumulatively significant for any of the  
23 General Plan buildout scenarios. Nonetheless, the Project proponent's payment of  
24 development impact fees and public safety-related design considerations will reduce  
25 potential impacts related to the need for new or physically altered sheriff facilities  
26 are less than significant after payment of fees at the time of Project construction.  
27 Thus, the Project will not significantly contribute to County-wide cumulatively  
28

1 significant impacts to sheriff services. (EIR, pp. 6.0-29–6.0-30; see also EIR Section  
2 5.12.)

3 Overall, all surrounding cumulative projects, as with the proposed Project, will be  
4 required to pay their fair share of development impact fees for public services (fire,  
5 libraries, school, and law enforcement). These fees can be used for the acquisition of  
6 land, buildings, and equipment necessary to mitigate impacts to these services.  
7 Impacts to healthcare services will be mitigated through Riverside County’s Periodic  
8 Medical Needs Assessment and on-site medical office uses available to the  
9 community. Although the County’s 2015 GP determined that impacts would be  
10 cumulatively significant to public services, the Project proponent will pay all  
11 applicable fees and include Project Design Measures to ensure that the Project has a  
12 less than significant impact to public services and a less than significant contribution  
13 to County-wide cumulatively significant impacts. (EIR, p. 6.0-30; see also EIR  
14 Section 5.12.)

- 15 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7’s impacts are the same as the proposed Project for  
16 fire/sheriff and are less than the proposed Project for health, libraries, and school  
17 facilities due to the smaller on-site population (EIR Section 6.0; pp. 7.06-64 – 7.0-  
18 66; 7.0-177) and for the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion for the proposed  
19 Project and in the EIR, public services impacts are not cumulatively considerable.

20 **M. Recreation.**

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

- 22 a. Project – Implementation of all applicable regulations and General Plan policies  
23 would be sufficient to ensure that all of the non-substantial incremental cumulative  
24 impacts with regard to need for new recreational facilities would be less than  
25 significant. As such, the 2015 GP’s incremental increase in demand for additional  
26 opportunities and the environmental effects of meeting such needs would not be  
27 cumulatively considerable for buildout of the General Plan. However, in terms of  
28

1 wear and tear on existing park and recreational facilities, including trails, incremental  
2 increases in use as county population grows will be cumulatively significant. (EIR,  
3 p. 6.0-30; see also EIR Section 5.13.)

4 The Project provides parks to meet its local requirements and in addition provides a  
5 regional-scale park, the Greenbelt, which will be available to serve some of the  
6 cumulative needs for park and recreation facilities at the regional level. In addition,  
7 nearly 1,000 acres of open space for conservation purposes will be conserved on site  
8 for the perpetual enjoyment of the existing and future residents of the area. Regional  
9 trail and community connections also traverse the Project site to provide continuity  
10 with the County Regional trail system as it connects with the cities of Perris and San  
11 Jacinto trails. Thus, although there will be increased demand for park and recreation  
12 facilities, these impacts will be reduced to below the level of significance for the  
13 proposed Project and the proposed Project will not contribute significantly to  
14 expected significant cumulative impacts to existing park and recreational facilities  
15 because the proposed Project includes a regional-scale park to offset impacts. (EIR,  
16 p. 6.0-30; see also EIR Section 5.13.)

17 The proposed Project will also create increased demand for park and recreation  
18 services. However, the Project will provide park and recreation opportunities and pay  
19 in lieu fees pursuant to the provisions of Section 10.35 of Ordinance No. 460  
20 (implementing the Quimby Act) and provide a total of 4.6 acres of park and open  
21 space per 1,000 residents. As a result, the potential impact of the Project will not  
22 exceed the demand for recreation facilities assumed in the General Plan. This coupled  
23 with payment of developer impact fees pursuant to Riverside County Ordinance No.  
24 659 will result in less than significant cumulative impacts to local and regional parks,  
25 and multipurpose trails. (EIR, p. 6.0-30; see also EIR Section 5.13.)  
26  
27  
28

- 1 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are the same as the proposed Project (EIR  
2 Section 6.0; pp 7.0-68; 7.0-177.) and are not cumulatively considerable for the  
3 reasons set forth in the preceding discussion for the proposed Project and in the EIR.

4 **N. Transportation/Traffic.**

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

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

8 **Impacts on Roadway Segments and Intersections**

9 Caltrans. Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable impacts  
10 to the following roadway segments under Cumulative Plus Proposed Project  
11 scenario: Beaumont Avenue (SR-79) from 1st Street to California Avenue and from  
12 California Avenue to Gilman Springs Road; Florida Avenue (SR-79/74) from State  
13 Street to Lyon Avenue, from Lyon Avenue to Sanderson Avenue, and from  
14 Sanderson Avenue to Winchester Road; Mid County Parkway from I-215 Freeway  
15 to Perris Boulevard; Ramona Boulevard (SR-79) from State Street to San Jacinto  
16 Avenue; San Jacinto Avenue (SR-79) from Ramona Boulevard to Esplanade  
17 Avenue, and from Esplanade Avenue to Menlo Avenue; Sanderson Avenue (SR-79)  
18 from Gilman Springs Road to Ramona Expressway; and State Route 74 from Perris  
19 Boulevard to Greenwald Avenue. (EIR, pp. 5.14-55-5.14-60.)

20 Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the  
21 following roadway intersections Cumulative Plus Proposed Project scenario:  
22 California Ave / Florida Ave (SR-74, SR-79); I-215 Northbound Ramps at Nuevo  
23 Rd; Menifee Rd / Ethanac Rd (SR-74); Beaumont Ave (SR-79) / California Ave;  
24 Sanderson Ave (SR-79) / Ramona Expwy; State Street (SR-79) / Ramona Expwy;  
25 Winchester Road (SR-79) / State Route 74; Warren Rd / Florida Ave (SR-74, SR-  
26 79); Palomar Rd / Ethanac Rd (SR-74); Briggs Rd / Ethanac Rd (SR-74); and Park  
27 Center Blvd / Mid County Pkwy Eastbound Ramps. Project implementation will  
28

1 result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation to the following roadway  
2 intersection under Cumulative Plus Proposed Project scenario: Beaumont Ave (SR-  
3 79) / 1st Street (MM Trans 28). (EIR, pp. 5.14-68-5.14-75.)

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

7 City of Menifee. Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable  
8 impacts under Cumulative Plus Proposed Project scenario to the intersection of  
9 Menifee Rd / McCall Blvd. (EIR, p. 5.14-76.)

10 City of Moreno Valley. Project implementation will result in significant and  
11 unavoidable impacts to the following roadway segments under Cumulative Plus  
12 Proposed Project scenario: Gilman Springs Road from the SR-60 Freeway to  
13 Alessandro Boulevard (MM Trans 33); and Perris Blvd from Iris Ave to Harley Knox  
14 Blvd (MM Trans 33). (EIR, pp. 5.14-60-5.14-61.)

15 Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable impacts under  
16 Cumulative Plus Proposed Project scenario to the intersection of Gilman Springs Rd  
17 / Alessandro Blvd. (EIR, p. 5.14-76.)

18 City of Perris. Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable  
19 impacts under Cumulative Plus Proposed Project scenario to the following  
20 intersection: Evans Rd / Ramona Expwy; Indian Street / Harley Knox Blvd; Perris  
21 Blvd / Ramona Expwy; and Perris Blvd / Placentia Ave. Project implementation will  
22 result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation under Cumulative Plus  
23 Proposed Project scenario to the following intersection: Indian Street / Ramona  
24 Expwy (MM Trans 29). (EIR, pp. 5.14-77-5.14-79.)

25 City of Riverside. Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable  
26 impacts to the following roadway segments under Cumulative Plus Proposed Project  
27 scenario: Alessandro Blvd from Canyon Crest Dr to Trautwein Rd and from  
28

1 Trautwein Rd to I-215 Freeway. (EIR, p. 5.14-62.)

2 Riverside County. Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable  
3 impacts to the following roadway segments under Cumulative Plus Proposed Project  
4 scenario: Van Buren Boulevard from Washington Street to Wood Road (MM Trans  
5 33); Cajalco Rd from El Sobrante Rd to Wood Rd (MM Trans 33), from Wood Rd  
6 to Carpinus Dr (MM Trans 33) and from Carpinus Dr to Harvill Ave (MM Trans 33).  
7 (EIR, pp. 5.14-62-5.14-67.)

8 Project implementation will result in significant and unavoidable impacts under  
9 Cumulative Plus Proposed Project scenario to the following intersections: Reservoir  
10 Ave / 10th Street/ Orange Ave (MM Trans 36). Project implementation will result  
11 in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation under Cumulative Plus Project  
12 scenario to the following intersections: Lakeview Ave / 10th Street (MM Trans 17);  
13 Bridge Street / Gilman Springs Rd (MM Trans 21a); Menifee Rd / Nuevo Rd (MM  
14 Trans 23); Menifee Rd / San Jacinto Ave (MM Trans 25); Menifee Rd / Ellis Ave  
15 (MM Trans 34); and Menifee Rd / Mapes Rd (MM Trans 27). (EIR, pp. 5.14-80-  
16 5.14-86.)

17 City of San Jacinto. Project implementation will result in significant and  
18 unavoidable impacts to the following roadway segment under Cumulative Plus  
19 Proposed Project scenario: State Street South of Ramona Expwy. (EIR, p. 5.14-68.)

### 20 Impacts on Freeway Segments

21 EIR Table 5.14-L – Cumulative (2035) Freeway Mainline and Ramp Operation  
22 Conditions without and with Project shows only the freeway segments that would  
23 operate at an unacceptable LOS in the cumulative condition without and with the  
24 Project. As shown in Table 5.14-L, 214 of 324 freeway segments would operate at  
25 an unacceptable LOS under the cumulative conditions without the Project, and 220  
26 of 324 freeway segments would operate at an unacceptable LOS with the proposed  
27 Project, an increase of six freeway segments from implementation of the Project.  
28

1 These six freeway segments are as follows: Southbound I-215: I-215/SR-60 (Merge);  
2 Southbound I-215: Alessandro (Diverge); Northbound I-215: Harley Knox (Merge);  
3 Northbound I-215: Alessandro (Merge); Eastbound SR-60: Potrero On to 6th St Off  
4 (Basic); Eastbound I-10: SR-60 On to Beaumont Off (Basic). (EIR, p. 5.14-115.)

5 Future development accommodated by any of the General Plan buildout scenarios  
6 would result in cumulatively considerable increases in traffic levels with related  
7 decreases in roadway segments operating at acceptable standards at various locations  
8 throughout Riverside County based on both existing and projected traffic volumes  
9 and roadway configurations. As a result, some roadways within the County would  
10 also conflict with applicable congestion management plan standards or policies, such  
11 as level of service standards and traffic demand measures. Implementation of various  
12 regulatory programs and mitigation measures identified in the 2015 GP would not be  
13 fully sufficient to ensure that all cumulative impacts would be reduced to less than  
14 significant levels. Thus, development pursuant to the 2015 GP would result in  
15 cumulatively considerable traffic impacts Countywide. (EIR, pp. 6.0-30–6.0-31; see  
16 also EIR Section 5.14.)

17 With development of the proposed Project, potentially significant cumulative  
18 impacts will occur at off-site roadway segments and off-site roadway intersections  
19 in the study area. These impacts are discussed in detail in Section 5.14. It should be  
20 noted that significant impacts will not occur to on-site roadway segments and  
21 intersections in the cumulative condition. The Project will impact roadway segments  
22 and intersections within incorporated cities (i.e., Hemet, Menifee, Moreno Valley,  
23 Perris, Riverside, and San Jacinto) and within Caltrans' jurisdiction. Riverside  
24 County, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction over all the segments and  
25 intersections that require improvements, and thus, neither Riverside County nor the  
26 Project proponent or implementing developer can guarantee that these improvements  
27 will be made within these other jurisdictions. Where the affected roadway segment  
28



1 or intersection is within the Riverside County's jurisdiction, the improvements are  
2 required as mitigation measures for this Project. Mitigation measures are enumerated  
3 in Section 5.14. Nonetheless, whereas there are roadway segments and intersections  
4 that will operate at an unacceptable LOS with implementation of the proposed  
5 Project in the cumulative condition, and whereas Riverside County cannot condition  
6 the improvements be made to all roadway segments and intersections outside its  
7 jurisdiction, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable. Thus, the Project  
8 will directly contribute toward cumulatively considerable impacts to roadways  
9 within the County. Additionally, cumulative impacts related to causing an effect  
10 upon or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads will be significant and  
11 unavoidable due to the size of the Project in addition to the approved and pending  
12 development projects around the Project site and in unincorporated Riverside  
13 County. (EIR, p. 6.0-32.)

14 Since the freeway analysis was completed for the basic freeway segment, merge,  
15 diverge, and weave segments, all locations that are identified as operating at a  
16 deficient level are likely due to either the ramp having insufficient capacity or due to  
17 mainline capacity constraints. Given the level of congestion of the freeway system  
18 in the Inland Empire, the resulting service levels are consistent with mainline  
19 constraints throughout the region. Moreover, freeway impacts are regional in nature  
20 and are a function of existing traffic, traffic from approved and pending projects, and  
21 traffic from the proposed Project. These impacts are discussed in detail in Section  
22 5.14. Since these are freeway facilities under the exclusive control of Caltrans, the  
23 timing of these improvements is unknown and, neither the County, as lead agency,  
24 nor the Project applicant can contribute fair share fees or implement the required  
25 improvements which must be designed and constructed by Caltrans, impacts to the  
26 freeway facilities will be significant and unavoidable without mitigation available.  
27 Therefore, due to Project-specific and cumulative impacts on roadway segments,

1 roadway intersections, and freeway segments, the Project will require a Statement of  
2 Overriding Considerations for Transportation/Traffic impacts prior to Project  
3 approval. (EIR, pp. 6.0-32-6.0-33.)

4 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7 would result in potentially significant impacts to  
5 roadway segments, roadway intersections, and freeway segments in various  
6 jurisdictions in the area including incorporated cities and Caltrans. Riverside County,  
7 as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction over all the segments that require  
8 improvements, and thus, neither Riverside County nor the project proponent or  
9 implementing developer can guarantee that improvements would be made within  
10 these other jurisdictions. These roadway segments and intersections that would  
11 operate at an unacceptable LOS as a result of Alternative 7 which are outside  
12 Riverside County's jurisdiction are therefore considered significant and unavoidable  
13 without mitigation available, as with the proposed Project. Roadway segment and  
14 intersections within unincorporated Riverside County that would be impacted as a  
15 result of Alternative 7, the improvements needed for these roadways to operate at an  
16 acceptable LOS are required as mitigation measures for Alternative 7, as with the  
17 Project. As Alternative 7 consists of a different Land Use Plan than the proposed  
18 Project, some of the mitigation measures for the facilities that would be impacted by  
19 both the proposed Project and Alternative 7 would require a revision specific to  
20 Alternative 7's build-out impacts. Impacts from Alternative 7 would also require  
21 additional mitigation measures to certain roadway facilities that are not applicable to  
22 the proposed Project, and conversely, not all of the proposed Project mitigation  
23 measures would be applicable to Alternative 7, (EIR, pp. 7.0-81-7.0-82.)

24 Regarding impacts to freeway segments, freeway impacts are regional in nature and  
25 are a function of existing traffic, traffic from approved and pending projects, and  
26 traffic from Alternative 7. Additionally, the cost for improving freeway facilities  
27 typically makes it infeasible for a single development project, including large  
28

1 projects such as Alternative 7, to implement individually or through a fair-share  
2 contribution program. Moreover, neither Riverside County nor the project proponent  
3 or implementing developers can guarantee implementation of freeway improvements  
4 in the study area since these are freeway facilities under the exclusive control of  
5 Caltrans, the timing of these improvements is unknown and, neither the County, as  
6 lead agency, nor the project applicant can contribute fair share fees or implement the  
7 required improvements which must be designed and constructed by Caltrans, impacts  
8 to the freeway facilities will be significant and unavoidable without mitigation  
9 available. (EIR, p. 7.0-82.)

10 With regard to construction-related traffic impacts for Alternative 7, standard  
11 construction-related disruptions to traffic may occur throughout the site.  
12 Additionally, Alternative 7 would include construction of improvements that may  
13 require traffic control and detours. Potentially significant impacts can occur to the  
14 existing traffic and circulation. Specific construction related traffic impacts for  
15 Alternative 7 would be identified along with proper protocol consistent with  
16 Riverside County policy at the time that phases and tentative maps are proposed for  
17 construction. (EIR, p. 7.0-82.)

18 As with the proposed Project, development of Alternative 7 would be required to  
19 participate in the cost of off-site improvements through payment of the following  
20 "fair share" mitigation fees: Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee, current at time  
21 of construction; Riverside County Traffic Signal Systems Fee Program; Road and  
22 Bridge Benefit District. These fees would be collected and utilized as needed by  
23 Riverside County to construct improvements necessary to maintain the required level  
24 of service. Alternative 7 will also pay development impact fees to Riverside County  
25 as set forth by Riverside County Ordinance No. 659. (EIR, p. 7.0-82.)

26 Both the proposed Project and Alternative 7 would be consistent with adopted plans  
27 and policies related to non-motorized travel in the area, and would include facilities  
28

1 to support bicycles and pedestrians on site. Neither the proposed Project nor  
2 Alternative 7 include any characteristics that would change air traffic in the study  
3 area, nor is the site located in an airport land use influence area. Thus, the impacts of  
4 both the proposed Project and Alternative 7 would be less than significant in this  
5 regard. Therefore, impacts under Alternative 7 to transit plans and policies and air  
6 traffic would be similar to the proposed Project. (EIR, p. 7.0-82.)

7 With regard to potential safety hazards from a design feature of Alternative 7, the  
8 same mitigation, measures required of the proposed Project would also be required  
9 of Alternative 7. Implementation of these mitigation measures will ensure impacts in  
10 this regard would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts under Alternative 7 in  
11 this regard would be similar to the proposed Project. (EIR, p. 7.0-83.)

12 Therefore, impacts to transportation and traffic from implementation of Alternative  
13 7 would be similar to the proposed Project (EIR, p. 7.0-83.) and are cumulatively  
14 significant.

15 **O. Utilities.**

16 **Cumulative Impact Finding – Water Treatment Facilities:** Not cumulatively  
17 considerable.

18 **Cumulative Impact Finding – Water Supply:** Cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

19 **Cumulative Impact Finding – Wastewater:** Not cumulatively considerable.

20 **Cumulative Impact Finding – Drainage Facilities:** Not cumulatively considerable.

21 **Cumulative Impact Finding – Electricity and Natural Gas:** Not cumulatively  
22 considerable.

23 **Cumulative Impact Finding – Solid Waste:** Not cumulatively considerable.

24 a. Project – Future growth within the region will result in increased demand for water  
25 service, wastewater service, storm drain facilities, electricity and natural gas, and  
26 solid waste disposal as discussed in EIR Section 5.15. (EIR, p. 6.0-32.)  
27  
28

1                    Water. EMWD projects their water supply will meet overall demand through  
2 2035 in average hydrology, dry year hydrology, and multi-day year hydrology, as  
3 shown in EIR Section 5.15 (see Tables 5.15-I, 5.15-J, and 5.15-K). Moreover, MWD,  
4 which supplies imported water to EMWD, also projects their water supply will meet  
5 overall demand through 2035 in average hydrology, dry year hydrology, and multi-  
6 dry year hydrology, as shown in EIR Section 5.15 see (Tables 5.15-C, 5.15-D, and  
7 5.15-E). The Project's demand at full build-out represents a small percentage of the  
8 total available supply and demand in the EMWD service area. Further, EMWD's  
9 2010 UWMP accounts for the proposed Project in its supply and demand analyses  
10 through 2035, and the proposed Project demand was also accounted for in MWD's  
11 2010 Regional Urban Water Management Plan. The proposed Project's WSA  
12 approved by EMWD determined sufficient water supplies exists to meet the Project's  
13 demand in addition to other existing and planning future water uses throughout the  
14 20-year analysis period. Thus, on a Project-specific and cumulative basis, additional  
15 treatment facilities will not need to be built to accommodate the proposed Project  
16 and cumulative development projects; impacts related to water infrastructure are  
17 considered less than significant. (EIR, p. 6.0-32; see also EIR Section 5.15.)  
18 Variations in supply and demand during average, dry and multiple dry years are  
19 expected to be minimal due to the water supply planning and projects undertaken by  
20 MWD and EMWD. In addition, EMWD is required to prepare an UWMP every five  
21 years to ensure that adequate water supplies exist for future growth. County of  
22 Riverside General Plan policies LU 5.3 and 17.2 require that all projects are  
23 consistent with an UWMP and that adequate and available water resources exist for  
24 proposed land uses. Therefore, based on the analysis in Section 5.15.1, and the  
25 analyses set forth in EMWD's 2010 UWMP and the Project's 2013 WSA, the total  
26 projected water supplies available to EMWD over the next 20-year period through  
27 2035, including average, dry, and multiple-dry years, is sufficient to meet the  
28

1 projected water demand of the Project, in addition to existing and planned future  
2 uses, including agricultural and industrial uses, in accordance with the requirements  
3 of Senate Bill 610. Based on the current level of water planning and supply allocation  
4 for the state in general, and the water agencies serving Riverside County in particular,  
5 buildout of the General Plan scenarios would cumulatively result in an “insufficient  
6 water supply” within Riverside County. However, due to the variability and  
7 unpredictability of water supplies from year to year, in some cases, the adequacy of  
8 future water supplies cannot be ascertained at this time at the Project-specific level.  
9 Therefore, although Countywide development pursuant to the General Plan will  
10 result in cumulatively considerable impacts to water supply, EMWD has determined  
11 that it has sufficient supply to serve the proposed Project. However, given the  
12 prolonged drought that the State is facing and the emergency mandates called for by  
13 Governor Brown and the reductions required for water suppliers including EMWD,  
14 at a cumulative level, impacts to water supply are significant and unavoidable. (EIR,  
15 p. 6.10-34; see also EIR Section 5.15.)

16 Wastewater. Project flows in conjunction with flows from future surrounding  
17 projects that would also be directed to the PVRWRF will total 11 MGD which would  
18 increase flows to 22-24 MGD, potentially 2 MGD over capacity. This amount  
19 assumes the unlikely scenario that the proposed Project and other listed projects in  
20 the Lakeview/Nuevo area are constructed to full build-out before EMWD expands  
21 the PVRWRF to 26 MGD starting by 2024. However, the proposed Project will not  
22 achieve full build-out, assuming an aggressive and conservative construction  
23 schedule that is not necessarily to market conditions, until late 2026 or early 2027.  
24 Moreover, given the land use proposals for the other projects in the Lakeview/Nuevo  
25 area are approximately 10 years old and none have commenced construction or to  
26 date appear to be nearing construction, the scenario is highly improbable.

