

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

ID	Intersection	Traffic Control ¹	Intersection Approach Lanes ²								Delay ³ (secs.)		Level of Service ³					
			Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound		Westbound		AM	PM	AM	PM		
			L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R				
1	Winchester Rd. (SR79) / Tempesta Rd.	TS	1	2	d	1	2	1	1	1	1>	1	1	0	53.8	54.7	D	D
2	Winchester Rd. (SR79) / Benton Rd.	TS	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	1>	26.1	42.0	C	D
3	Winchester Rd. (SR79) / Auld Rd.	TS	1	2	1	1	2	d	1	1	0	1	1	0	23.6	42.0	C	D
4	Project Dwy. / Benton Rd.	CSS	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	2	0	10.3	11.5	B	B
5	Temeku St. / Benton Rd.	TS	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	26.4	32.7	C	C
6	Project Dwy. / Briggs Rd.	CSS	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	8.8	8.5	A	A

This is consistent with, and implements the General Plan Circulation Element requirements. Therefore, the Project does not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system

The Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) Routes 23, 61, 79, 208, and 217 currently provide services the study area. The Project proposes no changes to this routing.

In addition, the developer will be required to pay the County of Riverside's Development Impact Fee (DIF) and the regional Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) to address the direct and cumulative traffic impacts generated by new development projects. Therefore, the Project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit. With the payment of TUMF and DIF, any impacts are considered less than significant.

b) The congestion management program (CMP) applicable to the Project area is the Riverside County Transportation Commission's (RCTC) 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program. The nearest identified CMP facility to the Project site is Highway 79, which is located adjacent to the Project site. However, due to the relatively limited scope of the proposed Project, there would be fewer than 100 two-way peak hour trips to Highway 79. Due to this it is unlikely that a conflict would arise with the CMP, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact.

c-d) The nearest airport to the Project site is the French Valley Airport, which is located approximately 0.53 miles southwest of the Project site. The Project site is located within the airport land use plan covering French Valley Airport. During a meeting on August 13, 2015, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Development Review found the proposed Project to be inconsistent with the 2007 French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan due to single-acre intensities in excess of the maximum permitted intensity for areas within Airport Compatibility Zone B1. However, the Project has no potential to result in impacts due to changes in air traffic patterns, nor would the Project alter any airborne traffic. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

The Project site is not adjacent or near a natural water body or near active railroad tracks. Accordingly, no impact to waterborne traffic or rail traffic would occur with implementation of the Project. Therefore, there would be no impact.

e) The Project proposes on-site development of commercial-retail uses. Any potential roadway improvement as a result of the proposed Project would not result in a hazard due to a design feature. Additionally, the Project area contains existing commercial and industrial uses. As such, the Project's

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

proposed commercial uses have no potential to result in uses that incompatible within the surrounding area and that could result in significant impacts to circulation and traffic. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

f) The Project proposes on-site development of commercial retail uses. No new or altered maintenance of roads is being proposed. Therefore, any impact would be less than significant.

g) It is not anticipated that there would be a substantial effect upon circulation during the Project's construction. Construction of the proposed Project may temporarily affect the operation of the immediate circulation network during the construction phase of the Project. The Project will be required to obtain an encroachment permit prior to commencing any construction within the public right-of-way. This will also include the submittal and approval of a traffic control plan (TCP) which is designed to mitigate any construction circulation impacts. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

h) The Project site is not identified as an emergency access route under any local or regional plans. Any potential Project effects to the surrounding circulation system would be minimal during construction, and access routes would remain available to ensure the adequate provision of emergency services to the area during Project construction. Thus, during construction of the proposed Project, there would be a less than significant impact.

i) According to the Southwest Area Plan Figure 8, Southwest Area Trails and Bikeway System, there are no regional trails planned in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. Accordingly, there would be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

44. Cultural Resources

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

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

A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision © of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In Applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c). of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 for the purpose of this

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance to a California Native tribe.