1 EMWD anticipates the existing 22 MGD capacity is sufficient to meet wastewater  
2 needs through 2023, and is planning to expand the PVRWRF to 26 MGD by 2024  
3 and to 30 MGD by 2033. Thus, it is reasonably anticipated that by the time the  
4 proposed Project achieves full build-out, or any of the above-listed development  
5 projects achieve full build-out, PVRWRF will be operating with at least a 26 MGD  
6 capacity, which would adequately treat the cumulative wastewater generation  
7 amounts. Additionally, in the highly improbable scenario that these development  
8 projects were to achieve full build-out prior to 2024, it is reasonably anticipated that  
9 EMWD would expand the capacity at PVRWRF to meet the anticipated demand  
10 ahead of its regularly planned dates. Therefore, the Project's contribution to  
11 cumulative impacts with regard to wastewater treatment capacity is not considerable.  
12 (EIR, pp. 6.0-33-6.0-34, see also EIR Section 5.15.)

13 Drainage Facilities. Increased development resulting from General Plan  
14 implementation would also incrementally reduce the distribution and extent of  
15 permeable surfaces suitable for recharge, in turn increasing runoff and subsequent  
16 flow in streams, and increase the amount of non-point source pollutants that enter  
17 watercourses and recharge areas. Therefore, cumulative development could  
18 substantially alter existing drainage patterns, resulting in substantial erosion or  
19 siltation and cumulatively considerable impacts to existing hydrology. (EIR, p. 6.0-  
20 34.)

21 The Project will implement mitigation measures MM Util 2 and MM Hydro 1.  
22 Mitigation measure MM Util 2 requires the applicant to construct the stormwater  
23 drainage conveyance infrastructure under Ramona Expressway at the time this  
24 segment of Ramona Expressway is widened. Mitigation measure MM Hydro 1  
25 requires hydrology studies to be conducted if the drainage system is not yet fully  
26 operational prior to approval of any Project-related tentative tract map. Construction  
27 of all storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities needed to  
28

1 prevent flooding on- and off-site will result in less than significant impacts from the  
2 proposed Project with adherence to NPDES requirements. As other development  
3 projects build out, the County will require that drainage facilities be constructed to  
4 address the potential for increased run-off and flooding. All future projects will also  
5 be subject to NPDES requirements; however, where existing storm drainage facilities  
6 are inadequate, or in particular, where no regional storm drain infrastructure exists,  
7 incremental increases in runoff consistent with General Plan implementation would  
8 result in cumulatively significant impacts. However, because the proposed Project  
9 will construct improvements to storm drain facilities as necessary, the Project's will  
10 not significantly contribute to these cumulatively cumulative impacts. River-related  
11 projects will also be constructed to prevent flooding and related hydrological issues.  
12 The impacts to the river system and drainage of the area are discussed above under  
13 Hydrology/Water Quality and in EIR Section 5.8, Hydrology/Water Quality. (EIR,  
14 pp. 5.8-79, 6.0-34, see also EIR Sections 5.8 and 5.15.)

15 Electricity and Natural Gas. Project implementation will result in a permanent and  
16 continued use of electricity and natural gas resources. With the completion of the  
17 Lakeview Substation by SCE, which commenced construction in October 2014 and  
18 is anticipated to be completed in December 2015, sufficient power and distribution  
19 capabilities will exist to provide electrical services to the proposed Project at full  
20 build-out and to the Lakeview/Nuevo area at large as other development projects  
21 proceed. As with the proposed Project, other development projects will be required  
22 to demonstrate compliance with regulatory standards prior to construction, which  
23 will ensure adequate infrastructure is developed as needed to serve demand. (EIR, p.  
24 6.0-35; see also EIR Section 5.15.)

25 At full build-out, Project demand for natural gas would be approximately 0.51  
26 percent of the existing natural gas use in Riverside County. Gas main extensions  
27 designed and constructed in accordance with CPUC and SCGC standards will be  
28



1 constructed to serve the proposed Project. SCGC projects total gas demand to decline  
2 at an annual rate of 0.33 percent from 2013 to 2035 due to modest economic growth,  
3 CPUC-mandated energy efficiency standards and programs, renewable electricity  
4 goals, the decline in commercial and industrial demand, and conservation savings  
5 linked to Advanced Metering Infrastructure. Specifically, residential load is expected  
6 to decline by 0.5 percent per year from 2013 to 2035, and commercial load is  
7 anticipated to grow at an annual rate of 0.04 percent from 2013 to 2035 (2014 CGR,  
8 pp. 64, 66). Thus, as other development projects in the Lakeview/Nuevo area are  
9 constructed, overall there exists sufficient natural gas supplies as the regional  
10 aggregate demand for natural gas is projected to decline over the next 20 years. As  
11 with the proposed Project, other development projects will be required to  
12 demonstrate compliance with regulatory standards prior to construction, which will  
13 ensure adequate infrastructure is developed as needed to serve demand. Therefore,  
14 even though development pursuant to the 2015 GP will result in significant  
15 cumulative impacts to energy and natural gas usage Countywide the Project's  
16 contribution to these cumulative impacts is not considerable. (EIR, pp. 6.0-34-6.0-  
17 35; see also EIR Section 5.15.)

18 Solid Waste. In conjunction with other projects within the area, cumulatively the area  
19 is expected to produce additional construction- and operational-related solid waste  
20 that will be landfilled at any of the three landfills that could serve the proposed  
21 Project. Mandatory landfill diversion rates will be applicable to other development  
22 projects, which includes the current 50 percent diversion rate and a 75 percent  
23 diversion rate by 2020. Moreover, landfill diversion is a requirement of RCWMD  
24 through the development and implementation of a Waste Recycling Plan.  
25 Nevertheless, development pursuant to the 2015 GP will result in an approximately  
26 43% increase in solid waste disposal over the next 50-plus years. The various waste  
27 stream reduction and recycling laws enacted by the state and implemented at the  
28

1 county and city level continue to contribute to the lower rates of cumulative increase  
2 being projected. Nevertheless, because of existing environmental constraints, landfill  
3 siting difficulties, and also the long-term environmental impacts inherent in landfill  
4 operations, cumulative impacts will be significant for existing waste disposal  
5 facilities. (EIR, p. 6.0-36.)

6 The total solid waste intake for the year 2010 was 1,744,206 tons. The remaining  
7 capacity at the end of that year was 19,013,265 tons. Accounting for Riverside  
8 County's generation of solid waste through the year 2024, an estimated 28,561,626  
9 tons of capacity remains. When compared against this total, solid waste generation  
10 directly attributable to the 2015 GP (18,070 tons) is 0.06 percent of the total waste  
11 generated in Riverside County annually. In addition, since AB 939 mandates the  
12 reduction of waste disposal in landfills with a 50 percent diversion rate, when this is  
13 taken into account the amount of solid waste resulting from the 2015 GP actually  
14 reaching sanitary landfill disposal would drop to roughly 9,000 tons. (And, per AB  
15 341, a 75 percent diversion rate is to be achieved by 2020.) Accordingly, the impact  
16 on landfill capacity would be less than significant. Regulatory compliance would  
17 also further reduce the less than significant impact. (EIR, p. 6.0-36.)

18 All development of future land uses would be required to comply with all applicable  
19 federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. In terms of  
20 development application and approval, both RCWMD and Riverside County  
21 Department of Environmental Health review all development applications within  
22 unincorporated Riverside County. Project-specific conditions of approval are  
23 required by these departments as deemed appropriate for implementation of and  
24 compliance with the various County solid waste regulations and programs, including  
25 the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). Nothing proposed  
26 by the 2015 GP or proposed Project would interfere with or alter this process. Nor  
27 would changes preclude the attainment of CIWMP policies, plans, or goals. Any  
28

1 future development would be required to comply with the CIWMP as part of standard  
2 project conditions of approval. Also, no land use changes are proposed for lands  
3 within existing or proposed Riverside County landfills. For these reasons, the effects  
4 of development in the County per the 2015 GP regarding compliance with federal,  
5 state and local statutes and regulations, including the, would be less than significant  
6 and the Project's contribution is not cumulatively considerable. (EIR, p. 6.0-36; see  
7 also EIR Section 5.15.)

- 8 b. Alternative 7 - Alternative 7 would create a need for water and sewer services beyond  
9 existing capacity, but less than that of the proposed Project. Even so, implementation  
10 of this alternative would still require the extension of potable water piping to the site,  
11 and the off-site potable water alignments proposed for the Project's offsite utility  
12 infrastructure would be the same for providing service to Alternative 7's site. Even  
13 though Alternative 7's water demand is estimated to be 3 percent less than the  
14 proposed Project, the water demand of Alternative 7 would be similar to the proposed  
15 Project. However, given the prolonged drought that the State is facing and the  
16 emergency mandates called for by Governor Brown and the reductions required for  
17 water suppliers including EMWD, at a cumulative level impacts to water supply for  
18 Alternative 7 remain significant and unavoidable. (EIR, p. 7.0-87.)

19 With regard to sewer service, Alternative 7 is expected to generate approximately 2.2 million  
20 gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater at full build-out, which would result in a  
21 decrease of approximately 31 percent, or 1 MGD of wastewater, compared to the  
22 proposed Project. Therefore, if the on-site wastewater treatment plant is not  
23 developed, there exists sufficient capacity at PVRWRF to treat wastewater from  
24 Alternative 7; or, if the on-site wastewater treatment facility is developed, it would  
25 convey and treat all of the generated wastewater without expanding existing sewer  
26 infrastructure to the site for reuse as recycled water or for groundwater recharge. For  
27 these reasons wastewater impacts would be less than the proposed Project. If the on-  
28

1 site wastewater treatment facility were not developed, wastewater impacts would still  
2 be less as the net increase of generated wastewater would be considerably lessened  
3 under this alternative compared to the proposed Project. (EIR, p. 7.0-88.)

4 With regard to electricity, similar to the proposed project, the new Lakeview Substation  
5 would need to be completed and operational in order for Southern California Edison  
6 (SCE) to adequately serve the project under Alternative 7, that is, as it develops and  
7 builds out. At full build-out, Alternative 7 would use approximately 58.6 million  
8 kilowatt hours (KWh) of electricity per year, which is a 0.37 percent decrease from  
9 the proposed Project's 58.8 million KWh of electricity per year. Thus, while the  
10 overall electrical demands at full build-out of Alternative 7 would be less than the  
11 proposed Project, albeit by less than one percent, both Alternative 7 and the proposed  
12 Project would rely on the construction of the Lakeview Substation and new  
13 transmissions lines, and as such, impacts to electrical distribution would be similar.  
14 (EIR, p. 7.0-89.)

15 With regard to natural gas, Alternative 7 would require new gas main extensions to be  
16 operated by Southern California Gas Company (SCGC) to serve the development as  
17 with the proposed Project, and new distribution lines would be constructed  
18 concurrently on site with Alternative 7 development by phase. At full build-out,  
19 Alternative 7 would use approximately 211.9 billion British thermal units or 2.1  
20 million therms per year, which is a 0.25 percent decrease from the proposed Project's  
21 212.4 billion British thermal units. Thus, overall natural gas demands at full build-  
22 out of Alternative 7 would be less than the proposed Project, albeit by less than one  
23 percent, and as such, impacts to natural gas distribution would be similar. (EIR, p.  
24 7.0-89.)

25 With regard to solid waste, Alternative 7 would result in approximately 55,657 tons total of  
26 construction waste, which is 107 tons more than the proposed Project. At full build-  
27 out, Alternative 7 would result in a 828 more tons per year of operational-related  
28

1 solid waste without any landfill diversion, 414 more tons per year at the 50 percent  
2 diversion rate, and 207 more tons per year at the 75 percent diversion rate, which is  
3 an approximately 7.6 percent increase from the proposed Project. Alternative 7  
4 would result in a greater generation of construction- and operational-related solid  
5 waste; however, the increase from the estimated proposed Project amount is  
6 comparatively marginal and the landfills have sufficient capacity for either the  
7 proposed Project or Alternative 7. The same regulatory requirements, including AB  
8 939 and AB 341, will ensure diversion rate mandates are met, and thus, operational  
9 solid waste would achieve a 75 diversion rate from a landfill after 2020. Therefore,  
10 impacts from solid waste would be similar. (EIR, pp. 7.0-90-7.0-92.)

11 For the reasons set forth above, Alternative 7's impacts with regard to water treatment  
12 facilities, wastewater, drainage facilities, electricity and natural gas, and solid waste  
13 are not cumulative considerable. Alternative 7's impacts with regard to water supply  
14 are cumulatively significant.

15 **P. Greenhouse Gases.**

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

- 17 a. Project – In assessing the Project's quantitative GHG emissions, the Project will emit  
18 less GHG than amount called for in AB 32 as it exceeds the 28.5 percent reduction  
19 called for in the Scoping Plan. However, because of the breadth of climate change  
20 regulation, many efforts to reduce GHG emissions that are set forth in AB 32 are  
21 outside of the County's jurisdiction and control. These other agencies at the regional,  
22 state, national and international level can and should adopt requirements to ensure  
23 cumulative GHG reductions. While the County believes such agencies will adopt and  
24 enforce these measures because it cannot be seen with certainty that these regulations  
25 will all be applied statewide level to successfully reduce emissions at the level  
26 required to avoid climate change, and for the purpose of full disclosure and informed  
27  
28

1 public debate, at a cumulative level impact level, under AB 32, GHG impacts remain  
2 significant and unavoidable. (EIR, pp. 6.0-37-6.0-38; see also EIR Section 5.16.)

3 Within SCAG's jurisdiction, CARB's adopted Regional Targets call for a reduction  
4 of GHG emissions by 8 percent for 2020 and by 13 percent for 2035. The current SB  
5 375 2020 GHG regional target (i.e., after 8 percent reduction) for the SCAG region  
6 is 19.5 lb per capita per weekday. The Project's 2020 per capita emissions is 19.2  
7 lbs/day. Thus, on a per capita basis, the Project reduces emissions by 9.8 percent in  
8 2020 and therefore meets and in fact goes beyond the called for 8 percent 2020 target  
9 for the SCAG region. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the SCS/SB 375 GHG  
10 reduction targets. The Project is also consistent with the mitigation measures  
11 suggested by the RTP/SCS. To the extent within the County's control, the Project is  
12 consistent with these land use strategies and mitigation measures. (EIR, p. 6.0-38;  
13 see also EIR Section 5.16.)

14 The Project is consistent with SCAG's 2012-2035 RTP/SCS and 2016-2040  
15 RTP/SCS, GHG regulations designed to reduce GHG emissions, and with the  
16 County's CAP. Although the County controls the CAP, the County has limited  
17 jurisdiction over many GHG reduction measures under SCAG's RTP/SCS and lacks  
18 the requisite level of jurisdiction and control to assure that all such measures will be  
19 fully implemented as planned by third party agencies. Therefore, the Project's  
20 contribution to cumulative impacts remain significant and unavoidable. (EIR, p. 6.0-  
21 38; see also EIR Section 5.16.)

- 22 b. Alternative 7 – Alternative 7's impacts are less than the proposed Project because of  
23 the reduction in development and increased land efficiency reducing vehicle trips  
24 and VMT. Alternative 7 will comply with regulatory programs that reduce GHG  
25 emissions designed to achieve AB 32's goals; would be consistent with the Riverside  
26 CAP; would be consistent with SCAG's 2012-2035 RTP/SCS and 2016-2040  
27 RTP/SCS; and would meet the AB 32 reduction target under both the original and  
28

1 updated Scoping Plan. Therefore, although impacts from Alternative 7 are less than  
2 the proposed Project, both the Project-specific and cumulative impacts remain  
3 significant and unavoidable under Alternative 7. (EIR Section 6.0; pp 7.0-93–7.0-98;  
4 7.0-178.)

5 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered the following  
6 alternatives identified in EIR No. 471 in light of the environmental impacts which cannot be avoided or  
7 substantially lessened and has rejected those alternatives as failing to meet most of the Project’s objectives,  
8 as failing to reduce or avoid the Project’s significant impacts or as infeasible for the reasons documented in  
9 the Final EIR No. 471 and summarized below and hereinafter stated:

10 A. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21002 and the State CEQA Guidelines section  
11 15126.6(a), an EIR must assess a reasonable range of alternatives to the project action or  
12 location. Section 15126.6(a) places special emphasis on focusing the discussion on  
13 alternatives which provide opportunities for eliminating any significant adverse  
14 environmental impacts, or reducing them to a level of insignificance, even if the alternative  
15 would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more  
16 costly. In this regard, the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among  
17 the other alternatives. As with cumulative impacts, the discussion of alternatives is governed  
18 by the “rule of reason.” The EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be  
19 reasonably ascertained, or does not contribute to an informed decision-making and public  
20 participation process. The range of alternatives is defined by those alternatives, which could  
21 feasibly attain the objectives of the project. As directed by State CEQA Guidelines section  
22 15126.6(a), an EIR shall include alternatives to the project that could feasibly accomplish  
23 most of the basic objectives of the Project.

24 B. The Project and Alternative 7 have been developed to achieve the following objectives:

25 a. Smart Growth Network Principle. Provide a mix of land uses.

26 1. Project Objective: To build upon the 2003 Riverside County Integrated  
27 Project by leveraging the unusually large size of the property and fortuitous  
28

1 location adjacent to a Community and Environmental Transportation  
2 Acceptability Process (CETAP) major transportation corridor and develop a  
3 mixed-use community within a logical build-out timeframe where residents  
4 can live, play, shop, learn, and to the extent possible, work.

5 Expected Outcome: A large property under a single ownership adjacent to a  
6 major transportation corridor – this extraordinary opportunity deserves an  
7 extraordinary community to be proposed. Of the proposed Project’s 2,786  
8 acres, the proposed community is approximately 10% mixed use, 38%  
9 residential, and 52% open space (conservation, parks, trails, earthen drainage  
10 channels, landscape setbacks, terrace slopes and open space), with the mixed-  
11 use Town Center Village centrally located creating easy access from the  
12 surrounding residential villages. Of Alternative 7’s 2,882.9 acres, the  
13 proposed community is approximately 10% mixed use, 26% residential, 2  
14 percent commercial office, 5 percent agricultural, and 57% open space  
15 (conservation, parks, trails, earthen drainage channels, landscape setbacks,  
16 terrace slopes and open space), with the mixed-use Town Center Village  
17 centrally located creating easy access from the surrounding residential  
18 villages. (EIR, p. 7.0-15.)

- 19 2. Project Objective: To leverage the shape and setting of the site and create a  
20 range of villages that support a variety of lifestyles within a mixed-use  
21 framework.

22 Expected Outcome: The shape and setting affords the ability to create a range  
23 of villages. Land use within each village responds to: the land and its setting;  
24 existing adjacent uses and the need for buffers; the opportunity to meet  
25 housing needs at many life stages; the economic reality that new development  
26 must pay its own way; and the desire to create diverse, yet cohesive villages  
27 within a mixed-use framework. The planning process for the proposed  
28



1 Project led to the identification of a maximum of 11,350 dwelling units and  
2 500,000 square feet of commercial uses within seven villages. The planning  
3 process for Alternative 7 led to the identification of a maximum of 8,725  
4 dwelling units and 1,380,000 square feet of commercial uses within eight  
5 villages.

6 b. Smart Growth Network Principle: Take advantage of compact building design.

7 1. Project Objective: To maximize land use efficiency and conserve land on-  
8 site as envisioned in the MSHCP and CETAP programs.

9 Expected Outcome: The CETAP is a comprehensive planning process that  
10 identifies future placements of highways and transportation corridors, while  
11 the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) determines what  
12 land should be set aside for open space and habitat conservation. THE  
13 VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW will implement each by employing compact  
14 building design to create a reduced development footprint, concentrating  
15 development along the Mid County Parkway that is proposed along the  
16 Ramona Expressway, contributing significant right-of-way to the Ramona  
17 Expressway corridor, and avoiding MSHCP high value habitat so it can make  
18 a significant contribution to the MSHCP. In doing so, THE VILLAGES OF  
19 LAKEVIEW is implementing the General Plan Population Growth Vision:  
20 "New growth patterns no longer reflect a pattern of random sprawl. Rather,  
21 they follow a framework of transportation and open space corridors, with  
22 concentrations of development that fit into that framework. In other words,  
23 important open space and transportation corridors define growth areas."

24 2. Project Objective: To conserve a contiguous 900+ acre portion of the  
25 Lakeview Mountains, to implement a portion of the MSHCP Proposed  
26 Constrained Linkage 20, and to avoid sensitive species/habitats and  
27 significant cultural resources.

1 Expected Outcome: By utilizing compact building design at the community  
2 level, neighborhood level, and house level, more than half of the land will be  
3 open space of some sort, including significant buffers to the San Jacinto  
4 Wildlife Area, Lakeview Mountains, and existing community of  
5 Lakeview/Nuevo. Consequently, approximately 1,000 acres of various  
6 habitats will be conserved and significant cultural resources are being  
7 avoided with buffers being provided with both the proposed Project and  
8 Alternative 7. Alternative 7 proposes agriculturally designated land north of  
9 the Ramona Expressway adjacent to the SJWA.

10 c. Smart Growth Network Principle: Create a range of housing opportunities and  
11 choices.

12 1. Project Objective: To create a single ownership master plan that builds upon  
13 the principle that "one size does not fit all." The plan will provide a variety  
14 of housing opportunities reflective of the County of Riverside's fair share  
15 housing need.

16 Expected Outcome: THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW will be composed of  
17 individual villages that, by variations in character, will be expressions of the  
18 existing community while also providing additional choices. The result will  
19 be a multi-generational community and a community reflective of a broad  
20 spectrum of lifestyles: from entry level to luxury and from young families to  
21 active adult and all in a refined informal setting.

22 2. Project Objective: To offer a "green" housing choice and support reduced  
23 energy consumption within the houses built.

24 Expected Outcome: A broad collection of practices, standards, measures,  
25 methods, procedures, techniques, and approaches will be provided. This  
26 broad collection is known as "Lakeview Green Design." Among many things,  
27  
28

1 it will offer potential homeowners the opportunity to choose a “green” home,  
2 which includes an energy conservation component.

3 d. Smart Growth Network Principle: Create walkable communities.

- 4 1. Project Objective: To inspire healthy living and accommodate a pedestrian-  
5 friendly lifestyle.

6 Expected Outcome: THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW is walkable, with  
7 sidewalks separated from streets and trail connections at every edge, a 32-  
8 mile network of bicycle lanes, trails, and paseos will enable every possible  
9 experience: walking, hiking, biking, or equestrian; on-street or off-street; up  
10 the mountain or through the open space; from short loops on flat terrain to  
11 large loops providing up to 1,200’ inclines. Alternative 7 will provide a 37-  
12 mile network of bicycle lanes, trails, and paseos.

- 13 2. Project Objective: To grow a community of trees on-site and use potable  
14 water efficiently.

15 Expected Outcome: Given the climate, shade is needed to encourage people  
16 to walk. Each new homeowner will receive a tree at closing, either to be  
17 planted in their yard, or to be donated and planted within the community. As  
18 such, the Project will be a community of trees—over 30,000 are possible.  
19 Recycled water will be utilized to the extent possible. To stabilize the system,  
20 the Project will provide a site for a recycled water tank. Drought tolerant  
21 landscaping will be used and turf will be used wisely. The 4-mile drainage  
22 channel system will be earthen, not lined with concrete, and eight miles of  
23 roadside swale will be vegetated, rather than concrete curb-and-gutter; in an  
24 effort to promote infiltration and groundwater recharge.

25 e. Smart Growth Network Principle: Foster Distinctive, attractive communities with a  
26 strong sense of place.

1                   1.     Project Objective: To develop an attractive community with a strong sense  
2                   of place in the Lakeview/Nuevo area of Riverside County.

3                   Expected Outcome: Given the Riverside County location, the character of  
4                   THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW will be inspired by the evocative imagery that  
5                   brought the first settlers to the area—images of early southern California such  
6                   as shaded arcades, tree-lined drives, and architecture graced by the beauty of  
7                   the natural environment as its backdrop. Within the community core will be  
8                   the bustling social center of the community and will include a library, public  
9                   community center, sports park, other recreation facilities, and schools  
10                  flanking either side. Through the use of these facilities, social infrastructure  
11                  will develop and encourage community involvement.

12                 2.     Project Objective: To inspire life-long learning.

13                 Expected Outcome: The concept of life-long learning will be promoted and  
14                 provided throughout the community which goes hand-in-hand with the extra  
15                 facilities provided, such as extra classrooms for pre-school, community  
16                 rooms for after-school programs and weekend health clinics, and the public  
17                 community center which could provide evening and weekend classes for on-  
18                 going training.

19                 f.     Smart Growth Network Principle: Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty and  
20                 critical environmental areas

21                 1.     Project Objective: To avoid, conserve, enhance, and/or protect critical  
22                 environmental areas both on site and adjacent to the Project.

23                 Expected Outcome: The planning effort for THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW  
24                 reacted to the site's existing natural setting by incorporating a reduced  
25                 development footprint that will avoid MSHCP high value habitat and enable  
26                 significant contributions to the MSHCP. As a result, development of the  
27                 proposed Project enables: avoidance of direct impacts to a vernal pool and  
28

1 other wetlands; expansion of the San Jacinto River floodplain volume; a  
2 minimum 500' buffer to the San Jacinto Wildlife Area to be established;  
3 natural storm water treatment systems to be built; quality of stormwater  
4 runoff to be enhanced; and nearly 1,000 acres of various habitats to be  
5 conserved. In addition to the aforementioned features, Alternative 7 proposes  
6 agricultural uses adjacent to the SJWA.

7 2. Project Objective: To inspire environmental stewardship.

8 Expected Outcome: An environmental stewardship program will be  
9 provided. Its goal is to educate homeowners on the benefits of the  
10 environment and inspire them to protect it. Throughout the community,  
11 interpretive elements may be provided including signs and sample  
12 demonstrations.

13 g. Smart Growth Network Principle: Strengthen and direct development towards  
14 existing communities.

15 1. Project Objective: To strengthen the existing Lakeview/Nuevo community  
16 by providing a library and public community center.

17 Expected Outcome: Both the proposed Project and Alternative 7 will provide  
18 access to the general public to community facilities such as schools, libraries,  
19 and a public community center; parks and open spaces; and retail shopping  
20 and employment opportunities. In addition, some existing residents will  
21 benefit from the installation of flood control facilities and a sanitary sewer  
22 system.

23 2. Project Objective: To protect the existing rural lifestyle adjacent to the site  
24 by supporting the Lakeview/Nuevo Design Guidelines.

25 Expected Outcome: The land plan for both the proposed Project and  
26 Alternative 7 will provide buffers between rural and suburban uses,  
27 equestrian trails, and an equestrian park opportunity. Circulation will be  
28

1 designed to direct anticipated traffic to Ramona Expressway and off existing  
2 rural roads. Both the proposed Project and Alternative 7 supports the  
3 Lakeview/Nuevo Design Guidelines, a document that further protects the  
4 existing rural community. Alternative 7 proposes agricultural uses north of  
5 the Ramona Expressway adjacent to the SJWA.

6 h. Smart Growth Network Principle: Provide a variety of transportation choices.

- 7 1. Project Objective: To provide residents with a hierarchy of transportation  
8 choices.

9 Expected Outcome: While light rail does not directly connect to this Project,  
10 THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW is designed to support a variety of transportation  
11 choices including walking, hiking, biking, mass transit and the automobile.  
12 THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW will coordinate transportation with local and  
13 regional agencies where possible in order to maximize integration of both the  
14 proposed Project and Alternative 7 with local transportation planning and  
15 implementation efforts. These efforts include the possibility of extending the  
16 Riverside Transit Agency's Bus Rapid Transit System into the area and bus  
17 connections to proposed Metrolink stations along the Perris Valley Line,  
18 which could provide residents access to Perris, March Air Reserve Base,  
19 University of California Riverside, and Riverside, Los Angeles and Orange  
20 counties. Bus stops within the community have been tentatively identified for  
21 the proposed Project and Alternative 7.

- 22 2. Project Objective: To encourage residents to use their cars less

23 Expected Outcome: The mixed-use Town Center Village (a feature of both  
24 the proposed Project and Alternative 7) will be designed to discourage the  
25 use of cars. The 32-mile network (37-mile network for Alternative 7) of  
26 bicycle lanes, trails, and paseos leads to destinations such as the library,  
27 schools, parks, open space, and bus stops. THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW will  
28

1 include a commute trip reduction program which will include ride matching  
2 assistance via the Home Owner Association (HOA) and school trip matching  
3 via the HOA and Parent Teacher Association. Future potential live/work units  
4 could encourage working from home. As a whole, these choices encourage  
5 residents to use their cars less.

6 i. Smart Growth Network Principle: Make development decisions predictable, fair, and  
7 cost effective.

8 1. Project Objective: To make development decisions predictable, fair, and cost  
9 effective for new development since economic reality causes new  
10 development to pay its own way.

11 Expected Outcome: The Master Developer will participate in on-going  
12 regional planning efforts. These efforts will include the creation of new  
13 funding programs, such as a Community Facilities Fee Program and a Road  
14 & Bridge Benefit District. By planning a region for the long term, decisions  
15 will be predictable to present and future generations, fair to existing and  
16 proposed communities, and cost effective for new development.

17 j. Smart Growth Network Principle: Encourage Community and stakeholder  
18 collaboration in development decisions.

19 1. Project Objective: To inspire community involvement through collaboration  
20 before, during, and after development.

21 Expected Outcome: An on-going outreach program has been established and  
22 will continue to encourage collaboration with the local community of  
23 Lakeview/Nuevo, environmental community, Native American tribes, and  
24 education community. It is an effort that has been and will be accessible and  
25 forthright to all stakeholders. Dozens of meetings have occurred. Fruits of the  
26 effort are evident. In 2004, Native American monitors representing multiple  
27 tribes participated in the archaeological testing fieldwork. In addition, this  
28

1 program is intended to assist with the social infrastructure needed to jump-  
2 start community involvement.

3 These Project objectives were defined consistent with the development proposal for this  
4 location and consistent with the need to provide extraordinary benefits.

5 As directed in State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a), an EIR shall include alternatives  
6 to the project that could avoid or substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects.  
7 Because not all significant effects can be substantially reduced to a less-than-significant  
8 level, either by adoption of mitigation measures, Project Design Features, existing  
9 regulations, or by standard conditions of approval, the following section considers the  
10 feasibility of the Project alternatives as compared to the proposed Project. As explained  
11 below, these findings describe and reject, for reasons documented in the Final EIR No. 471  
12 and summarized below, each one of the Project alternatives. The evidence supporting these  
13 findings is presented in EIR Section 7, Alternatives to the Proposed Project and elsewhere  
14 in the administrative record as a whole.

15 C. Alternative 7 – Revised Specific Plan/Reduced Density Alternative

- 16 1. This alternative provides a feasible alternative to the proposed Project that would  
17 attain all of the Project objectives while decreasing the total number of residential  
18 units. Alternative 7 would be developed under a specific plan similar to the proposed  
19 Project so comprehensive design elements, such as regional drainage/water quality  
20 facilities and design guidelines, would be a part of this alternative. Alternative 7  
21 would include the same entitlement applications as the proposed Project including  
22 Specific Plan No. 342 (modified to reflect the revised Land Use Plan), General Plan  
23 Amendment No. 720, General Plan Amendment No. 721, Change of Zone No. 7055  
24 (modified to reflect the revised Land Use Plan), and Development Agreement No.  
25 73. The site would be developed into eight villages of different land uses and  
26 densities similar to the proposed Project, but with a smaller development footprint  
27 and fewer units. This alternative would allow for a maximum of 8,725 dwelling units  
28



(DU). Residential densities range from 2 dwelling units per acre to 20 dwelling units per acre, between four land use designations: (1) Medium Density Residential (2-5 DU/acre) for a target of 660 dwelling units within approximately 140 acres, (2) Medium High Density Residential (5-8 DU/acre) for a target of 1,540 dwelling units within approximately 213 acres, (3) High Density Residential (8-14 DU/acre) for a target of 3,750 dwelling units within approximately 384 acres, and (4) Mixed-Use (8-40 DU/acre) for a target of 2,775 dwelling units within 257 acres, for a total of 1,332 acres. The Project will also allow for a maximum of 555,000 square-feet of commercial within 23 acres of the Mixed-Use land use designation, and a maximum of 825,000 square-feet of commercial office within approximately 71 acres of the Commercial Office land use designation. There are three (3) proposed schools each including a 5-acre joint use park, totaling 114 acres. There are public facilities including EMWD and MWD facilities totaling approximately 131 acres. There are 145 acres of agriculture uses that will be left as-is, and a variety of public parks throughout Alternative 7 totaling approximately 82 acres, approximately 1,030 acres of conservation habitat, and approximately 110 acres of drainage facilities. The remainder of the approximately 2,880-acre Alternative 7 site will include approximately 181 acres of roads and miscellaneous open space. The same off-site water and sewer conveyance facilities required for the proposed Project would also be required for Alternative 7. Alternative 7 proposes off-site gravity sewer pipeline for wastewater collection. The off-site recreational trails and flood control facilities that would be constructed under the proposed Project would also be constructed as part of Alternative 7. The off-site roadway improvements required under Alternative 7 include improvements to 18 of the 23 roadway facilities identified for improvement under the proposed Project as a result of the different Land Use Plans. Alternative 7 would also require off-site roadway improvements to 3 intersections that are not

1 needed for the proposed Project: (1) Lakeview Ave / Ramona Expwy, (2) Lakeview  
2 Ave / 9th St, and (3) Hansen Ave / Yucca Ave.

3 2. All Project objectives are attained with Alternative 7. Alternative 7 reduces the GHG  
4 emissions from mobile vehicles, results in less traffic, reduces impacts to farmland,  
5 reduces indirect impacts to the San Jacinto Wildlife Area, and eliminates the need to  
6 extend the Mid-County Parkway undercrossing. Alternative 7 adds acreage along the  
7 western edge of the Project site and removes acreage along the eastern edge, has a  
8 smaller development footprint and fewer dwelling units than the Project, adds a high  
9 school and joint-use sports fields, and increases preserved Open Space as well as  
10 overall acreage (by 97 acres) relative to the Project. Implementation of Alternative 7  
11 would not reduce any of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts to  
12 aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, cultural resources, noise, population  
13 and housing, water supply, transportation and traffic, utilities, and GHG emissions  
14 to a level that is less than significant even with mitigation measures. However,  
15 Alternative 7 would in most cases reduce the level of the degree of the impact.  
16 Further, Alternative 7 would not result in an additional significant impact that is not  
17 otherwise anticipated to result under the proposed Project.

18 3. The Board of Supervisors finds that Alternative 7, Revised Specific Plan/Reduced  
19 Density Alternative, is the environmentally preferred alternative because it reduces  
20 all categories of significant environmental impact. Alternative 7 also achieves all of  
21 the Project objectives. Because this alternative does not avoid or minimize a  
22 significant unmitigated Project impact, CEQA does not mandate nor prohibit  
23 selection of this alternative instead of the Project. However, because Alternative 7  
24 reduces overall environmental impacts to a greater extent than does the Project, the  
25 County finds that Alternative 7, rather than the Project, should be approved subject  
26 to those EIR mitigation measures required to reduce Alternative 7's environmental  
27 impacts to a less than significant level.

1 D. Alternative 1 – No Project/ No Development

2 1. Under this alternative, the Project site would continue to be used for agricultural  
3 operations with no additional changes to the existing land uses. Existing land uses  
4 include: approximately 12 single-family residences, a horse farm, a chicken ranch, field  
5 crops, vacant hillsides, and some existing roads and utilities. The chicken ranch will  
6 remain onsite until the start of construction and will then be shut down. Although it is  
7 slated to relocate with or without the Project, for purposes of this alternative, it is  
8 assumed to remain because it existed on site when the environmental baseline was  
9 established. All houses are on septic systems. Agricultural uses currently receive  
10 recycled water from EMWD to irrigate.

11 2. With respect to Alternative 1 – No Project/No Development, the majority of the  
12 Project objectives are not attained because no development is included as a part of  
13 this alternative. Specifically, Alternative 1 would not provide a mix of land uses;  
14 would not consolidate over 900 acres of conservation/open space consistent with the  
15 MSHCP; would not provide a variety of housing opportunities reflective of the  
16 County of Riverside's fair share housing need; would not offer a "green" housing  
17 choice and support reduced energy consumption within the houses built; would not  
18 create walkable communities; would not provide an environmental stewardship  
19 program; would not install flood control facilities and a sanitary sewer system;  
20 would not provide a variety of transportation choices; and would not provide the  
21 commute trip reduction program. Alternative 1 would avoid all of the unavoidable  
22 significant impacts of the Project, but would result in other impacts that the Project  
23 mitigates or avoids. These impacts include some sensitive species that are impacted  
24 by agricultural operations, existing pesticide/chemical use and water quality  
25 degradation associated with agriculture would not be remedied, regional recreational  
26 facilities provided by the Project would be lost under Alternative 1, none of the  
27 County regional housing needs would be provided under Alternative 1, and no  
28

1 additional sources of revenue toward fees and funding would be provided to upgrade  
2 local or regional transportation infrastructure.

- 3 3. The Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 1, the No Project/No Development  
4 Alternative, on the grounds that Alternative 1 fails to meet the Project objectives,  
5 which provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative. Therefore,  
6 Alternative 1 is not adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

7 E. Alternative 2 – No Project/Existing Plans and Entitlements

- 8 1. Alternative 2 would involve development of agricultural, commercial, industrial, and  
9 residential uses pursuant to the 2003 and 2015 General Plans with no proposed  
10 amendments. Approximately 802 acres of THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan  
11 area is already designated with a “Community Development Overlay.” As defined  
12 within the County of Riverside General Plan, a Specific Community Development  
13 Overlay “Permits flexibility in land use designations to account for local conditions.”  
14 The description also states, “Consult the applicable Area Plan text for details,”  
15 referring to development characteristics, densities, and specific policies for each  
16 specific Community Development Overlay. However, the LNAP is silent on the  
17 “details.” Therefore, without set development details in the LNAP, Alternative 2  
18 includes the mix of land uses with densities permissible within the underlying  
19 General Plan designations. Alternative 2 would also include development of single-  
20 family homes within existing residential lots in the mountains where legal lots exist  
21 today. Land uses under this alternative include: 826 acres of agriculture with up to  
22 82 houses, a chicken ranch, 27 residences in the Lakeview Mountains, and 436  
23 residences and up to 239,571 square feet of commercial/industrial businesses shown  
24 in the LNAP. Alternative 2 assumes that no specific plan or other unifying  
25 entitlement mechanism would be prepared for the area. Therefore, Alternative 2  
26 would lack the regional water quality treatment solution and comprehensive design  
27  
28

1 guidelines included in the proposed Project and all development under Alternative 2  
2 would have to be accommodated with septic systems.

- 3 2. With respect to Alternative 2 – No Project/Existing Plans and Entitlements, the  
4 majority of the Project objectives are not attained including, but not limited to: the  
5 consolidation of over 900 acres of conservation/open space consistent with the  
6 MSHCP would not be achieved by Alternative 2 which allows for development in  
7 the Lakeview Mountains and agriculture where sensitive plant species are found; the  
8 density of Alternative 2 uses is so low that vehicular transportation to commercial  
9 and employment opportunities is the only option (no mixed-use area, not a walkable  
10 community); and overall development provided in the Specific Plan such as Green  
11 Design, drought tolerant landscaping, and landscape and design guidelines would not  
12 be included in this alternative. Alternative 2 would avoid or reduce some of the  
13 unavoidable significant impacts of the Project including: air quality because the build  
14 out of units would likely occur over a similar timeframe as the Project but with far  
15 fewer units, and population because no change from current designations and  
16 regional projections would result. While impacts to air quality will be reduced, they  
17 are not likely to be reduced to less than significant levels due to the size of the site  
18 and amount of development allowed (per **Table 7.0-A**). However, some additional  
19 significant impacts would result that the Project mitigates or avoids, including: some  
20 sensitive species that are impacted by agricultural operations, biological resources  
21 which development within the Lakeview Mountains would impact, existing  
22 pesticide/chemical use and water quality degradation associated with agriculture  
23 would not be remedied, although some new parks might be required over time as this  
24 area build out, regional recreational facilities provided by the Project would be lost  
25 under this alternative as no one property owner could afford to set aside nearly 100  
26 acres of regional Greenbelt, septic systems would have to be used with their inherent

1 water quality issues, and no fees and funding would be provided to upgrade regional  
2 transportation infrastructure.

- 3 3. The Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 2 – No Project/Existing Plans and  
4 Entitlements Alternative, on the following grounds, each of which individually  
5 provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) Alternative 2  
6 while feasible fails to meet the Project objectives; (2) Alternative 2 is not  
7 environmentally superior to the Project and would result in additional environmental  
8 impacts; (3) Alternative 2 would not provide the regional programs, infrastructure  
9 improvements and benefits of the Project; (4) Alternative 2 would not achieve open  
10 space protection; and (5) Alternative 2 does not provide for comprehensive planning  
11 through a specific plan. Therefore, Alternative 2 is not adopted by the Board of  
12 Supervisors.

13 F. Alternative 3 – No Development North of Ramona Expressway

- 14 1. This alternative consists of continued agricultural use of the property located north  
15 of Ramona Expressway. Since the Riverside County General Plan designates this  
16 area with a Community Development Overlay, anticipating development, it will be  
17 assumed for purposes of this analysis of Alternative 3 that the Community  
18 Development Overlay does not exist and that the area is protected in some way from  
19 future development. All 11,350 dwelling units proposed by THE VILLAGES OF  
20 LAKEVIEW will be built south of Ramona Expressway. Alternative 3 would be  
21 developed under a specific plan similar to the proposed Project so comprehensive  
22 design elements such as regional drainage/water quality facilities and design  
23 guidelines would be a part of this alternative. At least one additional school would  
24 be needed south of Ramona Expressway and the Greenbelt, which is proposed to be  
25 located north of Ramona Expressway in the Project, would no longer be needed, and  
26 is not required to meet Quimby requirements. Other park acreages would be provided  
27  
28

1 within the developed area. Sewer and water services would be extended to serve the  
2 area.

3 2. With respect to Alternative 3 – No Development North of Ramona Expressway, the  
4 majority of the Project objectives are attained except the conservation of sensitive  
5 species located north of Ramona Expressway would not occur. Alternative 3 is  
6 feasible to the same extent that the Project is feasible because the amount of  
7 development is the same. Alternative 3 would not avoid or reduce to less than  
8 significant any unavoidable significant impact of the Project. Some additional  
9 significant impacts would result from this alternative that the Project would mitigate  
10 or avoid for some sensitive species and sensitive cultural resources that exist north  
11 of Ramona Expressway would not be conserved and would continue to be impacted  
12 by agricultural operations. Additionally, regional recreational facilities provided by  
13 the Project would not be developed under Alternative 3.

14 3. The Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 3 – No Development North of Ramona  
15 Expressway Alternative, on the following grounds, each of which individually  
16 provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) Alternative 3  
17 while feasible fails to meet the Project objectives; and (2) while Alternative 3  
18 substantially reduces the Project's impact to agricultural resources by providing for  
19 the continuation of agricultural operations north of Ramona expressway, it creates  
20 additional impacts to biological and cultural resources. since agricultural uses  
21 associated with Alternative 3 could directly and indirectly impact a significant  
22 historical-period site associated with the construction of the CRA located north of  
23 Ramona Expressway (CA-RIV-8710H)) and does not eliminate entirely the Project's  
24 unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources; (3) while Alternative 3 removes the  
25 proximity of some residence to the San Jacinto Wildlife Area, it would still bring in  
26 new residents overall to the Lakeview/Nuevo area that would continue to have  
27 indirect impacts on the San Jacinto Wildlife Area; and (4) while on balance some  
28

1 impacts are reduced by this Alternative, other impacts, such as cultural resources and  
2 biological resources, could be greater than the proposed Project, the benefits of  
3 additional conservation and open space protection north of Ramona Expressway  
4 provided by the Project do not warrant adoption of Alternative 3 in favor of the  
5 proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative 3 is not adopted by the Board of  
6 Supervisors.

7 G. Alternative 4 – Reduced Density Alternative

- 8 1. Alternative 4 will reduce the total number of dwelling units by proposing single-  
9 family residential lots over the Project site. Alternative 4 includes 7,200 square-foot  
10 residential lots over the majority of the site, except MWD properties, the area the  
11 General Plan currently designates as “Conservation,” the 100-year floodplain, and  
12 the 27 larger lots which exist now in the Rural Mountainous area. This alternative  
13 would result in approximately 8,000 to 8,500 residential dwelling units. It is assumed  
14 that this alternative would build out under several developers/owners instead of one  
15 comprehensive specific plan or other unifying entitlement mechanism.
- 16 2. Some Project objectives are not attained with Alternative 4 including, but not limited  
17 to: the consolidation of over 900 acres of conservation/open space in the Lakeview  
18 Mountains consistent with the MSHCP; the incorporation of a mixed-use area and a  
19 walk-able community due to the density of Alternative 4; and overall development  
20 guidelines provided in the Specific Plan would not be included such as Green Design,  
21 drought-tolerant landscaping, and landscape and design guidelines. Alternative 4  
22 would reduce some of the unavoidable significant impacts of the Project including:  
23 air quality due to fewer units, but not so few as to reduce air quality impacts to less  
24 than significant levels; likewise, traffic and noise impacts would be reduced, but not  
25 to less than significant levels. Some additional significant impacts would result from  
26 Alternative 4 that the Project mitigates or avoids, including: biological and cultural  
27 resources within the Lakeview Mountains and elsewhere on the site which  
28



1 development would impact; and water quality mitigation being applied on a tract-by-  
2 tract basis would result in less effective water quality treatment. The number of units  
3 proposed in Alternative 4 still far exceeds the County and regional projections for  
4 housing needs while not meeting other General Plan and regional policies for mixed  
5 use and higher density housing along transportation corridors; although new parks  
6 would be required over time as this area build out, regional recreational facilities  
7 provided by the Project would not be developed under this alternative as no one  
8 property owner could afford to set aside nearly 100 acres of Regional Park; and fewer  
9 fees and funding would be provided to upgrade regional transportation infrastructure.  
10 Reduced density with no commercial services nearby does not necessarily result in  
11 fewer vehicle miles traveled. The reduced number of cars may have to travel much  
12 farther to obtain goods and services without the mitigating effect of the mixed use  
13 Project. This, coupled with the potentially higher energy emissions associated with  
14 less dense development, can result in higher GHG emissions.

- 15 3. The Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 4, the Reduced Density Alternative, on  
16 the following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient justification  
17 for rejection of this alternative: (1) Alternative 4 while feasible fails to meet the  
18 Project objectives; (2) Alternative 4 would have a greater impact upon aesthetics due  
19 to the lack of comprehensive design standards, and allowing development in the  
20 Lakeview Mountains viewshed; biological, resources in that the Lakeview  
21 Mountains and other conservation areas would not be protected; cultural resources;  
22 hydrology/water quality due to the lack of regionally-planned infrastructure to  
23 address runoff and contamination; and population/housing (the job/housing balance)  
24 would be worse; (3) Alternative 4 is not considered to be environmentally superior  
25 as compared with the proposed Project in that it would provide for development of  
26 the Project site, including areas that are set aside and protected by the Project, such  
27 as the Lakeview Mountains, in the typical suburban/sprawl development pattern  
28

1 which does not promote compact building design or walkability; and (4) because  
2 none of the impacts would be avoided in their entirety, and Alternative 4 would not  
3 meet many of the basic Project objectives, and would not provide the benefits that  
4 the Project provides, such as comprehensive planning and open space protection, do  
5 not warrant adoption of Alternative 4 in favor of the proposed Project. Therefore,  
6 Alternative 4 is not adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

7 H. Alternative 5 – Light Industrial/ Reduced Density

- 8 1. Alternative 5 includes 192 acres of office and light industrial development north of  
9 Ramona Expressway. The light industrial land use designation would mirror what  
10 the County allows in the General Plan which includes a wide variety of industrial  
11 and related uses, including assembly and light manufacturing, repair and other  
12 service facilities, warehousing, distribution centers, and supporting retail uses.  
13 Building intensity ranges from 0.25 to 0.6 FAR. The alternative also includes 969  
14 acres of conservation in the Lakeview Mountains and 29 acres of conservation in the  
15 floodplain, and acreage within the eastern end of the Project site (the Enclave Village  
16 within the Project) to be free of development and used for agricultural uses and to  
17 act as a buffer between the city of San Jacinto and the Project site. The alternative  
18 would also have a reduced density with 6,500 dwelling units proposed to be built  
19 south of Ramona Expressway. Alternative 5 would be developed under a specific  
20 plan similar to the proposed Project so comprehensive design elements, such as  
21 regional drainage/water quality facilities and design guidelines, would be a part of  
22 this alternative. Differences between entitlements would be the exclusion of a  
23 Development Agreement given the smaller overall development. The east end of the  
24 proposed Project would be excluded and left as agriculture, but the wildlife corridor  
25 and mountain conservation area would be conserved by the RCA. It is assumed that  
26 the smaller residential density would result in the decrease of public services from  
27 the level proposed within the Project, including the removal of the library, and a  
28

1 smaller public community center. Alternative 5 would be served by sewer, as with  
2 the proposed Project.

- 3 2. With respect to Alternative 5 – Light Industrial/Reduced Density, only the Project  
4 objectives related to conservation and residential community are generally met.  
5 However, a majority of the objectives are not met. Specifically, the range in the mix  
6 of land uses would not be provided; a variety of housing opportunities reflective of  
7 the County of Riverside's fair share housing need would not be provided; trail  
8 connections at every edge, a 32-mile network of bicycle lanes, trails, and paseos  
9 would not be provided; the environmental stewardship program would not be  
10 provided; and the commute trip reduction program would not be provided. It is not  
11 within the objectives of the Project to provide a large office/industrial complex,  
12 however. Although it reduces impacts in several areas, Alternative 5 is not feasible  
13 from a development perspective because, while there is long-term demand for light  
14 industrial uses, the market requires a freeway location. THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW  
15 site is located seven miles east of I-215 and twelve miles south of SR 60. However,  
16 when Ramona Expressway is improved to the Mid County Parkway, the roadway  
17 would better facilitate truck traffic and land uses that generate such traffic. Even so,  
18 the Lakeview/Nuevo area is not suited to support a significant amount of light  
19 industrial space; the local streets are not designed to carry trucks which would impact  
20 the rural community more heavily under this alternative. Demand for light industrial  
21 uses is being met now and into the foreseeable future along existing freeways. If light  
22 industrial demand were to be relevant to THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW site, three  
23 things would be required. First, Ramona Expressway would need to become a  
24 freeway similar to the design configurations set forth in the Mid County Parkway  
25 Project. Second, SR 79 in San Jacinto would need to be a freeway to connect the  
26 Ramona Expressway to I-10. Third, all the current vacant and planned space would  
27 have to have been absorbed by market demand. Some Project impacts are reduced  
28

1 with Alternative 5 though not to levels less than significant, such as: less agricultural  
2 land would be impacted, no change to views of the Lakeview Mountains at the  
3 eastern end of the Project site, fewer sensitive receptors located along Ramona  
4 Expressway, retention of the setting for sensitive cultural resources at the eastern end  
5 of the site, reduced population and greater land use designation consistency with the  
6 General Plan, reduced noise impacts, reduced traffic, reduced construction-related  
7 solid waste, and less water and sewer demand. Some additional or increased adverse  
8 impacts would result that the Project mitigates or avoids including: potentially  
9 impacted westbound views of the Bernasconi Hills from the Ramona Expressway  
10 due to taller industrial buildings, biological and water quality impacts due to  
11 continued runoff from agricultural operations, a higher likelihood of the storage and  
12 transport of hazardous materials due to light industry and continued use of  
13 agricultural pesticides, no regional park facilities for the Lakeview/Nuevo area, and  
14 significantly greater operational solid waste.

- 15 3. The Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 5, the Light Industrial/Reduced Density  
16 Alternative, on the following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient  
17 justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) Alternative 5 would have the same  
18 or similar degree of impacts as the proposed Project with respect to aesthetics (with  
19 regards to the Lakeview Mountains and loss of open land to urban use), short-term  
20 air quality impacts, biological resources, cultural resources, short-term noise  
21 impacts, fee-based local parks, and utilities (electric and gas) associated with the  
22 Project; (2) Alternative 5 would have a greater impact upon aesthetics (with regards  
23 to the taller buildings north of Ramona Expressway), long-term air quality, including  
24 increased toxic air contaminants due to additional truck traffic, hazards, hydrology  
25 and water quality (due to continued untreated agricultural runoff), land use/planning  
26 (the area north of Ramona Expressway would be inconsistent with the General Plan),  
27 recreation (with regards to regional facilities), transportation/traffic (with regards to  
28

1 key roadway improvements), and utilities (solid waste) impacts associated with the  
2 Project; (3) The Light Industrial/Reduced Density Alternative would meet Project  
3 objectives associated with conservation and the development of residential uses, but  
4 would be inconsistent with the basic goals and objectives of the Project in that the  
5 development of an office/light industrial complex was not an objective of the  
6 proposed Project; (4) on balance the Light Industrial/Reduced Density Alternative  
7 would reduce only one unavoidable significant impact of the Project (the LOS of  
8 Ramona Expressway between Bernasconi Road and Reservoir Avenue) and would  
9 reduce, but not avoid or reduce to less than significant, other unavoidable adverse  
10 impacts of the Project such as the loss of agricultural resources, air quality, noise and  
11 cultural resources; (5) the feasibility of Alternative 5 depends on the demand for light  
12 industrial-zoned land in this particular area, which would require the improvement  
13 of Ramona Expressway and SR 79 to a freeway to accommodate greater truck traffic  
14 and to connect to I-10, and market demand before industrial uses proceed to the  
15 Lakeview/Nuevo area; (6) the needed improvements to Ramona Expressway and  
16 marked demand is not anticipated to occur for decades, therefore, Alternative 5 is  
17 considered to be infeasible in terms of not being capable of being accomplished in a  
18 successful manner within a reasonable period of time. Therefore, Alternative 5 is not  
19 adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

20 I. Alternative 6 - Low Carbon Alternative

- 21 1. Alternative 6 primarily addresses impacts associated with greenhouse gas (GHG)  
22 emissions by incorporating additional GHG mitigation measures and Project design  
23 guidelines suggested by the California Attorney General. Alternative 6 would not  
24 substantively change the design of the proposed Project but would incorporate the  
25 following additional features: (1) the Project will install vegetated roof that covers at  
26 least 50 percent of roof area on commercial buildings; (2) the Project will provide an  
27 electric lawn-mower to the first homeowner of each residence; and (3) the Project  
28

1 will include an electric vehicle charging station at the public community center  
2 and/or commercial center.

3 2. Alternative 6 would meet all of the Project objectives. Because the Project has been  
4 amended to include additional GHG mitigation measures, Alternative 6 would not  
5 lessen the significance of the unavoidable significant impacts of the Project.  
6 Furthermore, the additional GHG reduction measures incorporated into Alternative  
7 6 (as with the additional measures added to the Project) require many third party  
8 agencies to adopt and fully implement the California Air Resources Board's (CARB)  
9 Scoping Plan to achieve GHG reductions applicable to numerous other economic  
10 sectors. The CARB Scoping Plan has tasked new residential and commercial  
11 development with achieving only about 3 percent of the total targeted 169  
12 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>E reduction for GHG emissions by 2020. Many of the actions required of  
13 others pursuant to AB 32 are currently underway or have been completed. As such,  
14 AB 32 is on track to in fact be fully implemented, and therefore effective in reaching  
15 the statewide reduction targets of meeting 1990 emissions levels by 2020.  
16 Development of renewable sources for electricity in accordance with California's  
17 Renewables Portfolio Standard, the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and improved vehicle  
18 emissions standards under the Pavley standards will all significantly reduce THE  
19 VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW GHG emissions, but these measures cannot be implemented  
20 independently by the Project. Adoption and implementation of these and other AB  
21 32 Scoping Plan components is within the responsibility and control of other public  
22 agencies, and these requirements can and should be adopted and implemented by  
23 these other agencies.

24 3. The Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 6 – Low Carbon Alternative, on the  
25 following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient justification for  
26 rejection of this alternative: (1) Alternative 6 does not substantially lessen or reduce  
27 any of the Project's impacts; (2) Alternative 6 would have the effect of having greater  
28

1 electrical and water usage than the proposed Project by shifting and encouraging use  
2 of electric-powered lawn care machines, and by encouraging the use of more water  
3 to maintain the vegetated roofs. Therefore, Alternative 6 is not adopted by the Board  
4 of Supervisors.

5 J. Alternative Site

- 6 1. In addition to the Alternatives considered in the EIR, a number of potential  
7 alternatives were considered, but rejected from a more detailed analysis and  
8 consideration in the Draft EIR. Development of the Project on alternative sites was  
9 considered but rejected for the reasons set forth in the EIR at pages 7.0-9 7.0-10.
- 10 2. One such alternative was rejected because it included development too close to the  
11 San Jacinto Wildlife Area and Lakeview Mountains, and placed open space for a  
12 wildlife corridor further east than delineated by the MSHCP. Alternative sites in this  
13 area of Riverside County were considered for the proposed Project, including the  
14 Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan, lands along County Community and Environmental  
15 Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP) corridors, and the neighboring cities  
16 of San Jacinto and Perris. No sites large enough for this Project remain within the  
17 city of Perris. Lands along County CETAP corridors that were outside of the  
18 Lakeview/Nuevo area were also rejected. Land of sufficient size appears to be  
19 available north of Ramona Expressway, immediately northeast of the Project site;  
20 however many potential significant adverse environmental impacts would be similar  
21 between this alternative site property and THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW site and was  
22 therefore rejected from further consideration. Land of sufficient size appears to be  
23 available in the Lakeview Mountains/Juniper Flats area, south of the Project site.  
24 However, this area is too mountainous for higher density development with limited  
25 access to major roads, and therefore not considered further. Within the city of San  
26 Jacinto, an area south and west of the Villages of San Jacinto and Gateway projects  
27 could be large enough for the proposed Project. However, many potentially  
28

1 significant adverse environmental impacts would be similar between this alternative  
2 site property and THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW site. Further, the Project applicant  
3 does not own a similar amount of acreage within this area. Therefore, because  
4 potential impacts would be similar to those of the proposed Project location and no  
5 significant impacts would likely be reduced, the alternative site located in the city of  
6 San Jacinto will not be considered further.

7 K. Environmentally Superior Alternative

8 1. Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of  
9 alternatives to a proposed Project shall identify an environmentally superior  
10 alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. This issue is evaluated in EIR  
11 Section 7.0, Alternatives to the Proposed Project. The EIR concluded that  
12 Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative is determined to be the environmentally  
13 superior alternative with respect to minimal impacts compared to the proposed  
14 Project. However, Alternative 1 does not meet the Project objectives or County  
15 General Plan designations, and continues some potentially significant impacts such  
16 as water quality due to agricultural runoff and lack of provision of regional housing  
17 to meet population projections assumed for the area. The State CEQA Guidelines  
18 also require the identification of another environmentally superior alternative if the  
19 “No Project” is the environmentally superior alternative.

20 2. With respect to the significant impacts of THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW, Alternative  
21 7 – Revised Specific Plan/Reduced Density (Alternative 7), implementation of  
22 Alternative 7 would not reduce any of the Project’s significant and unavoidable  
23 impacts to aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, cultural resources, noise,  
24 population and housing, and transportation and traffic to a level that is less than  
25 significant even with mitigation measures. Thus, Alternative 7 would also require a  
26 Statement of Overriding Considerations. However, Alternative 7 would in most cases  
27 reduce the degree of the impact for each of these environmental areas. Further,  
28



1 Alternative 7 would not result in an additional significant impact that is not otherwise  
2 anticipated to result under the proposed Project. Alternative 7 also maintains the  
3 Smart Growth design principles of the proposed Project, and as such, would  
4 effectively meet all of the proposed Project's objectives. As stated above, because  
5 Alternative 7 does not avoid or minimize a significant unmitigated Project impact,  
6 CEQA does not mandate nor prohibit selection of this alternative instead of the  
7 Project. However, because Alternative 7 reduces overall environmental impacts to a  
8 greater extent than does the Project, the County finds that Alternative 7, with EIR  
9 mitigation measures required to reduce Alternative 7's environmental impacts, does  
10 have reduced environmental impacts and should be approved. Therefore, whereas  
11 Alternative 7 meets all of the proposed Project's objectives, and whereas Alternative  
12 7 would reduce the degree of significant impacts (with an exception to off-site  
13 roadway noise at one additional roadway segment) compared to the proposed Project,  
14 Alternative 7 has been determined to be environmentally superior to THE VILLAGES  
15 OF LAKEVIEW Project.

16 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has, pursuant to State CEQA  
17 Guidelines section 15093, balanced the "economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits" of the  
18 Alternative 7, including Specific Plan No. 342, against the unavoidable adverse environmental effects  
19 identified in EIR No. 471, and has determined that each and every one of the following benefits and  
20 considerations individually outweigh and render acceptable each and every one of those adverse  
21 environmental effects of the Project, each of which standing alone is sufficient to support approval of the  
22 Project, evaluated as Alternative 7 from the EIR, and explains that the unavoidable environmental effects  
23 are considered acceptable, in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(b), and **ADOPTS THE**  
24 **FOLLOWING STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS:**

- 25 A. *Provide a Variety of Housing Opportunities within the County Consistent with the*  
26 *RCIP Vision Statement.* THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan provides a variety of  
27  
28

1 housing opportunities reflective of the County of Riverside’s fair share housing need. THE  
2 VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan consists of medium, medium-high, high density, and  
3 very high density residential uses. In addition, the mixed use Town Center Villages will  
4 allow for the integration of commercial and residential uses. It is intended that the Specific  
5 Plan, through the various residential densities, will cater to a range of lifestyles, physical  
6 abilities, and income levels.

7 **B. *Create a Project Consistent with the Southern California Council of Governments***  
8 ***(SCAG) RTP/SCS and SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy.*** As stated in SCAG’s  
9 May 7, 2012 letter, THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan is consistent with the growth  
10 projections contained in the RTP/SCS, and is an example of a community that meets that  
11 goals of the RTP/SCS because it espouses smart growth principles such as compact building  
12 design, integration of uses, and walkability, thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled on  
13 freeways.

14 **C. *Create a Range of Villages that Support a Mixed-Use Framework.*** THE VILLAGES OF  
15 LAKEVIEW Specific Plan creates a range of villages containing land uses that respond to the  
16 land and its setting; existing adjacent uses and the need for buffers; the opportunity to meet  
17 housing needs at many life stages; and the desire to create diverse, yet cohesive, villages  
18 within a mixed-use framework.

19 **D. *Design an Energy Efficient Community that Promotes Green Building Components.***  
20 THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan offers “green” housing choices and supports  
21 reduced energy consumption within houses built. It includes specific Green Building  
22 Development Standards requiring, among other things, that: if homebuilders install major  
23 appliances such as dishwashers, washing machines, and refrigerators in new residential  
24 units, Energy Star-rated model appliances (or other equivalent technology) must be used;  
25 street lights shall be installed with energy-efficient lighting; high efficiency light bulbs and  
26 lighting fixtures shall be installed in residential and non-residential buildings; where  
27 professional management is available, such as an HOA, recycled water shall be used in  
28

1 residential front-yards and backyards if available, and in adjacent street parkways, subject  
2 to EMWD and County approvals; California-appropriate vegetation shall be incorporated  
3 into THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW landscape; THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW will designate  
4 parking spaces for Electric Vehicles (EV); and the Project shall implement Transportation  
5 Demand Management (TDM) measures, including providing bicycle parking in recreation,  
6 commercial, and public use areas. Lastly, the Project includes the incorporation of solar  
7 facilities to help reduce its overall impact on the electrical grid and to advance the growth of  
8 renewable energy.

9 E. ***Provide Affordable Housing Opportunities.*** The Villages of Lakeview Specific Plan will  
10 provide a mix of housing types that include single-family detached, single-family attached,  
11 and multi-family dwellings and provide housing options for a diverse range of households  
12 with varying income levels located adjacent to employment-generating mixed-use and  
13 commercial land uses.

14 F. ***Support a Variety of Transportation Choices.*** THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan  
15 is designed to support a variety of transportation choices including walking, hiking, biking,  
16 mass transit, and automobile. It is designed to discourage the use of cars, and includes a 32-  
17 mile network of bicycle lanes, trails, and paseos leading to designations such as the library,  
18 schools, parks, open space, and bus stops. Sidewalks are separated from streets. The Villages  
19 of Lakeview Specific Plan will coordinate transportation with local and regional agencies  
20 where possible to maximize integration of the Project with local transportation planning and  
21 implementation efforts, including the possibility of extending the Riverside Transit  
22 Agency's Bus Rapid Transit System into the area and bus connections to Metrolink stations  
23 along the Perris Valley Line. The Project will create a Smart Shuttle Program to transport  
24 commuters from the Project site to the Perris Valley Line Metrolink Station or other  
25 Metrolink stations that may be closer to the site.

26 G. ***Conservation of Open Space Consistent with MSHCP Implementation.*** Over half of  
27 THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan contains open space (conservation, parks, trails,  
28

1 earthen drainage channels, landscape setbacks, terrace slopes, and open space). The Project  
2 was modified through the MSHCP HANS process to minimize impacts to sensitive species.  
3 The Project will designate approximately 1,175 acres for permanent conservation  
4 (approximately 145 acres for agriculture and 1,030 acres for biological resources), including  
5 approximately 192 acres north of Ramona Expressway (47 acres for biological conservation  
6 and 145 acres for agriculture), adjacent to the San Jacinto Wildlife Area; 970 acres located  
7 within the Lakeview Mountains, the majority of which consists of native habitats; and  
8 approximately 13 acres south of Ramona Expressway for PCL-20. The Project eliminates  
9 the frontage road (JJ Street), which would decrease the length of the future wildlife crossing  
10 for PCL-20. The designation of these conservation areas will avoid and preserve adjacent  
11 portions of the San Jacinto River, all alkali playa pools, and almost all of the Lakeview  
12 Mountains (including riparian habitat) within or immediately contiguous with the site.

13 H. ***Provide a Significant Buffer to the San Jacinto Wildlife Area.*** THE VILLAGES OF  
14 LAKEVIEW Specific Plan is designed to address and maintain compatibility with the San  
15 Jacinto Wildlife Area (SJWA) and San Jacinto River. The Project will provide an  
16 approximate 1,000-foot buffer between new development and the wildlife area. Allowable  
17 land uses in this area include passive park activities, water quality and drainage facilities,  
18 and natural open space. The majority of areas located north of Ramona Expressway in the  
19 River Bend Village (known as the Resort Village in the proposed Project) will be maintained  
20 as agriculture, with approximately 70 acres designated as commercial office property. As  
21 such, the Project provides a significant buffer to the SJWA and is designed to address and  
22 maintain compatibility with the SJWA and San Jacinto River.

23 I. ***Public Facilities with Regional Benefits.*** THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan  
24 provides funding of up to eight million dollars for future library expansion. Additional  
25 public facilities to benefit the region will include a public community center, sports park,  
26 and trails. Specifically, the Project will construct 82 acres of new onsite public parks, 15  
27 acres of joint-use parks, and 31 acres of trails (50% or 15.5 ac credit for park purposes), for  
28

1 a total of approximately 112.5 acres of parkland, providing 5.0 acres of parkland per each  
2 1,000 residents. The Project will also reserve up to two acres within the site for the purpose  
3 of the construction of a new fire station and contribute funding towards both new equipment  
4 and staffing.

5 J. ***Assist with Implementation of the Master Drainage Plan and Area Drainage Plan for***  
6 ***the Lakeview/Nuevo Area.*** The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation  
7 District adopted a Master Drainage Plan (MDP) and Area Drainage Plan (ADP) for the  
8 Lakeview/Nuevo area in 1981. The MDP includes improvements to the existing Lakeview  
9 Dam located south of the Project site that would reduce flooding in the Lakeview community  
10 and in certain western portions of the Project site. THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific  
11 Plan will construct the training dike and a connecting lateral to assist with implementation  
12 of the MDP, thus removing property downstream of the dam from flooding, including  
13 existing homes.

14 K. ***Construction of Water Quality Improvements that Treat Runoff Prior to Entering the***  
15 ***San Jacinto River.*** THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan proposes to construct a water  
16 quality basin (WQB) in the northwest portion of the site that will capture and treat runoff  
17 from on-site generated runoff before the runoff is discharged into downstream receiving  
18 water bodies. The WQB preliminary design was refined to demonstrate that existing  
19 hydrology can be managed to maintain existing drainage patterns as closely as possible to  
20 the existing site hydrology. Specifically, the Project's WQB is proposed to be split into two  
21 basins of approximately equal value. Flows would be split between the two basins;  
22 stormwater treated in the West WQB would discharge into the San Jacinto River at the same  
23 location as originally proposed, and stormwater treated in the East WQB would discharge to  
24 the off-site wetland area in the SJWA. The proposed refinement would allow treated water  
25 to discharge to the wetland more frequently than originally proposed to better match existing  
26 discharges to the SJWA. It would also improve flexibility of managing the quantity and  
27 timing of these discharges in the future. Offsite runoff is currently untreated and flows  
28

1 directly into storm drains or the San Jacinto River. With implementation of the Project,  
2 existing off-site, untreated runoff will be captured and treated before it is discharged,  
3 resulting in area-wide improvements to water quality that extend beyond the Project's  
4 runoff.

5 L. ***Provide Infiltration and Groundwater Recharge.*** In lieu of constructing traditional  
6 concrete-lined drainage channels with steep sides, which do not allow infiltration of storm  
7 water and groundwater recharge, create downstream erosion conditions, eliminate wildlife  
8 use, and are not aesthetically attractive, the Project will construct a four-mile earthen  
9 drainage and five miles of vegetated roadside swale, in an effort to promote infiltration and  
10 groundwater recharge.

11 M. ***Upgrade Regional Sanitary Sewer Infrastructure.*** THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific  
12 Plan will provide upgrades to regional infrastructure including new and expanded sanitary  
13 sewer service located off-site, in existing communities. Existing residents will benefit from  
14 installation of the sanitary sewer system, because existing properties not connected to a  
15 sanitary sewer system will be able to connect. The Project facilities will incorporate modern  
16 sanitary sewer construction, inspection, and maintenance practices.

17  
18 N. ***Traffic Facilities Fee.*** THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan will provide funding for  
19 traffic improvements (or portions thereof) that are not currently included in the Development  
20 Impact Fees or TUMF.

21 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the State CEQA Guidelines  
22 section 15126(g) requires an EIR to discuss how a proposed Project could directly or indirectly lead to  
23 economic, population, or housing growth. A Project may be growth inducing if it removes obstacles to  
24 growth, taxes, community service facilities, or encourages other activities which cause significant  
25 environmental effect. For reasons documented in the Final EIR No. 471 and summarized below, the  
26 discussion is as follows:

1 A. THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan, including construction of off-site improvements,  
2 will foster both population and economic growth directly through the development of 11,350  
3 residential dwelling units, which will yield a population of approximately 36,434 people to  
4 the Project site (at 3.21 persons per household). The Project also includes 500,000 square  
5 feet of commercial development, which has the potential to create approximately 1,190 jobs  
6 (at 1 employee per 420 square feet). The number of new dwelling units available will  
7 directly induce substantial population growth at the Project site and to the surrounding  
8 geographical area compared to the existing conditions, as will the commercial component.  
9 Based on the existing conditions of the Project site and surrounding geographical area,  
10 implementation of the proposed Project will result in the "urbanization" of the site, i.e., a  
11 change from the predominately rural/low density character of the site to that more akin to a  
12 large town or city. Additionally, Project construction will also generate demand for  
13 approximately 17,700 person-years' worth of work. However, given the nature of the phased  
14 build-out based on market demands coupled with the availability of labor in both the inland  
15 Riverside and San Bernardino County region and the Southern California region as a whole,  
16 it is reasonable to assume that the construction of the Project will be completed by companies  
17 already in business and doing business in the area, with employees already residing in the  
18 area, thus construction-related growth-inducing impacts are not anticipated. Even so,  
19 because of the quantity of new housing that will be provided by the Project, the Project will  
20 directly result in growth inducement. (EIR, pp. 6.0-44-6.0-45.)

21 THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan, Alternative 7 including construction of off-site  
22 improvements, will foster both population and economic growth directly through the  
23 development of 8,725 residential dwelling units, which will yield a population of  
24 approximately 28,007 people to the Project site (at 3.21 persons per household). Alternative  
25 7 also includes 1,380,000 square feet of commercial development, which has the potential  
26 to create approximately 3,286 jobs (at 1 employee per 420 square feet). The number of new  
27 dwelling units available will directly induce substantial population growth at the Alternative  
28

1 7 site and to the surrounding geographical area compared to the existing conditions, as will  
2 the commercial component. Based on the existing conditions of the Alternative 7 site and  
3 surrounding geographical area, implementation of the Alternative 7 will result in the  
4 “urbanization” of the site, i.e., a change from the predominately rural/low density character  
5 of the site to that more akin to a large town or city. Additionally, Alternative 7 construction  
6 will also generate demand for approximately 13,600 person-years’ worth of work.  
7 Alternative 7 would also directly result in substantial population growth in the area, as with  
8 the proposed Project. Moreover, development of Alternative 7 could potentially influence  
9 the timing and extent of development within adjacent properties from the improvements of  
10 off-site roadways and extension of water and sewer service to the area, and thus, would  
11 indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area as with the proposed Project.  
12 (EIR, pp. 7.0-61–7.0-64.)

13 B. The urbanization of the Project site through either the proposed Project or Alternative 7 will  
14 likely influence continued development of vacant, unimproved adjacent properties within  
15 the surrounding geographical area as a result of the extension and/or increased capacity of  
16 infrastructure. Specifically, the construction of extended and increased capacity potable  
17 water and wastewater conveyance facilities to the immediate area, and off-site roadway  
18 segments and intersection improvements will provide services where none currently exist.  
19 Additionally, the Project proponent has agreed with RCFC&WCD to construct the Lateral  
20 D storm drain and training dike to direct additional flows into the existing Lakeview Dam,  
21 removing an existing flood risk to area properties, and thus, removing a potential obstacle to  
22 additional development. Since the surrounding area is primarily vacant or rural-type  
23 properties, the infrastructure improvements and expansion required for both the Project and  
24 Alternative 7 will eliminate existing constraints for future development and remove obstacles  
25 to population growth in this area. This type of future development in the surrounding  
26 geographical area may also contribute to further urbanization of the area, thereby potentially  
27 resulting in a growth-inducing impact. In other words, this Project and Alternative 7 can be  
28



1 considered to have growth inducing impacts as improvement of roadways and utility  
2 infrastructure into the area will likely encourage development of existing agricultural or  
3 vacant land that might not otherwise be improved into a higher density use increasing the  
4 area's built environment. (EIR, pp. 6.0-45; 7.0-64.)

5 C. The Mid County Parkway will serve multimodal bus and rail facilities that are part of the  
6 Perris Valley Line, which is served by the commuter rail service Metrolink, and connects  
7 the cities of Perris and Riverside and areas west by extending existing service (Metrolink 91  
8 Line) that links the city of Riverside with downtown Los Angeles via Fullerton.  
9 Additionally, the Perris Valley Line connects the Perris Multimodal Facility locations in  
10 downtown Perris and provide for connecting bus service (including Riverside Transit  
11 Agency). The Perris Multimodal Facility is in close proximity to the Mid County Parkway  
12 alignment, and as a result, by reducing travel time and traffic congestion in the Mid County  
13 Parkway area, which includes the Project site area, the Mid County Parkway will help  
14 improve accessibility to stations serving the Perris Valley Line. It should also be noted that  
15 Mid County Parkway includes a 62-foot-wide center median, which could be used for high  
16 occupancy vehicles lanes, bus-only lanes, additional mixed-flow lanes, or rail in the future.  
17 Further, as part of Mid County Parkway, RCTC will provide facilities for bicycles and  
18 pedestrians in locations where local streets will cross the Parkway, and existing and planning  
19 bike routes and trails are being considered. Therefore, these multimodal design  
20 considerations and linkages provided by the Mid County Parkway will also directly and  
21 indirectly foster both population and economic growth within the Project and Alternative 7  
22 site areas and along the Parkway corridor, independently of Project implementation. (EIR,  
23 p. 6.0-46.)

24 D. Although EMWD has planned for the Project and Alternative 7, and improvements are  
25 expected to be incremental—occurring as the Project or Alternative 7 develops—the Project  
26 and Alternative 7 could be considered growth inducing because either will extend existing  
27 and increased capacity water and wastewater conveyance pipelines to the Project and  
28

1 Alternative 7 site areas, which will also eliminate existing septic system constraints and  
2 make it easier to accommodate future growth, thereby contributing significantly to  
3 eliminating development constraints making the Project or Alternative 7 a contributor to  
4 indirect growth inducement. (EIR, p. 6.0-49.)

5 E. Implementation of energy service improvements is not directly growth-inducing because it  
6 occurs incrementally as needed to adequately supply the actual and projected demands of  
7 development. However, these improvements indirectly foster economic and population  
8 growth by removing barriers to development in areas that are underserved or where capacity  
9 would be exceeded and energy system improvements are needed to support new  
10 development. While there is a likely indirect growth-inducing outcome to SCE constructing  
11 the Lakeview Substation and the SCGC natural gas infrastructure in the Project area, these  
12 activities are entirely independent of the Project and Alternative 7. That is to say these  
13 actions by SCE and SCGC are not designed to specifically serve the Project or Alternative  
14 7, but rather the existing and projected demand in the Lakeview/Nuevo area. This energy  
15 service infrastructure will be sufficient for the Project or Alternative 7, and as no off-site  
16 improvements or extensions into the Project or Alternative 7 site areas are needed for the  
17 Project or Alternative 7, implementation of the Project or Alternative 7 will not result in an  
18 indirect growth-inducing impact with regards to energy services. (EIR, p. 6.0-50.)

19 F. There is a potential for unplanned and planned growth-related effects in the surrounding  
20 geographical area as a result of implementing the proposed Project or Alternative 7. All  
21 future development projects, including those indirectly induced by the proposed Project or  
22 Alternative 7, will be subject to their own environmental review processes and will be  
23 required to comply with applicable regulations and policies, and to develop mitigation  
24 measures to offset impacts to resources of concern, as feasible. However, significant and  
25 unavoidable environmental effects may still result for certain development projects,  
26 including those indirectly induced by the proposed Project or Alternative 7. Therefore,  
27 implementation of the proposed Project or Alternative 7, for its direct and indirect growth  
28

1 inducement resulting from directly fostering population and economic growth and indirectly  
2 so from extension of water and sewer conveyance infrastructure to the Project site area, and  
3 to a lesser degree the off-site roadway improvements, could likely result in significant  
4 environmental impacts in the long-term from this reasonably anticipated future  
5 development. (EIR, p. 6.0-54.)

6 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Project or Alternative 7 will  
7 implement applicable elements of the Riverside County General Plan as follows:

8 A. Land Use Element.

9 Analysis of the Project's consistency with all of the 2003 General Plan and 2015 General  
10 Plan Land Use Element policies is presented in EIR Appendix N, pages 1-70 and in EIR  
11 Section 5.9, Land Use and Planning, incorporated herein by reference. A discussion of  
12 Alternative 7's consistency with General Plan policies is presented on page 7.0-57 of the  
13 EIR. The analysis in the EIR concluded that with approval of GPA No. 720, the proposed  
14 Project and Alternative 7 are compatible with, and do not frustrate, the goals and policies of  
15 the General Plan Land Use Element.

16 B. Circulation Element.

17 Analysis of the Project's consistency with all of the 2003 General Plan and 2015 General  
18 Plan Circulation Element policies is presented in EIR Appendix N on pages 70-107 and in  
19 EIR Section 5.9, Land Use and Planning, incorporated herein by reference. A discussion of  
20 Alternative 7's consistency with General Plan policies is presented on page 7.0-57 of the  
21 EIR. The analysis in the EIR concluded that with approval of GPA No. 721, the proposed  
22 Project and Alternative 7 are compatible with, and do not frustrate, the goals and policies of  
23 the General Plan Circulation Element.

24 C. Multipurpose Open Space Element.

25 Analysis of the Project's consistency with all of the 2003 General Plan and 2015 General  
26 Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element policies is presented in EIR Appendix N on pages  
27 107-131, incorporated herein by reference. A discussion of Alternative 7's consistency with  
28

1 General Plan policies is presented on page 7.0-57 of the EIR. The analysis in the EIR  
2 concluded that the proposed Project and Alternative 7 are compatible with, and do not  
3 frustrate, the goals and policies of the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element.

4 D. Safety Element.

5 Analysis of the Project's consistency with all of the 2003 General Plan and 2015 General  
6 Plan Safety Element policies is presented in EIR Appendix N on pages 131-153,  
7 incorporated herein by reference. A discussion of Alternative 7's consistency with General  
8 Plan policies is presented on page 7.0-57 of the EIR. The analysis in the EIR concluded that  
9 the proposed Project and Alternative 7 are compatible with, and do not frustrate, the goals  
10 and policies of the General Plan Safety Element.

11 E. Noise Element.

12 Analysis of the Project's consistency with all of the 2003 General Plan and 2015 General  
13 Plan Noise Element policies is presented in EIR Appendix N on pages 153-173,  
14 incorporated herein by reference. A discussion of Alternative 7's consistency with General  
15 Plan policies is presented on page 7.0-57 of the EIR. The analysis in the EIR concluded that  
16 the proposed Project and Alternative 7 are compatible with, and do not frustrate, the goals  
17 and policies of the General Plan Noise Element.

18 F. Housing Element.

19 Analysis of the Project's consistency with all of the 2003 General Plan and 2015 General  
20 Plan Housing Element policies is presented in EIR Appendix N on pages 133-175,  
21 incorporated herein by reference. A discussion of Alternative 7's consistency with General  
22 Plan policies is presented on page 7.0-57 of the EIR. The analysis in the EIR concluded that  
23 the proposed Project and Alternative 7 are compatible with, and do not frustrate, the goals  
24 and policies of the General Plan Housing Element.

25 G. Air Quality Element.

26 Analysis of the Project's consistency with all of the 2003 General Plan and 2015 General  
27 Plan Air Quality Element policies is presented in EIR Appendix N on pages 175-211,  
28

1 incorporated herein by reference. A discussion of Alternative 7's consistency with General  
2 Plan policies is presented on page 7.0-57 of the EIR. The analysis in the EIR concluded that  
3 the proposed Project and Alternative 7 are compatible with, and do not frustrate, the goals  
4 and policies of the General Plan Air Quality Element.

5 H. Healthy Communities Element.

6 Analysis of the Project's consistency with all of the 2003 General Plan and 2015 General  
7 Plan Healthy Communities Element policies is presented in EIR Appendix N on pages 211-  
8 223, incorporated herein by reference. A discussion of Alternative 7's consistency with  
9 General Plan policies is presented on page 7.0-57 of the EIR. The analysis in the EIR  
10 concluded that the proposed Project and Alternative 7 are compatible with, and do not  
11 frustrate, the goals and policies of the General Plan Healthy Communities Element.

12 I. Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan.

13 Analysis of the Project's consistency with all of the 2003 LNAP and 2015 LNAP is presented  
14 in EIR Appendix N on pages 223-230 and in EIR Section 5.9, Land Use and Planning,  
15 incorporated herein by reference. A discussion of Alternative 7's consistency with LNAP  
16 policies is presented on page 7.0-57 of the EIR. The analysis in the EIR concluded that with  
17 approval of GPA No. 720 and GPA No. 721, the proposed Project and Alternative 7 are  
18 compatible with, and do not frustrate, the goals and policies of the LNAP.

19 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the EIR also discusses, pursuant  
20 to State CEQA Guidelines sections 15126(c) and 15126.2(c), irreversible environmental changes and  
21 provides in EIR Section 6.4, pages 6.0-56-6.0-57, the following:

- 22 A. Implementation of the proposed Project would irreversibly commit approximately 1,800  
23 acres of the generally non-urbanized Project site for the development of residential,  
24 commercial, and public facilities land uses. The irreversible environmental changes of this  
25 urbanization include: loss of agricultural soils and agricultural zoning, increased traffic  
26 volumes, incremental degradation of the regional air quality, additional noise created by  
27 traffic generated by inhabitants of the Project, incremental demands for public services and  
28

1 utilities, and changes to the visual environment that will not likely be reversed. Significant  
2 unavoidable adverse environmental effects associated with degradation of air quality,  
3 agriculture, aesthetics, indirect biological effects, ambient noise, and increased traffic levels  
4 will result in the long term from development following implementation of all mitigation  
5 measures, conditions of approval, Project Design Features, and local, state, and federal  
6 regulations. (EIR, p. 6.0-56.)

7 Implementation of Alternative 7 would irreversibly commit approximately 1,722 acres of  
8 the generally non-urbanized Alternative 7 site for the development of residential,  
9 commercial, and public facilities land uses. Similar to the Project, the irreversible  
10 environmental changes of this urbanization associated with Alternative 7 include: loss of  
11 agricultural soils and agricultural zoning, increased traffic volumes, incremental degradation  
12 of the regional air quality, additional noise created by traffic generated by inhabitants of  
13 Alternative 7, incremental demands for public services and utilities, and changes to the visual  
14 environment that will not likely be reversed. Significant unavoidable adverse environmental  
15 effects associated with degradation of air quality, agriculture, aesthetics, indirect biological  
16 effects, ambient noise, and increased traffic levels will result in the long term from  
17 development following implementation of all mitigation measures, conditions of approval,  
18 Project Design Features, and local, state, and federal regulations. (EIR, pp. 7.0-97-7.0-98)

19 B. Primary impacts will result from the consumption of non-renewable resources during  
20 construction and operation of the proposed Project and Alternative 7. Non-renewable  
21 resources such as sand, gravel, and steel, and renewable resources such as lumber will be  
22 consumed during Project or Alternative 7 construction. Energy, fossil fuels, oils, and natural  
23 gas will be irreversibly committed during construction. These same resources are used for  
24 vehicles and heating/cooling equipment during operations. The continued use of these  
25 resources associated with Project operations represents a long-term obligation. The energy  
26 consumed in developing and maintaining the site for urban use may be considered a  
27 permanent investment. (EIR, pp. 6.0-56, 7.0-88 - 89.)

1 C. Secondary impacts result from fuel consumption in the form of air pollution which degrades  
2 both air quality in general and contributes to the formation of GHG which cumulatively  
3 affect global warming. Human activities associated with industrial/manufacturing, utilities,  
4 transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors contribute to these GHG. Transportation  
5 is responsible for 41 percent of the state's GHG emissions, followed by electricity  
6 generation. Emissions of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) are byproducts  
7 of fossil fuel combustion. Methane, a highly potent GHG, results from off-gassing associated  
8 with agricultural practices and landfills. (EIR, pp. 6.0-56, 7.0-93–7.0-97.; see also EIR  
9 Section 5.16.)

10 D. Project or Alternative 7 development will result in a long-term, irreversible change in the  
11 visual character of the Project site. The non-urbanized, agricultural character of the site  
12 would be transformed into residential/commercial development. Night lighting in the Project  
13 vicinity would incrementally increase as a result of the proposed development. The “open  
14 space” quality of agriculture currently visible in the community will be irreversibly changed  
15 to a developed state and is unlikely to revert to open space again even after the 50- to 75-  
16 year life span of structures on site is reached. (EIR, pp. 6.0-56, 7.0-26–7.0-27, 7.0-97; see  
17 also EIR Section 5.1.)

18 E. Project development will convert approximately 1,237 acres of Designated Farmland (894  
19 acres of Prime Farmland, 309 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, 34 acre of Unique  
20 Farmland) to non-agricultural land uses. Indirect impacts of the Project may result as planned  
21 regional improvements to roadways and utilities convert surrounding Designated Farmland  
22 to non-agricultural land uses which will be permanent. (EIR, p. 6.0-56; see also EIR Section  
23 5.2.)

24 Development of Alternative 7 will convert approximately 1,151 acres of Designated  
25 Farmland (827 acres of Prime Farmland, 305 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance,  
26 19 acres of Unique Farmland) to non-agricultural land uses. Indirect impacts of Alternative  
27 7 may result as planned regional improvements to roadways and utilities convert surrounding  
28

1 Designated Farmland to non-agricultural land uses which will be permanent. (EIR, pp. 7.0-  
2 27-7.0-28.)

3 F. The Project or Alternative 7 will also introduce indirect impacts with respect to state  
4 endangered, or threatened species, or on any species identified as a federal candidate,  
5 sensitive, or special status species. Through the MSHCP Urban/Wildlands Interface  
6 Guidelines, projects located adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area are required to  
7 implement measures to address indirect effects to plants and wildlife located within the  
8 adjacent Conservation Areas. The implementation of such measures is intended to reduce  
9 indirect effects to below a level of significance. However, the Project or Alternative 7 along  
10 with subsequent developments will introduce additional population to the area which  
11 indirectly and cumulatively impacts these species and their habitats. As the urban dwellers  
12 will be permanent, irreversible changes to edge conditions will result. (EIR, pp. 6.0-57, 7.0-  
13 41; see also EIR Section 5.4.)

14 G. Although the site was previously utilized for agriculture, imported water consumption  
15 increases will result from Project or Alternative 7 development. Such additional  
16 consumption in this area will require a long-term commitment to providing such service.  
17 Due to the lack of developed groundwater resources for urban use, imported potable water  
18 will be needed to serve the site. Conservation programs and mitigation measures will limit  
19 consumption, encourage reuse and groundwater recharge, and therefore demand on potable  
20 water sources will be lessened, but such measures cannot prevent irreversible use of water  
21 from imported sources. (EIR, p. 6.0-57; 7.0-86-7.0-87; see also EIR Sections 5.8 and 5.15.)

22 H. The Project or Alternative 7 together with ambient growth and other cumulative projects in  
23 the vicinity will result in significant area-wide noise impacts due to increased ambient noise  
24 levels caused by either the Project or Alternative 7. Noise levels will remain higher  
25 permanently. (EIR, p. 6.0-57; 7.0-58-7.0-60; see also EIR Section 5.10.)

26 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that Specific Plan No. 342 is  
27 consistent with the Riverside County General Plan.



1           **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and considered  
2 EIR No. 471 in evaluating General Plan Amendment Nos. 720 and 721, Specific Plan No. 342, Change of  
3 Zone No. 7055 and Development Agreement No. 73, that EIR No. 471 is an accurate and objective  
4 statement that complies with the California Environmental Quality Act and reflects the County's  
5 independent judgment, and that EIR No. 471 is incorporated herein by this reference.

6           **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **ADOPTS** the statement of  
7 overriding consideration, **CERTIFIES** EIR No. 471 and **ADOPTS** the Mitigation Monitoring and  
8 Reporting Plan attached as Attachment A hereto. To the extent that there are any inconsistencies between  
9 the mitigation measures as set forth in EIR No. 471, and those set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and  
10 Reporting Program, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program shall control.

11           **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that Specific Plan No. 342, on file  
12 with the Clerk of the Board, including the final conditions of approval and exhibits, is hereby **ADOPTED**  
13 as the Specific Plan of Land Use for the real property described and shown in Specific Plan No. 342, and  
14 said real property shall be developed substantially in accordance with Specific Plan No. 342, unless Specific  
15 Plan No. 342 is amended by the Board of Supervisors.

16           **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors copies of Specific Plan No. 342 shall  
17 be placed on file in the Office of the Clerk of the Board, in the Office of the County Planning Department,  
18 and the Office of the Building and Safety Director, and that no applications for subdivision maps,  
19 conditional use permits or other development approvals shall be accepted for the real property described  
20 and shown in Specific Plan No. 342, unless such applications are substantially in accordance therewith.

21           **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the custodian of the documents  
22 upon which this decision is based are the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and the County Planning  
23 Department and that such documents are located at 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, California.

24 ROLL CALL:

25 Ayes:           Jeffries, Tavaglione, Perez and Ashley  
26 Nays:           None  
27 Absent:         Washington

The foregoing is certified to be a true copy of a  
resolution duly adopted by said Board of Super-  
visors on the date therein set forth.

By  Deputy  
K. H. APPLE, Clerk of said Board

**ATTACHMENT "A"**

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

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

### 3.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
Aesthetics	<p><b>MM Aesthetics 1:</b> Permanent water tank(s) shall be screened using landscaping and paint colors that blend in with the surrounding hills. A combination of earthen berms and landscaping may be used. The landscape screening plans shall be submitted to Eastern Municipal Water District for approval prior to approval of final construction documents for the tank(s).</p>	<p>Prior to final approval of construction documents for water tank(s).</p>	EMWD	<p>Landscape and construction plans shall be submitted to EMWD for approval.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Aesthetics 2 - Alt 7:</b> Landscaping shall be provided adjacent to the Garden Village and Town Center Village to address foreground views from Ramona Expressway. The extent and nature of the landscaping shall be reviewed and approved by the County during the Village Refinement Process for these villages. The Village Refinement Process is detailed in Section B.11 of The Villages of Lakeview Specific Plan, Alternative 7, and shall occur prior to, or concurrent with, the first subdivision within a village. The landscaping shall include drought-tolerant, low groundcover and shrubs with mulch or rock to provide an attractive ground plain. Trees shall be grouped to create a row between Ramona Expressway and any residential units consistent with <b>MM AQ 3</b>.</p>	<p>Prior to Village Refinement Plan approval for Garden and Town Center Villages.</p>	Planning Department	<p>Village Refinement Plans shall be submitted to Planning Department for approval.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Aesthetics 3:</b> The landscaping of the school and residential uses within the Hansen Avenue area shall include the preservation of existing mature trees, to the extent feasible, and the use of white split rail fences. The preservation of the trees shall be confirmed at the approval of the Village Refinement Plan (detailed in Section B.11 of the Specific Plan) for the Garden Village and finalized prior to Final Inspection of last adjacent residential unit. If the 24 existing trees along the entry to the horse ranch cannot be preserved, then they shall be replaced within the planned park at a ratio of 1:1 by the planting of new 36-inch box trees of the same species as the mature trees being removed. The Multi-Purpose Community Trail along Hansen and Wolfskill Avenues and Poppy Road shall also include trees spaced to the extent feasible so as not to block views and shall also incorporate the use of white split-rail fences. Prior to grading permits, landscape plans shall be submitted to the Building Department for approval. Construction of trail and landscaping shall occur commensurate with adjacent implementing tracts and finalized prior to Final Inspection of last adjacent residential unit. Construction of the park elements shall be completed as required per unit number triggers in the Specific Plan (No. 342) as reflected in the Parkland Tracking Report. The Parkland Tracking Report shall be accompanied with the Village Refinement Plan and shall occur prior to, or concurrent with, the first subdivision within a village as detailed in Section B.11 of the Specific Plan.</p>	<p>Tree preservation confirmation prior to Village Refinement Plan approval for the Garden Village; finalized prior to Final Inspection of last adjacent residential unit.  Trails and landscaping prior to last building permit for residential uses in implementing maps adjacent to Hansen Avenue, Wolfskill Avenue, and/or Poppy Road.</p>	<p>Planning Department and Building &amp; Safety Department</p>	<p>Village Refinement Plan shall be submitted to Planning Department for approval.  Landscape plans shall be submitted to the Building &amp; Safety Department for approval.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Aesthetics 4:</b> Grading plans for the portions of the site which abut Wolfskill Avenue or Poppy Road, shall be reviewed by the Building Department to ensure that slopes which are higher than existing roads are no higher or longer than the Conceptual Grading Diagram in Specific Plan 342 indicates. Building layouts and setbacks shall also be reviewed to ensure that some views over or between proposed buildings are maintained along Wolfskill Avenue. Some means of achieving the intent of this mitigation may include, but are not limited to: reduced-height homes along the frontage with existing local roads, larger setbacks, stepped grading, etc.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permits.</p>	Building & Safety Department	<p>Grading plans shall be submitted to the Building &amp; Safety Department for approval.</p>	

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
Agricultural and Forestry Resources	<p><b>MM Ag 1:</b> A perpetual agricultural conservation easement as defined by Section 815.1 of the California Civil Code (Easement) and containing a minimum of 100 acres of "agricultural land" as defined by Public Resources Code Section 10213, within five miles of the project or within the project boundaries, shall be provided by the Master Developer to the state, county, resource conservation district, regional park or open-space district, regional park or open-space authority, a nonprofit organization, or other entity authorized to acquire and hold conservation easements under Civil Code Section 815.3 as approved by the Riverside County Planning Department. The purpose of this Easement is to restrict the property's use to only those uses that will not impair or interfere with the property's agricultural productive capacity, its soils, and its agricultural character, values, and utility. To the extent that the preservation of the open space character and scenic, habitat, natural, or historic values of the property are consistent with such use, it will be within the purpose of this easement to protect those values. Rural enterprises or activities, including, but not limited to, grazing, hunting and fishing, wildlife habitat improvement, predator control, timber harvesting, and firewood production shall be permitted uses provided that the agricultural productivity of the land is not significantly impaired by those activities. The Easement shall be recorded on or before the issuance of the 1,500th building permit.</p> <p><b>MM Ag 2:</b> To reduce potential significant adverse impacts due to incompatibility between agricultural uses and proposed development, proposed residences, and school buildings shall be setback 300 feet from the location of any of the following active agricultural uses: corrals, chicken houses, dairy waste ponds, manure stockpiles, or commercial livestock pens. This setback shall not apply to areas of the project where Ramona Expressway intervenes between active agriculture and proposed development. The 300-foot setback may include public road rights-of-way, parking lots, and service or maintenance areas. A temporary 300-foot setback shall also be maintained between occupied project-related buildings and any of the existing on-site or adjacent active corrals, chicken houses, dairy waste ponds, manure stockpiles, or commercial livestock pens that are located in a later phase of project development and that may continue to operate while earlier phases of development are built. The temporary setback requirement shall expire when the applicable onsite use is discontinued and the planned residential and school development may then occur in the previous setback area.</p> <p><b>MM Ag 3:</b> All owners or renters of residential units in the project shall be provided with a recorded deed disclosure or similar written notice prior to the completion of a residential purchase transaction or a lease. The notice shall inform new residents that existing agricultural uses near the project area may create nuisances such as flies, odors, dust, and chemical spraying. This form of the disclosure shall be approved by the County during the review and approval of the first tentative map for the project and shall be supplied to a residential property purchaser or renter by the Master Developer, Master Developer's agent or the Master Developer's successors in interest or assignees, including any purchaser of residential property within the project area.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of the 1,500<sup>th</sup> building permit.</p> <p>Prior to approval of Tentative Tract Maps within 300 feet from active agricultural uses.</p> <p>Prior to approval of the Tentative Tract Map.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p> <p>Planning Department</p> <p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Conservation easement shall be submitted and recorded by Riverside County.</p> <p>Tentative Tract Maps shall be submitted to the Planning Department for approval, and Maps shall show the 300-foot setback from active agricultural uses.</p> <p>Disclosure form shall be submitted to the Planning Department for approval, and supplied to a residential property purchaser or renter.</p>	
Air Quality	<p><b>MM AQ 1:</b> During construction, ozone precursor emissions from mobile construction equipment shall be controlled by maintaining equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune as required by and compared against the manufacturers' specifications applicable to each piece of equipment to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety. Equipment maintenance records and equipment design specification data sheets shall be kept on-site during construction. Compliance with this measure shall be subject to periodic inspections by the Department of Building and Safety.</p> <p><b>MM AQ 2:</b> During grading phases, all project developers shall use construction equipment (i.e., scrapers, dozers, and tractors/loaders/backhoes) that is United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Tier 3 certified. Proof of compliance shall be reviewed by the Department of Building and Safety's Grading Division prior to issuance of a grading permit. For all other off-road equipment with engines rated at 75 horsepower or greater, no construction equipment will be used that is less than Tier 2 at the commencement of construction (2016), less than Tier 3 starting in construction year 5 (2020), less than Tier 4 interim starting in construction year 10 (2025), and Tier 4 Final starting in construction year 15 (2030). An exemption from these requirements may be granted by Riverside County in the event that the applicant documents that (1) equipment with the required tier is not reasonably available (e.g., reasonability factors to be considered include those available within Riverside County within the scheduled construction period), and (2) corresponding reductions in criteria pollutant emissions are achieved from other construction equipment.</p>	<p>During construction.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of grading permit.</p>	<p>Building &amp; Safety Department</p> <p>Building &amp; Safety Department's Grading Division</p>	<p>Equipment maintenance records and equipment specification data sheets shall be kept on site.</p> <p>Proof of compliance shall be submitted to Building &amp; Safety Department's Grading Division for approval.</p>	

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
	<p><b>MM AQ 3:</b> Where economically and physically feasible, project developers shall use electricity from power poles instead of temporary diesel or gasoline powered generators. Feasibility shall be determined by the Department of Building and Safety's Grading Division prior to issuance of grading permits.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permit.</p>	<p>Building &amp; Safety Department's Grading Division</p>	<p>Issuance of grading permits.</p>	
	<p><b>MM AQ 4:</b> All project developers shall minimize vehicle and truck idling time during construction through the implementation of traffic control measures (e.g., including turn lanes during construction activities, scheduling of construction activities to minimize congestion, parking configuration to minimize traffic interference). Prior to issuance of grading permits, a traffic control plan detailing the traffic control measures shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Building and Safety's Grading Division.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permit.</p>	<p>Building &amp; Safety Department's Grading Division</p>	<p>Traffic control plan shall be submitted for approval.</p>	
	<p><b>MM AQ 5 – AR 7:</b> The applicant or its successor shall install tiered vegetative landscaping, which shall include trees with finely needled leaves, like Deodar, between Ramona Expressway/Mid-County Parkway and any residential unit located within 500 feet of Ramona Expressway/Mid County Parkway on the project site. The tiered vegetation shall extend at least 154 feet (50 meters) laterally on either side of the project site. It shall be maintained as part of the residential community landscaping areas. Landscape plans shall be reviewed and approved by the County.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permit for any unit within 500 feet of Ramona Expressway/Mid County Parkway.</p>	<p>Building &amp; Safety Department</p>	<p>Landscapes plan shall be submitted to Building &amp; Safety Department for approval.</p>	
	<p><b>MM AQ 6 – AR 7:</b> The applicant or its successor shall install an air filtration system on any Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system within any residential unit located within 500 feet of Ramona Expressway/Mid County Parkway on the project site. The air filtration system shall achieve a reduction of at least 80 percent of the particulate matter emissions, such as can be achieved with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value 13 ("MERV-13") air filtration system. For rental units within 500 feet of the Ramona Expressway/Mid County Parkway on the project site, the owner/property manager shall maintain the air filtration system on any HVAC in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. For residential owned units within 500 feet of Ramona Expressway/Mid County Parkway on the project site, the homeowner's association (HOA) shall incorporate requirements for long-term maintenance of the air filtration system on any HVAC in the HOA's Covenant, Conditions, and Restrictions.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of Final Inspection for any unit within 500 feet of Ramona Expressway/Mid County Parkway.</p>	<p>Planning Department, County Counsel, and Building &amp; Safety Department</p>	<p>Issuance of building permits. CC&amp;Rs shall be submitted to the Planning Department and County Counsel for approval.</p>	
	<p><b>MM AQ 7:</b> Project developers shall minimize grading, earth-moving, and other energy-intensive construction practices.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permits</p>	<p>Building &amp; Safety Department's Grading Division.</p>	<p>Issuance of grading permits.</p>	
	<p><b>MM AQ 8:</b> The project developers will encourage construction contractors to apply for SCQMD "SOON" funds for construction equipment.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permits.</p>	<p>Building &amp; Safety Department's Grading Division.</p>	<p>Construction specifications shall include information for applying.</p>	

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
	<p><b>MM AQ 9:</b> Prior to issuance of grading or building permit, the project proponent shall submit a Fugitive Dust Control Plan to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for review and approval. The Fugitive Dust Control Plan shall reduce emissions, during construction of particulate matter that is 10 microns or less and 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM10 and PM2.5). The Fugitive Dust Control Plan shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Name(s), address(es), and phone number(s) of person(s) responsible for the preparation, submission and implementation of the plan.</li> <li>2. Identification of a dust control supervisor that has completed the SCAQMD Fugitive Dust Control Class.</li> <li>3. Description and location of operation(s).</li> <li>4. Listing of all fugitive dust emissions sources included in the operation.</li> <li>5. The following dust control measures shall be implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain daily records to document the specific dust control actions taken</li> <li>• Implement Table 2 or Rule 403 at all times and actions specified in Table 3 of Rule 403 when applicable.</li> <li>• Install and maintain project signage with project contact person that meets the minimum standards of Rule 403 Implementation Handbook</li> <li>• Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind gusts (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.</li> <li>• Apply water at least three times daily, or non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces.</li> <li>• To prevent trackout, pave construction roadways as early as possible; install gravel pads; install wheel shakers or wheel washers, and limit site access.</li> <li>• When sweeping streets to remove visible soil materials, use SCAQMD Rule 1186 and 1186.1 certified street sweepers or roadway washing trucks.</li> <li>• Limit soil disturbance to the amounts analyzed in the Final EIR.</li> <li>• Replace ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.</li> <li>• All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc., to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.</li> <li>• All haul trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials on public roads shall be covered (e.g., with tarps or other enclosures that would reduce fugitive dust emissions).</li> <li>• Where feasible, use bedliners in bottom-dumping haul vehicles.</li> <li>• Traffic speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to a maximum of 15 miles per hour.</li> <li>• Require the application of non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specification to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).</li> <li>• Other fugitive dust control measures as necessary to comply with SCAQMD Rules and Regulations.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>MM AQ 10:</b> During construction, project developers shall have truck routes clearly marked with trailblazer signs, so trucks will not enter residential areas.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading or building permit</p>	<p>South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)</p>	<p>Approval of Fugitive Dust Control Plan</p>	
	<p><b>MM AQ 11:</b> The project developers shall, where feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use coatings and solvents with a VOC content lower than that required under SCAQMD Rule 1113.</li> <li>• Construct or build with materials that do not require painting.</li> <li>• Require the use of pre-painted construction materials.</li> </ul>	<p>During Construction</p>	<p>Project developers Building and Safety Department's Grading Division</p>	<p>Traffic control plan shall be submitted for approval.</p>	
		<p>During Construction</p>	<p>Project developers Building and Safety Department's Grading Division</p>	<p>Building plans shall demonstrate how these practices were encouraged.</p>	

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
<b>Biological Resources</b>	<p><b>MM Bio 1:</b> The project will introduce new sources of nighttime lighting and glare near conservation areas for outdoor security purposes and the residences located on site. Proposed land uses immediately adjacent to the SJWA (northern interface) consist of conservation and open space with drainage facilities (including but not limited to drainage facilities, water quality basins, and passive parks). Proposed land uses adjacent to the Lakeview Mountains (southern interface) consist of residential development (including a fuel modification zone for fire protection) and park use. Potential impacts from introduced lights include impacts to migratory birds that use constellations to guide them during migration and impacts to foraging, reproduction, and circadian rhythms of other species. The CC&amp;Rs and Homeowners' Associations will ensure that lighting is not projected into the Conservation Area at either interface. Street lighting will be designed with internal baffles to direct the lighting towards the ground and have a zero side angle cut off to the horizon. At the interface with the Lakeview Mountains, street lighting will be at least 50 feet away from the Conservation Area. North of Ramona Expressway, street lighting will be at least 400 feet from the project's proposed conservation areas and at least 500 feet away from the existing SJWA. The shielded lighting and adequate setback will ensure that there will be no spillage of lighting into the Conservation Area. The CC&amp;Rs shall be submitted to the Planning Department and County Counsel prior to Map Recordation and will restrict the placement and use of lighting on private residential properties, such that individual residences will not direct lighting into the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Prior to map recordation.</p>	<p>Planning Department and County Counsel</p>	<p>CC&amp;Rs shall be submitted to the Planning Department and County Counsel for approval.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Bio 2:</b> Planning Areas and roads adjacent to the SJWA, Proposed Constrained Linkage 20 (wildlife corridor) and Lakeview Mountains will incorporate barriers (as appropriate) to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal trespass, or unauthorized dumping. The exception will be public access locations, which will direct the public to authorized access areas within the Conservation Area (i.e., SJWA and the Lakeview Mountains). All barriers will be placed within the boundaries of the development and will be outside of the Conservation Areas. Barriers will be located between the SJWA/Lakeview Mountains and houses/paved roads. Barriers will be designed to accommodate wildlife movement, but directing wildlife away from residential areas. Barriers may consist of, but not be limited to, walls, plants, fences, berms, and other means (such as horizontal distance and vertical distance) or combination of means to achieve the desired result. Cat-proof barriers shall be installed by the developer along the interface between the project residential planning area boundaries and the Lakeview Mountains Conservation Area and the wildlife corridor. The final design of both the cat-proof barriers and the "edge zone treatment" barriers (referred to previously in this measure) shall be completed based on consultation between the developer, County Planning Department, Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) and as approved by the County Environment Programs Department when tentative tract maps and/or road plans are approved. California Department of Fish and Wildlife San Jacinto Wildlife Area representatives will be consulted regarding final design of barriers along the SJWA edge, the Lakeview Mountains conservation area, and the wildlife corridor. At the time of grading permit submission for implementing projects in Planning Areas in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Areas (i.e., Lakeview Mountains and SJWA) the County will require submittal of fencing plans which will be routed and approved by the RCA prior to the issuance of the grading permit. Where barriers are required between established conservation areas and other areas of the project site, impacts to cultural resources shall be taken into consideration with respect to location, design, and installation such that cultural resources adjacent to the conservation areas are avoided and that the setting is respected or enhanced. The County Archaeologist, or designee thereof, shall review all barrier plans proposed adjacent to conservation areas on-site to assure consistency with this mitigation measure.</p>	<p>Prior to the approval of Tentative Tract Map s.</p>	<p>Environmental Programs Department</p>	<p>Tentative Tract Maps and street improvement plans shall be submitted for approval.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Bio 3:</b> The project Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions (CC&amp;R) shall restrict the number of domestic animals (e.g., dogs, cats and other predatory animals) allowed per residence to two, thus further limiting potential impacts. Cats shall be limited to indoors. These restrictions cannot be amended. Copies of the CC&amp;Rs shall be provided to the County Planning Department prior to Map Recordation. [Note: Current County zoning allows up to 4 dogs per premises.] This restriction for domestic animals applies to planning areas north of Ramona Expressway and to residences within 500 feet of the Lakeview Mountains conservation area. The Homeowners Association will be the entity responsible for enforcing the (CC&amp;Rs).</p>	<p>Prior to Map Recordation.</p>	<p>Planning Department and County Counsel</p>	<p>CC&amp;Rs shall be submitted to the Planning Department and County Counsel for approval.</p>	

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
	<p><b>MM Bio 4:</b> No more than 30 days prior to ground disturbance associated with the development of the project regarding clearing, grading, or demolition, a qualified biologist will conduct a pre-construction burrowing owl survey to satisfy Objective Number 5 of the MSHCP species-specific objectives for the burrowing owl. If breeding burrowing owls are detected on site, the Master Developer will coordinate with the County of Riverside Environmental Programs Department (EPD) to determine if the occupied habitat will need to be avoided, or if the owls can be relocated from the site. If the relocation of owls is approved, the Master Developer will prepare a plan of relocation (passive or active) to be approved by EPD and the responsible wildlife agencies (i.e., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and CDFW). If approved, relocation will be conducted outside of the breeding season. If non-breeding owls are identified on site, including wintering owls, the proponent will also notify EPD, and will relocate the owls following a protocol to be approved by EPD and the wildlife agencies.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permit.</p>	<p>Environmental Programs Department</p>	<p>Pre-construction Burrowing Owl Survey from a qualified biologist.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Bio 5:</b> If habitat suitable to support the coastal California gnatcatcher is to be removed between March 1 and August 15, focused surveys shall first be conducted to determine if the habitat is occupied by gnatcatchers. If gnatcatchers are present and are determined to be nesting, the occupied areas shall be avoided until after August 15.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permit, if construction commences between March 1 and August 15.</p>	<p>Environmental Programs Department</p>	<p>Focused surveys shall be submitted to Environmental Programs Department, if construction commences between March 1 and August 15.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Bio 6:</b> The removal of potential nesting vegetation of sensitive bird species will be conducted outside of the nesting season (February 1 to August 31) to the extent that this is feasible. If vegetation must be removed during the nesting season, a qualified biologist will conduct a nesting bird survey of potentially suitable nesting vegetation prior to removal. Surveys will be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to scheduled removals. If active nests are identified, the biologist will establish buffers around the vegetation containing the active nest (500 feet for raptors and 200 feet for non-raptors). The vegetation containing the active nest will not be removed, and no grading will occur within the established buffer, until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active (i.e., the juveniles are surviving independent from the nest). If clearing is not conducted within three days of a negative survey, the nesting survey must be repeated to confirm the absence of nesting birds.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permit, if construction commences between February 1 and August 31.</p>	<p>Environmental Programs Department</p>	<p>Focused nesting bird survey shall be submitted to Environmental Programs Department, if construction commences between February 1 and August 31.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Bio 7:</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for a parcel requiring authorization from a regulatory agency (including Section 404 permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Board, and/or a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from California Department of Fish and Wildlife) such authorization shall be obtained.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permit.</p>	<p>Building &amp; Safety Department</p>	<p>Authorization/Permits from the appropriate agency.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Bio 8:</b> On-site impacts to jurisdictional waters will be mitigated at a minimum 3:1 ratio in a manner to be determined by the Master Developer and to be approved by the US Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Regional Board through the permitting process. Impacts to jurisdictional waters from the construction of off-site infrastructure improvements (water, sewer, roads, trails, roadway segments and intersections, and storm drains) will be mitigated at a minimum 1:1 ratio through the purchase of credits from an approved mitigation bank/in-lieu fee program. The permits shall include one or a combination of the following mitigation concepts that are sufficient to reduce the impacts, with preference given to on-site mitigation, as agreed to by the respective agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preservation of on-site jurisdictional resources,</li> <li>• Restoration and long-term management of on-site resources,</li> <li>• Restoration and long-term management of off-site resources,</li> <li>• Purchase of credits from an approved mitigation bank, and/or,</li> <li>• Payment into an approved in-lieu fee program.</li> </ul>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permit.</p>	<p>Building &amp; Safety Department</p>	<p>Authorization/Permits from the appropriate agency.</p>	



Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
	<p><b>MM Bio 9:</b> To allow for future flexibility in the hydrological function of the project drainage system so as to best meet the needs of the San Jacinto Wildlife Area (SJWA), the San Jacinto River as well as the on-site vernal pool areas, the detention basin adjacent to the MWD aqueduct and/or water quality basins shall be designed to allow flows to be detained (as currently planned) or to bypass (completely or partially) the basin(s) such that greater flows can be released to the SJWA property to most closely mimic existing conditions in the 2-year and 10-year storm. During basin design, consultation shall occur between the applicant, County, Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife Staff to vet the objectives of the drainage system to maintain existing flows to the San Jacinto Wildlife Area and allowing flexibility in the future amount of flows requested by California Department of Fish and Wildlife Staff. Prior to approval of basin design by the County and/or Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, an Operation and Maintenance (O&amp;M) Plan shall be developed by the applicant in consultation with California Department of Fish and Wildlife Staff. The O&amp;M Plan shall include, but not be limited to: management objectives and strategies that outline how objectives are met; specification of the conditions under which maintenance will be done; scheduling of maintenance activities and frequency at which they will be performed; and monitoring, record keeping and evaluation frequency.</p>	<p>Prior to the approval of Tentative Tract Map s.</p>	<p>Flood Control and Water Conservation District and/or Planning Department</p>	<p>Drainage Plan shall be submitted for approval.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Bio 10:</b> The County of Riverside is a participating entity or permittee of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The purpose of the MSHCP is to conserve open space and habitat on a countywide, cumulative basis. Take authorization for the MSHCP was granted by the USFWS and CDFW on June 22, 2004. The County of Riverside will be allowed to utilize its allotted authorized take for projects in compliance with the MSHCP. Compliance with the MSHCP fee requirements will provide adequate mitigation for potential impacts to the burrowing owl and other species and plant communities determined to be adequately conserved by the MSHCP. To address the impacts associated with the cumulative loss of habitat for special status birds by the loss of habitat, the proposed project shall be conditioned to pay Riverside County MSHCP mitigation fees as set forth under County Ordinance No. 8102.</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance of building permits.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Payment of fees.</p>	
	<p>In order to meet the Reserve Assembly requirements of the MSHCP, the project applicant/owner shall offer the project's open space areas, which include the Lakeview Mountains, areas adjacent to the San Jacinto Wildlife Area and the wildlife corridor, for dedication to the Regional Conservation Authority prior to grading. The areas to be Conserved will be in substantial conformance with or larger than what was outlined in the 2008 JPR.</p>				

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
	<p><b>MM Bio 11:</b> In order to increase public awareness and knowledge about local environmental issues and reduce potential significant indirect effects of development near to Conservation Areas, the Master Developer of the proposed project shall provide an Environmental Stewardship Program. The program will include methods of community education to residents and business owners such as interpretive and directional signs, pamphlets and demonstrations. Purchasers of homes and commercial property shall receive an informational packet educating them on the Environmental Stewardship Program, the San Jacinto Wildlife Area, the Lakeview Mountains and the Conservation Areas. The types of information presented shall include, but not be limited to: lighting, noise, keeping on trails, wildlife, plants, habitats, barriers, domestic animals, toxics such as pesticides, invasive species, and vector-borne disease prevention. The Environmental Stewardship Program shall include a fund to be administered by the Lakeview Community Services Organization (CSO) and a portion of the fund shall be used for SIWA and Lakeview Mountains management items, including feral animal trapping, removal of trash, invasive species removal and enforcement. The Lakeview CSO's budget directed towards the SIWA and Lakeview Mountains interface issues shall be a priority and the appropriate percentage of the Lakeview CSO's fund directed towards the SIWA and Lakeview Mountains will be developed in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife SIWA Staff and the RCA.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of building permit for the 500th residential unit, the developer shall initiate with California Fish &amp; Wildlife staff for them to submit an initial budget of work necessary to offset recognized impacts of the Specific Plan development on the San Jacinto Wildlife Area to the CSO and County of Riverside. Budgets shall continue to be requested by the developer and submitted by California Fish &amp; Wildlife on an annual basis. Quarterly meetings shall be held with the CSO, California Fish &amp; Wildlife, and County staff to review the budget, work needed at the San Jacinto Wildlife Area, and provision of funding by the CSO to California Fish &amp; Wildlife.</p> <p>To assist initial funding of the Environmental Stewardship Program, the developer shall provide funding to the program in the amount of \$200 per unit for the first 500 units. Such proof of funding shall be provided prior to building permit issuance for the first 500 units.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permit for 500<sup>th</sup> unit.</p>	<p>Environmental Programs Department and/or Planning Department</p>	<p>Master Developer shall submit program materials to Environmental Programs Department for review.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Bio 11a:</b> In order to reduce the potential significant indirect effects of invasive species to Conservation Areas, the Specific Plan will design landscaped areas adjacent to the SIWA and Lakeview Mountains to avoid the use of invasive plant species identified in Table 6-2 of the MSHCP document. Of the 86 species identified in the MSHCP table (see also Appendix D) and Appendix C) of the Specific Plan), 71 of them will be outright prohibited within the Specific Plan. Of the remaining 15 plants, if used, they shall be placed at least 150 feet from the existing and proposed conservation areas in the Lakeview Mountains and shall not be used within 500 feet of the San Jacinto Wildlife Area and the downstream conservation areas along the San Jacinto River. CC&amp;Rs will be enforced through the Home Owners' Association to exclude 71 invasive species from properties throughout the project and 86 invasive species from properties within the above-prescribed distances from the urban/wildland interfaces. Maintenance of landscaping in these areas will include the removal of invasives that may establish through natural dispersal mechanisms. Such maintenance shall be funded through the Environmental Stewardship Program.</p>	<p>Ongoing review of landscape plans. Prior to issuance of building permit for 1,601<sup>st</sup> unit for CC&amp;R approval.</p>	<p>Environmental Programs Department and/or Planning Department shall approve landscape plans, and County Counsel shall approve CC&amp;Rs.</p>	<p>CC&amp;Rs shall be submitted to the Planning Department and County Counsel for approval.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Bio 11b:</b> In order to reduce the potential significant indirect effects of pesticides and rodenticides to conservation areas, the Environmental Stewardship Program established under <b>MM Bio 11</b>, shall include an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program. The IPM program will 1) Establish minimum action thresholds for the application of pesticides; 2) Provide educational materials to promote accurate identification of pests by homeowners, so appropriate control decisions can be made in conjunction with action thresholds; 3) Educate homeowners to promote the prevention of pests before infestation occurs; and 4) Recommend thresholds for utilization of control methods. Compliance with the IPM program will be made a requirement of the project Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions, and enforced through the homeowners association.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permit for 1,601<sup>st</sup> unit.</p>	<p>Environmental Programs Department and/or Planning Department</p>	<p>Master Developer shall submit program materials to Environmental Programs Department for review.</p>	

Section 3.0 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW EIR No. 471

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
	<p><b>MM Bio 12:</b> Where barriers are required between established conservation areas and other areas of the project site, impacts to cultural resources shall be taken into consideration with respect to location, design, and installation such that cultural resources adjacent to the conservation areas are avoided and that the setting is respected or enhanced. The County Archaeologist, or designee thereof, shall review all barrier plans proposed adjacent to conservation areas on-site to assure consistency with this mitigation measure.</p> <p><b>MM Bio 13:</b> Prior to issuance of grading permit for a parcel located adjacent to a conservation area that will come under Riverside Conservation Authority Management, sensitive resources (conservation areas) shall be delineated with temporary construction fencing. Training for construction workers and construction management personnel shall have occurred which informs project workers of their responsibilities in regards to avoiding and minimizing impacts to sensitive biological resources through avoiding the fenced areas.</p> <p><b>MM Bio 14:</b> To further deter wildlife from entering developed areas, trash receptacles and refuse containers located within the Greenbelt and parks located within 100 feet of all Conservation Areas shall be provided with mechanisms which prevent scavenging animals from gaining access to the contents of such trash containers.</p> <p><b>MM Bio 15:</b> A Programmatic DBESP shall be prepared prior to issuance of grading permit for off-site infrastructure subject to the MSHCP to provide a conceptual framework for mitigating any riparian/riverine impacts identified once the facilities are designed. Prior to ground disturbance for the construction of off-site infrastructure subject to the MSHCP, as well as for any project-development proposals in the future that will build out areas of the Specific Plan which were identified as having MSHCP riparian/riverine resources, and if impacts to MSHCP riparian/riverine areas cannot be avoided, then a project-level DBESP will be required. The future programmatic and project-level DBESPs shall include mitigation for the loss of riparian habitat at a minimum 1:1 ratio through the purchase of credits from an approved mitigation bank/in-lieu fee program or other equivalent mitigation approved by the MSHCP Permittee, in accordance with MSHCP Section 6.1.2. The project sponsor shall comply with any recommendations identified in the studies to ensure MSHCP compliance; for example, if impacts were to occur off paved roads and onto unpaved or undisturbed road shoulder, then additional studies would be required if the area is located in an MSHCP survey area, including focused plant surveys, focused burrowing owl surveys, and trapping for small mammals.</p>	<p>Barrier plans shall be submitted with implementing maps.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of grading permit.</p> <p>Prior to plan approval for the Greenbelt and parks within 100 feet of all on-site Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Prior to ground disturbance for off-site infrastructure subject to MSHCP when DBESP is required.</p>	<p>County Archaeologist, or designee thereof</p> <p>Building &amp; Safety Department County Grading Inspector</p> <p>Environmental Programs Department and/or Planning Department</p> <p>Environmental Programs Department and/or Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority</p>	<p>Approval of implementing maps.</p> <p>Notification of construction worker training sent to Planning Department, Building &amp; Safety Department, and Environmental Programs Department; notes of training.</p> <p>Park plans approval.</p> <p>DBESP shall be submitted to Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority for approval and its mitigation measures implemented.</p>	
<p><b>Cultural and Paleontological Resources</b></p>	<p><b>MM Cultural 1 – Alt 7:</b> Prior to initial construction of a parcel on or within 500 feet of an NRHP- and CRHR-eligible prehistoric site identified in the <i>Addendum to: Mystic Pavo' Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation of The Villages of Lakeview Specific Plan Alternative 7</i>, or if construction will not occur on a parcel on or within 500 feet of such an NRHP- and CRHR-eligible prehistoric site, prior to initial construction on the parcel nearest such site where development is planned, the master Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) contained in Chapter 9 of the Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation shall be implemented. The master CRMP contains the measures and strategies by which direct and indirect adverse impacts to prehistoric sites shall be treated over the course of the project development. The CRMP shall be implemented with an addendum to the master CRMP to address the archaeological resources sites affected by such parcel(s). Each such addendum to the CRMP shall include Site Preservation Plans (SPP) for sites to be preserved in place, and Data Recovery Plans (DRP) for sites that cannot be avoided and require archaeological excavation as provided by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3).</p> <p>Each SPP and DRP shall be developed consistent with the requirements enumerated in Chapter 9 of the Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation and contain a brief description of the site(s) it addresses, review the previous archaeological investigations conducted at the site(s), and consider the project components that would affect the site(s); then, with reference to the appropriate research questions and data requirements presented in the research design contained in Chapter 3, the SPP or DRP will present specific measures to be implemented as conditions of grading plan approval for the parcel(s). Further, each CRMP addendum shall be reviewed and approved by the County Archaeologist prior to County approval of the associated parcel(s). Any cultural resources mitigation measures recommended in the addendum shall be implemented as conditions of approval of the parcel(s), and any measures involving archaeological fieldwork shall be completed prior to issuance of grading</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permit for parcels within 500 feet of an NRHP- and CRHR-eligible site, or prior to construction on the parcel nearest such site if construction will not occur on a parcel on or within 500 feet of such an NRHP- and CRHR-eligible historic site.</p>	<p>Planning Department and County Archaeologist</p>	<p>Each CRMP addendum shall be submitted to the Planning Department and County Archaeologist for approval.</p>	

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
	<p>permits, and evidence of completion in the form of technical reports and curation agreements for disposition of recovered archaeological collections shall be required prior to issuance of occupancy permits.</p> <p>Each addendum shall contain a Discovery Plan with detailed provisions for the treatment of unanticipated discoveries during project construction, including human remains, as required by CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.5(e) and (f). The provisions of the Discovery Plan shall be consistent with state law as contained in Health and Safety Code Section 7050.3 and PRC Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98. Such mitigation shall be addressed in a manner consistent with the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If buried materials of potential historical, cultural or archaeological significance are accidentally discovered during any earth-moving operations associated with the proposed project, all work in that area shall be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the finds. If the find is determined to be a historical or unique archaeological resource, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the California Code of Regulations (State CEQA Guidelines), avoidance or other appropriate measures as discussed in the CRMP shall be implemented.</li> <li>b. If evidence of potentially significant prehistoric or historic resources is uncovered during project-related grading outside of the high sensitivity areas in which archaeological and Native American monitoring has already been required, the extent of monitoring shall be amended and the presence of archaeological and Native American monitors shall be incorporated into the monitoring program for all areas in the affected parcel(s).</li> <li>c. If human remains are encountered on a parcel, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be contacted pursuant to the law, and the NAHC shall identify the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD shall then make recommendations in the time frames set forth in the Public Resources Code, and engage in consultation with the project proponent and landowner concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until the MLD has made his or her recommendation regarding the treatment and disposition of the human remains and any associated grave goods. Should the MLD fail to make a recommendation or the landowner or his or her authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD, the landowner (or authorized representative) is required to inter the human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance.</li> <li>d. In addition to unanticipated discoveries, the applicable CRMP addendum shall incorporate the following recommendations to mitigate impacts to identified cultural resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site CA-RIV-8710H is a historical-period refuse dump that most likely derives from a construction camp for the Aqueduct. Because the site will be subject to indirect adverse impacts from possible vandalism or illicit artifact collection due to the increased population of the project area, a DRP shall be prepared and implemented prior to ground-disturbing activities at the site. The DRP shall be developed consistent with the requirements enumerated in Chapter 8 of the Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation, which shall include, in part, detailed recording and mapping of all items at the dump, along with photographic documentation or collection of diagnostic and unique items. Although subsurface deposits are unlikely at the site, a limited set of shovel probe excavations to determine if any dump materials have become completely buried shall be implemented, and recovery of a representative sample of such materials, if present shall be conducted.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>The recommended data recovery work in the DRP shall be conducted prior to initial construction on the parcel nearest site CA-RIV-8710H where development is planned. The results of the data recovery investigations shall be documented in a professional quality technical report, and as public interpretive information to be presented in the form of</p>				

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
	<p>brochures, public lectures, and signage placed within public parks and facilities.</p> <p>e. Sites CA-RIV-394 and CA-RIV-8707, the former consisting of a single boulder with four mortars and the latter consisting of a single slick, are not to be subject to direct adverse impacts, and are to be preserved in place in their entirety. Current plans call for Conservation Habitat at these sites which are adjacent to a Public Facilities planning area that calls for water tanks to be placed and a pipeline to be installed south and west of the sites. To mitigate potential indirect impacts from possible vandalism, future development within the adjacent Public Facilities planning area, and activities within the nearby fuel modification zone, an SPP for each site shall be prepared by the developer prior to approval of any water tanks or other improvements within the Public Facilities planning area. The SPP for these sites shall include provisions for the site boundaries and a 16-foot buffer area to be flagged and avoided, and for archaeological and Native American monitors from the tribes consulted for the project to be present during all activities that could cause ground disturbance within 100 feet of the sites.</p> <p>f. Site CA-RIV-397 consisting of a boulder outcrop and rockshelter with pictographs and an associated midden area, is located within a Conservation Habitat planning area and adjacent to a Medium Density Residential planning area envisioned for low density residential uses near the toe of the slope of the Lakeview Mountains. The site will be avoided and preserved from direct impacts to all known cultural deposits, and provides a buffer between residential development and the Split Rock boulder and associated rock art panels. To mitigate potential indirect impacts from possible vandalism, illicit artifact collection, and changes in the integrity of setting, feeling, and association resulting from the proximity of the residential use, an SPP shall be prepared by the developer prior to approval of any tentative tract within 500 feet of the site. The SPP shall include provisions for removal of modern graffiti, detailed recording of rock art elements by a recognized rock art expert, capping of exposed cultural deposits, with fill and restoration of native vegetation, and protection of the site area from vandalism through appropriate fencing, landscaping, and interpretation. Provisions for ongoing maintenance and protection shall be through a conservation easement or other deed restriction held by a Homeowners' Association, Tribe, or other entity approved by the County.</p> <p>g. Site CA-RIV-806, a rock shelter, is located deep within a Conservation Habitat planning area away from any proposed development or recreational trails, and thus, no direct impacts are to occur to this site and the site is to be preserved in place in its entirety. To mitigate potential indirect impacts from possible vandalism or illicit artifact collection from increased use of the project area, an SPP shall be prepared by the developer prior to approval of any tentative tract within 500 feet of the site. The SPP shall include a public education program regarding prehistoric and historical cultural resources to be incorporated into the interpretive center planned for the project (THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW Specific Plan Section 8.8), and shall include provisions to protect the site from vandalism through appropriate fencing and possible signage.</p> <p>h. Sites CA-RIV-2585, CA-RIV-4155, CA-RIV-8699, CA-RIV-8700, CA-RIV-8704, and CA-RIV-8711 consist of varying numbers of milling features, including both slicks and mortars, some with associated cultural deposits, and are all located within Conservation Habitat planning areas. The sites are not to be subject to grading or other ground disturbances associated with development and therefore no direct impacts to these sites are anticipated and are to be preserved in place in their entirety. However, indirect impacts could occur as a result of the proximity of residential areas, the recreational use of nearby trails, and activities within adjacent fuel modification zones. To provide long term management and protection, an SPP shall be prepared by the developer prior to approval of any tentative tract within 500 feet of any of the sites. The SPPs for these sites shall include provisions for the sites' boundaries and a 16-foot buffer area to be flagged and avoided, archaeological and Native American monitors from the tribe(s) consulted for the project to be present during all activities that could cause ground disturbance within 100 feet of the sites, and for fencing or other site protective measures such as signage. Provisions for ongoing maintenance and protection</p>				

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
i.	<p>shall be through a conservation easement or other deed restriction held by a Homeowners' Association, Tribe, or other entity approved by the County.</p> <p>Site CA-RIV-8705, with eight milling slicks and one mortar spread across four boulders, is partially located within a Conservation Habitat planning area and partially outside the boundaries of the Alternative 7 project area, and thus, no direct impacts are to occur to this site and the site is to be preserved in place in its entirety. To mitigate potential indirect impacts from possible vandalism or illicit artifact collection from increased use of the project area, an SPP shall be prepared by the developer prior to approval of any tentative tract within 500 feet of the site. The SPP shall include provisions for fencing, signage, and public interpretation.</p>				
j.	<p>Site CA-RIV-1842, a small- to moderate-size milling complex site that includes two milling features with milling slicks, is located mostly in a Medium Density Residential planning area envisioned for low density residential uses, but Feature 1 (boulder outcropping containing milling features) is located at the eastern end of the site in a Conservation Habitat planning area approximately 100 feet from the Lakeview Mountains toe of slope. No direct impacts are to occur to Feature 1 of Site CA-RIV-1842, and this portion of the site is to be preserved in place. To mitigate potential indirect impacts from possible vandalism or illicit artifact collection from increased use of the project area or from activities within the fuel modification zone, an SPP shall be prepared by the developer prior to approval of any tentative tract within 500 feet of Feature 1. The SPP shall include provisions for fencing and signage. Feature 2 and the remainder of Site CA-RIV-1842 will be subject to direct adverse impacts. Due to the increased human activity in the area from the residential uses, the aboveground nature of the site, and distance of the site from Conservation Habitat planning areas, a DRP shall be prepared by the developer prior to ground-disturbing activities at this portion of the site. The DRP shall include provisions for additional testing to determine firmly the northern boundary of the site and assess the composition and structure of the subsurface deposits. Based on the testing data, a representative sample of subsurface cultural deposits shall be excavated, analyzed, and interpreted. The results of the data recovery shall be documented in a professional report and public interpretive information. The appropriate disposition of all cultural resource collections resulting from data recovery excavations shall be determined in consultation with the applicant, the County, and consulted tribes, and documented in the DRP contained in addenda to the CRMP.</p>				
k.	<p>Site CA-RIV-4156/H, which contains four milling features with a total of six slicks and one mortar, is located in a Conservation Habitat planning area and will not be subject to direct adverse impacts. Indirect impacts may occur from recreational uses nearby, construction in the vicinity, and increased human activity near the site with the potential for vandalism, inadvertent harm, and increased domestic animal activity, and also from activity in the fuel modification zone. To mitigate these potential indirect impacts, an SPP shall be prepared by the developer prior to approval of any tentative tract within 500 feet of the site. The SPP shall include provisions for fencing and signage.</p>				
l.	<p>Site CA-RIV-4158, which is believed to be a redeposited assortment of artifacts removed from other nearby sites, is located in a Medium High Density Residential planning area and is traversed by a planned roadway and will be subject to direct adverse impacts. Due to the increased human activity in the area from the residential uses, a DRP shall be prepared by the developer prior to ground-disturbing activities at the site. The DRP for CA-RIV-4158 shall include provisions for additional testing to assess the composition and structure of the subsurface deposits. Based on the testing data, a representative sample of subsurface cultural deposits shall be excavated, analyzed, and interpreted. The results of the data recovery shall be documented in a professional report and public interpretive information. The appropriate disposition of all cultural resource collections resulting from data recovery excavations shall be determined in consultation with the applicant, the County, and consulted tribes, and documented in the DRP contained in addenda to the CRMP.</p>				
m.	<p>Site CA-RIV-8703, which consists of slicks and boulders, is located in a Medium High Density Residential planning area and will be subject to direct adverse impacts. Due to the increased</p>				

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
	<p>human activity in the area, a DRP shall be prepared by the developer prior to ground-disturbing activities at the site. The DRP shall include provisions for testing to confirm the presence or absence of subsurface deposits. If the testing indicates that a subsurface deposit is present, a representative sample of subsurface cultural deposits shall be excavated, analyzed, and interpreted. The results of the data recovery shall be documented in a professional report and public interpretive information. The appropriate disposition of all cultural resource collections resulting from data recovery excavations shall be determined in consultation with the applicant, the County, and consulted tribes, and documented in the DRP contained in addenda to the CRMP.</p> <p>n. Sites CA-RIV-8698 and CA-RIV-8702, which consist of two milling slicks on one boulder and a single milling slick on one boulder, respectively, are located in Conservation Habitat planning areas, and will not be subject to direct impacts. To mitigate potential indirect impacts due to construction in the vicinity, increased human activity near the site with the potential for vandalism, inadvertent harm, and increased domestic animal activity, or from activity within the fuel modification zone for CA-RIV-8702, an SPP shall be prepared by the developer prior to approval of any tentative tract within 500 feet of the site. The SPP shall include provisions for fencing and signage.</p> <p>o. CA-RIV-8706, which consists of three slicks, each on a separate boulder, is located in Recreation planning area to be developed as a park, and existing and proposed trails are located in the vicinity of the site. Thus the site may be subject to indirect effects due to recreational use of nearby trails, construction in the vicinity, increased human activity near the site with the potential for vandalism, inadvertent harm, and increased domestic animal activity, and also from activity within the fuel modification zone adjacent to the site. To mitigate these indirect effects, an SPP shall be prepared by the developer prior to approval of any tentative tract within 500 feet of the site. The SPP shall include provisions for fencing and signage.</p> <p>p. Site CA-RIV-8712 covers an area of 77.22 acres (57.68 acres of which are subject to potential direct or indirect adverse impacts by Alternative 7) and consists of a large site complex. The site within the Alternative 7 project area subject to direct impacts includes 6.68 acres located within a Medium High Density Residential planning area. As this portion will be subject to direct adverse impacts due to increased human activity in the area and development, a DRP shall be prepared by the developer prior to ground-disturbing activities at this portion of the site. The DRP shall include provisions for additional testing to assess the composition and structure of the subsurface deposits. Based on the testing data, a representative sample of subsurface cultural deposits shall be excavated, analyzed, and interpreted. The results of the data recovery shall be documented in a professional report and public interpretive information. The appropriate disposition of all cultural resource collections resulting from data recovery excavations will be determined in consultation with the applicant, the County, and consulted tribes, and documented in the DRP contained in addenda to the CRMP.</p> <p>The site within the Alternative 7 project area subject to indirect impacts includes 51 acres located within a Conservation Habitat planning area. As this portion will be subject to indirect adverse impacts from activity in the fuel modification zone and habitat restoration as well as from possible vandalism, illicit artifact collection, and changes in the integrity of setting, feeling, and association resulting from the proximity of residential uses, an SPP shall be prepared by the developer prior to approval of tentative tract within 500 feet of this portion. The SPP shall include provisions for protection of the site area from vandalism through appropriate fencing, landscaping, and interpretation. Provisions for ongoing maintenance and protection shall be through a conservation easement or other deed restriction held by a Homeowners' Association, Tribe, or other entity approved by the County.</p>				

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
	<p><b>MM Cultural 2:</b> Even after full implementation of data recovery through mitigation measure <b>MM Cultural 1</b>, it is possible that significant buried resources could be present in many areas that will be graded. It is also possible that prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources could be discovered in off-site improvement areas. Therefore, the entire area designated as having high sensitivity for buried sites (see Figure 3.5-1, <b>Cultural Resources Sensitivity</b>), borrow areas from within the project boundaries, and off-site improvement areas shall be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor during any ground-disturbing activities. Full time archaeological and Native American monitoring during excavations shall be conducted in these areas. A full report of all monitoring activities, including disposition of all resulting collections, shall be prepared according to the provisions of the Cultural Resources Management Plan.</p> <p>In the event of unanticipated discovery of cultural resources or human remains, compliance with CRMP requirements for Discovery Plans would be required, including, at minimum, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If buried materials of potential historical, cultural or archaeological significance are accidentally discovered during any earth-moving operations associated with the proposed project, all work in that area shall be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the finds. If the find is determined to be an historical or unique archaeological resource, as defined in the CEQA Guidelines (CCR Title 14, Section 15064.5), avoidance or other appropriate measures as discussed in the CRMP shall be implemented.</li> <li>• If evidence of potentially significant prehistoric or historic resources is uncovered during project-related grading, the extent of monitoring shall be amended and the presence of a Native American observer shall be incorporated into the monitoring program.</li> <li>• If human remains are uncovered at any time, all activities in the immediate area of the find shall be halted by the developer or its contractor and the County Coroner shall be notified immediately pursuant to Health &amp; Safety Code Section 7050.5 and PRC Section 5097.98. If the Coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner shall proceed as directed in Section 15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines.</li> </ul>	<p>During construction.</p>	<p>Project construction manager, County Archaeologist, and the Planning Department</p>	<p>Monitoring report from a qualified archaeologist / Native American shall be submitted to the Planning Department and County Archaeologist.</p>	
	<p><b>MM Paleontology 1:</b> Should any paleontological resources be accidentally discovered during construction, construction activities shall be moved to other parts of the project site and a qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to determine the significance of these resources. If the find is determined to be a significant paleontological resource, and if the area was identified as having a "low" sensitivity for containing paleontological resources, similar sediments may be reassigned as "high" sensitivity and would be subject to <b>MM Paleontology 2</b>.</p>	<p>During construction.</p>	<p>Project construction manager and the Planning Department</p>	<p>Monitoring report from a qualified paleontologist shall be submitted to the Planning Department.</p>	



Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
	<p><b>MM Paleontology 2:</b> For areas of the site identified as having a "High" sensitivity for finding paleontological resources and on-site borrow areas where excavation activity will achieve depths at or greater than 4 feet or 15 feet depending on the location in sediments mapped with a "High B-4" and a "High B-15" sensitivity rating, respectively, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified vertebrate paleontological monitor shall be present during construction excavation and a Paleontological Resource Monitoring and Treatment Plan (PRMTP) shall be prepared. The PRMTP shall be consistent with the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's <i>Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Paleontological Resources: Standard Guidelines (1995)</i> and <i>Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources (2010)</i>. Once the PRMTP is approved by the County of Riverside Planning Department, grading and construction activities may commence under the provisions of the PRMTP. The plan should include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pregrade meeting with a qualified paleontologist. The paleontologist will explain the likelihood for encountering paleontological resources, what resources may be discovered, and the methods that will be employed if anything is discovered.</li> <li>2. In areas mapped with High B-4 rating where grading or excavation will disturb depths of 4-feet or greater, or areas mapped with a High B-15 rating where excavation will disturb depths of 4-feet or greater, a qualified vertebrate paleontological monitor shall be present during construction excavation. The monitor shall inspect fresh cuts and/or spoils piles to recover paleontological resources. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily divert construction equipment away from the immediate area of the discovery.</li> <li>3. If the qualified paleontologist is not present when fossil remains are uncovered by earth-moving activities, these activities shall be stopped and a qualified paleontologist shall be called to the site immediately to evaluate the significance of the fossil remains.</li> <li>4. Native sediments shall occasionally be spot-screened through one-eighth to one-twentieth-inch mesh screens to determine whether microfossils are present. If microfossils are encountered, additional sediment samples as determined by the paleontological monitor shall be collected and processed to recover additional fossils.</li> <li>5. If the qualified paleontologist determines that insufficient fossil remains have been found after fifty percent of earth moving activities have been completed, monitoring can be reduced or discontinued.</li> <li>6. Any recovered specimens shall be prepared to the point of identification and permanent preservation, which may include the picking of any washed mass samples to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils, if present, the removal of surplus sediment from around larger specimens to reduce the volume of storage for the repository and the hardeners/stabilizers to fragile specimens.</li> <li>7. Specimens shall be identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible and curated at an institutional repository approved by the County of Riverside.</li> <li>8. Fill dirt shall be free of cultural resources. Fill dirt from off-site resources shall be certified by the provider as being free of cultural or paleontological resources.</li> <li>9. A report shall be prepared that details the methods and results of the monitoring program, even if the results are negative. If applicable, this shall include an appended itemized inventory of identified specimens. This report shall be submitted by the project paleontologist to the County of Riverside, Planning Department, prior to the issuance of the final grading inspection for all grading permits in areas mapped with High B-4 rating where grading or excavation activities reached a depth of 4-feet or greater and areas mapped with High B-15 rating where excavation will achieve depths of 15 feet or greater.</li> </ol>	<p>During construction.</p>	<p>Project construction manager and the Planning Department</p>	<p>PRMTP shall be submitted to the Planning Department.</p>	

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
<b>Geology and Soils</b>	<p><b>MM Geo 1:</b> Rockfall hazards shall be addressed for all project development located adjacent to the Lakeview Mountains and in rockfall hazard/Remedial Zones 1, 2 or 3 as identified in the Preliminary Rockfall Hazard Evaluation in Appendix F of this EIR and in Figure 5.6-5, Rockfall Hazard Zones of this EIR. The following general mitigation measures and a maintenance plan for such measures shall be finalized by a licensed geotechnical engineer and approved by the County Building Department prior to issuance of a grading permit and shall be implemented in each of the applicable remedial zone consistent with the recommendations provided in the Preliminary Rockfall Hazard Evaluation:</p> <p><b>Remedial Zone 1</b> – Due to the isolated nature of rockfall hazards, mitigation will generally include the removal of individual rocks and/or the construction of low impact walls (i.e. block walls). Blasting may be required to completely remove certain individual rock hazards. A geotechnical engineer shall be responsible for determining which rocks require removal and/or blasting and the general location and building requirements for the construction of low impact walls.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The implementation of any of the remedial options designated for Remedial Zones 2 or 3 would also serve to remediate Zone 1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Remedial Zone 2</b> – Mitigation will include the removal of isolated rocks in certain locations and implementation of at least one (1) of the following measures where more extensive rockfall remediation is required. The implementation of any of the remedial options designated for Remedial Zone 3 would also serve to remediate Zone 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of a debris ditch with a 5 foot tall, 1.5:1 (horizontal to vertical) manufactured slope, which will capture falling debris. Due to the granular nature of on-site soils, the slope will need to be reinforced with geogrid, a synthetic polymer-coated material that is used to reinforce an earth-fill slope, wall, and base layer construction. Geogrid provides a stabilizing force within the soil structure and will improve the surficial stability of fill slopes inclined at 1.5:1. This manufactured slope should be a minimum of 15 feet from the toe of the natural slope (i.e. the base or bottom of the slope). Fencing at the top of the manufactured slope that will provide some additional measure of protection from a rockfall hazard will be constructed to provide additional protection.</li> <li>Construction of a debris ditch with a 5 foot tall, 2:1 manufactured slope and 3-foot tall, top of slope impact wall. The impact wall would be designed using an equivalent fluid pressure of 125 pounds per cubic foot (pcf). The toe of the manufactured slope should be a minimum 15 feet from the toe of the natural slope.</li> <li>Construction of a debris ditch with a 3 foot tall retaining wall. The base of the wall should be a minimum 15 feet from the toe of the natural slope.</li> <li>Construction of a 6 foot tall block wall fence designed in accordance with which shall be set back a minimum of 15 feet from the toe of the natural slope.</li> <li>Implementation of a 50-foot setback from the toe of the natural slope to the property line of the closest proposed lots and construction of block wall fencing that will provide an additional measure of protection from rock fall hazards. Implementation of the 100 foot fuel modification zone may be used to satisfy this measure provided that the 50 foot setback is continuously maintained.</li> <li>The implementation of any of the remedial options designated for Remedial Zone 3 would also serve to remediate Zone 2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Remedial Zone 3</b> – Mitigation will focus on the following rockfall remediation measures, although specific rocks may be removed to reduce rockfall risks in certain locations as required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of a debris ditch with an 8-foot tall, 1.5:1 (horizontal to vertical) manufactured slope. Due to the granular nature of on-site soils, the slope will need to be reinforced with geogrid. The manufactured slope should be a minimum of 15 feet from the toe of the natural slope. A 5 foot tall fence constructed at the top of the manufactured slope will provide additional protection.</li> <li>Construction of debris ditch with a 5 foot tall, 2:1 manufactured slope and 5-foot tall top of</li> </ul>	Prior to issuance of grading permits in Planning Areas within each respective Remedial Zone.	Building & Safety Department	Grading plan shall be submitted to the Building & Safety Department for approval.	

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
	<p>slope impact wall. The impact wall should be designed using an equivalent fluid pressure of 125 pcf. The toe of the manufactured slope should be a minimum 15 feet from the toe of the natural slope.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a debris ditch with a 5 foot tall retaining wall. The base of the wall should be a minimum 15 feet from the top of the natural slope.</li> <li>• Construct a 6 foot tall block wall fence which shall be set back a minimum of 15 feet from the toe of the natural slope.</li> <li>• Implementation of a 75-foot setback from the toe of the natural slope to the property line of the closest proposed lots and the construction of block wall fencing that will provide an additional measure of protection from rock fall hazards. Implementation of the 100 foot fuel modification zone may be used to satisfy this measure provided that the 75 foot setback is continuously maintained.</li> </ul>		Building & Safety Department	Geotechnical investigation(s) and any measures recommended therein shall be submitted to the Building & Safety Department for approval.  On-site inspection.	
<b>Hazards</b>	<p><b>MM Geo 2:</b> In accordance with the recommendations of the preliminary geotechnical investigations prepared by Leighton and Associates (included in Appendix F) for each subarea within the project site, the upper 5 to 8 feet of the existing soils, or the depth of soil recommended in any applicable geotechnical investigation, shall be removed and recompacted in areas where structures will be placed, to reduce the potential for total or differential ground surface and structural settlement. Subject to the specific recommendations of any applicable geotechnical investigation, all manure and soil with organic content in excess of 1% by weight, or excess of 3% by weight if Type V cement is used, and all areas of uncontrolled artificial fills, shall be removed and disposed offsite accordance with all applicable rules and regulations. The preliminary geotechnical investigation(s) and any measures recommended therein shall be reviewed and approved by the Riverside County Building Department prior to issuance of any grading permits.</p>	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	Building & Safety Department		
	<p><b>MM Hazards-Mat 1:</b> An asbestos and lead paint survey will be required prior to issuance of a demolition permit for the demolition of existing site structures. Recommendations of the study shall be implemented in compliance with all applicable regulations.</p>	Prior to issuance of demolition permit.	Building & Safety Department	Submission of asbestos and lead paint survey.	
	<p><b>MM Hazards-Mat 2:</b> If, while performing any excavation as part of project construction, material that is believed to be hazardous waste, as defined in Section 25117 of the California Health &amp; Safety Code, is discovered, the developer shall contact the Department of Environmental Health. Excavation shall be stopped until the material has been tested and the presence of hazardous waste has been confirmed. If no hazardous waste is present, excavation may continue. If hazardous waste is determined to be present, the County Department of Environmental Health will provide guidance regarding necessary oversight so that the material is removed and disposed of pursuant to applicable provisions of California law.</p>	During earthwork on the site.	Developer, Environmental Health Department	Report at the completion of in-field monitoring, if hazardous waste testing is performed and presence confirmed.	
	<p><b>MM Hazards-Mat 3:</b> A geotechnical evaluation shall be performed of onsite soils proposed for use as fill by a qualified professional prior to the approval of all tentative tract maps or site plans for a given phase of development. The evaluation will include an analysis of the organic matter content of the onsite soils to be used as fill in conjunction with the applicable tentative tract maps or site plans. If the organic matter content of the onsite soils to be used as fill is greater than 1 percent by weight, or up to 3 percent if Type V cement is used, when mixed with subsurface soils and/or imported fill, then manure will be removed from soils and the site and properly disposed of, or mixed with other soils as required to reduce the organic matter in any soils used as fill onsite to less than 1 percent by weight, or up to 3 percent if Type V cement is used, prior to grading operations.</p>	Prior to approval of all Tentative Tract Maps or site plans for a given phase.	Planning Department and County Geologist	Updated soils / geotechnical report shall be submitted to the Planning Department and County Geologist with Tentative Tract Maps or site plans for approval.	

Section 3.0 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW EIR No. 471

Impact Category	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring / Reporting Method	Completion Confirmation/Date
Hydrology/Water Quality	<p><b>MM Hazards-Mat 4:</b> If the Lakeview Burn Dump is not fully remediated and closed by the County by the time project-related development is initiated on parcels located within 1,000 feet of the burn dump, then a 300-foot buffer from the burn dump site shall be maintained until such time as the remediation and closure is complete. Drainage and access road infrastructure, and commercial development, may be constructed and occupied within the buffer area prior to the completion of remediation and closure of the burn dump. No project development setbacks or other measures to eliminate exposure pathways related to the Lakeview Burn Dump are required if remediation has been completed, and the site has been closed by the County Department of Environmental Health, pursuant to the approved remediation plan.</p> <p><b>MM Hazards-Fire 5:</b> All buildings shall be constructed with fire retardant roofing material as per the California Fire Code.</p> <p><b>MM Hazards-Fire 6:</b> Prior to the approval of any development plan for lands adjacent to the Lakeview Mountains open space areas, a fire protection/vegetation management (fuel modification) plan shall be submitted to the fire department for review and approval. The project area Homeowner's Association or appropriate management entity shall be responsible for maintaining the elements of the plan.</p> <p><b>MM Hydro 1:</b> Prior to approval of future implementing projects (i.e. Tentative Tract maps) within The Villages of Lakeview Specific Plan proposed prior to the completion of the drainage improvements, hydrology studies will be required to analyze potential storm water flow or water quality impacts and to identify any interim improvements within the proposed tract map area or other locations within the Specific Plan area that are required to reduce the potential impacts to less than significant levels and to comply with the applicable stormwater and water quality regulations and standards adopted by the County of Riverside and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. Potential BMPs that may be implemented to address interim storm water or water quality impacts related to a proposed tract map may include vegetated swales, sand filtration systems, water quality inlets, mechanical separators, and/or other proprietary devices.</p>	<p>Prior to construction start of parcels within 1,000 feet of burn dump. If burn dump has not been remediated and closed.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of building permits.</p> <p>Prior to approval of any development plan for lands adjacent to Lakeview Mountains open space areas.</p> <p>Prior to approval of Tentative Tract Maps.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p> <p>Building &amp; Safety Department and Fire Department</p> <p>Fire Department</p> <p>Flood Control and Water Conservation District and/or Planning Department</p>	<p>Prior to construction of parcels within 1,000 feet of burn dump, developer shall submit maps showing 300-foot buffer between the dump site and development, if burn dump has not been remediated and closed.</p> <p>Building plans shall be submitted for approval.</p> <p>Fuel Modification Plan shall be submitted to the Fire Department for approval.</p> <p>Submittal of hydrology studies and WQMPs to Flood Control and Water Conservation District for approval.</p>	<p>Prior to construction start of parcels within 1,000 feet of burn dump, developer shall submit maps showing 300-foot buffer between the dump site and development, if burn dump has not been remediated and closed.</p>
	<p><b>MM Land Use 1:</b> To reduce potential significant adverse impacts due to incompatibility between existing agricultural uses and the proposed project, proposed residences, school buildings, and commercial structures within the proposed project shall be set back 300 feet from existing active agricultural uses of an offensive nature, which are defined as: corrals, chicken houses, dairy waste ponds, manure stockpiles, or commercial livestock. This setback shall not apply to areas of the project where Ramona Expressway intervenes between active agriculture and proposed development because the expressway will act as the buffer. The 300-foot buffer area may include public road rights-of-way, parking lots, and service or maintenance areas. In addition to project edge conditions, the 300-foot setback shall also apply to interim conditions on-site between occupied project-related buildings and existing on-site agricultural uses of an offensive nature (e.g., chicken ranch) that are located in a later phase of project development and may remain operational while earlier phases of development are being built. (Same as MM Ag 2.)</p>	<p>Prior to the approval of Tentative Tract Maps within 300 feet from active agricultural uses.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Tentative Tract Maps shall be submitted to the Planning Department for approval, and the Maps shall show the 300-foot setback from active agricultural uses.</p>	<p>Tentative Tract Maps shall be submitted to the Planning Department for approval, and the Maps shall show the recommended setbacks and landscaping screens.</p>
	<p><b>MM Land Use 2:</b> To reduce potential land use density/intensity conflicts between existing rural residences on Mike Lane and future adjacent residential homes, a sight line study or evidence showing avoidance of views from proposed residences into existing homes on Mike Lane shall be submitted at the time of Tract Map submittal, or as otherwise approved by the Planning Director. Conflicts associated with potential views from proposed residences into existing homes on Mike Lane may be avoided through use of various means including but not limited to: location of windows and balconies, landscaping, walls, elevation differences, or setbacks for proposed buildings within the proposed project.</p> <p><b>MM Land Use 3:</b> To eliminate inconsistencies with General Plan Policy LU.4.1, which encourages public art, and to provide a mechanism for interpretation of some of the historic land uses of the project site, public art and/or historic interpretation art or exhibits, shall be incorporated into the project in a minimum of three locations. At least one exhibit will focus on the project site's prehistoric archaeological resources and interpretation at a location(s) to be determined at a later date, depending on subject matter.</p>	<p>Prior to approval of Tentative Tract Maps.</p> <p>Prior to approval of Village Refinement Plans.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p> <p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Tentative Tract Map shall be submitted to the Planning Department for approval, and the Map shall show the recommended setbacks and landscaping screens.</p> <p>Village Refinement Plan submitted to Planning Department for approval.</p>	<p>Tentative Tract Map shall be submitted to the Planning Department for approval, and the Map shall show the recommended setbacks and landscaping screens.</p>