Source: Native American Consultation

Findings of fact: In compliance with Assembly Bill 52 (AB52), notices regarding this project were mailed to four requesting tribes on July 14, 2015. Consultations were requested by the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians and the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians. Consultation was conducted with Soboba on August 19, 2015. Soboba did not suggest that Tribal Cultural Resources were present within the project. Soboba did express the concern for subsurface resources to be identified during ground disturbing activities and requested to have a Soboba monitor present during grading. Consultation was held with Pechanga on October 14, 2015. The final conditions of approval for the project were provided to both Pechanga and Soboba on May 24, 2016. Neither Pechanga nor Soboba had any further comments and consultation was concluded on June 07, 2016.

During consultation, Pechanga stated that the Project may fall within a village site and a traditional cultural landscape. Based on the known village name and the Pechanga's experience with the area, the Pechanga believe this cultural landscape to be a tribal cultural resource. However, the County has not received any evidence, from Pechanga or from any other source, geographically defining the size and scope of any cultural landscape in the Project area. Because the County has no substantial evidence to support a finding that the potential cultural landscape meets the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21074(b), the County is precluded from determining that the potential cultural landscape is a "tribal cultural resource." Because any potential cultural landscape at the Project site does not meet the definition of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 21074, the Project will have a less than significant on tribal cultural resources in this regard.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

45. Bike Trails

Source: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact: According to the Southwest Area Plan Figure 8, Southwest Area Trails and Bikeway System, there are no bike trails planned in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. Accordingly, there would be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

46. Water

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Eastern Municipal Water District

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project will receive potable water service from Eastern Municipal Water District. Any connections from the Project site to existing water lines are considered to be part of the Project's construction phase and are evaluated throughout this environmental assessment accordingly. However, the Project would not result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects. Accordingly, there would be a less than significant impact.

b) The Project site is located within the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) service area. EMWD's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) identifies the water district's anticipated future demands for potable water resources and the plans for meeting those demands. The UWMP demonstrates that the EMWD has sufficient supplies to meet its existing and projected demand through 2035. Thus, the Project's demand for domestic water service would not require new or expanded entitlements and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

47. Sewer				
a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Eastern Municipal Water District

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project will receive sewer service from Eastern Municipal Water District. Any connections from the Project site to existing sewer lines are considered to be part of the Project's construction phase and are evaluated throughout this environmental assessment accordingly. However, the Project would not result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects. Accordingly, there would be a less than significant impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) All sanitary sewer flows from the Project site would be conveyed to the Temecula Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility (TVRWRF) for treatment. The TVRWRF is located approximately 6.44 miles southwest of the Project site at 42565 Avenida Alvarado, Temecula, CA. The TVRWRF provides primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment for a rated capacity of 18 million gallons per day (mgd) and is currently undergoing an expansion that would increase the capacity of the TVRWRF from 18 mgd to 28 mgd. With completion of the expansion of the existing facility, there would be more than adequate capacity to treat wastewater flows generated by the Project. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects. Impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

48. Solid Waste

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

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Waste Management District

Findings of Fact:

a) Construction and operation of the proposed Project would result in the generation of solid waste, requiring disposal at a landfill. The Riverside County Waste Management Department operates six (6) landfills that serve Riverside County residents. During the first quarter of 2015 (January 1 through March 31), waste collected from unincorporated portions of western Riverside County were disposed of at one of four facilities: Badlands Landfill, Blythe Landfill, El Sobrante Landfill, and Lamb Canyon Landfill. Due to the Project's location, it is anticipated that solid waste generated during construction and long-term operation would be disposed of at Badlands Landfill, El Sobrante Landfill, and/or Lamb Canyon Landfill. These landfills have a permitted daily disposal capacity of between 3,000 and 16,054 tons per day. Therefore, the proposed Project would be served by landfills with adequate capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste needs during both construction and long-term operation.

Although the Project would likely contribute to the ultimate need for landfill expansion as needed to accommodate future growth within Riverside County, such potential landfill expansion would not be the direct result of the proposed Project. Furthermore, any environmental impacts that could result from such landfill expansions cannot be determined at this time, as the environmental impacts would be evaluated as part of a future CEQA document prepared in support of future landfill expansion efforts. Accordingly, environmental impacts that may result from future landfill expansions are herein evaluated as speculative in nature.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) The California Integrated Waste Management Act (Assembly Bill (AB) 939), signed into law in 1989, established an integrated waste management system that focused on source reduction, recycling, composting, and land disposal of waste. In addition, the bill established a 50% waste reduction requirement for cities and counties by the year 2000, along with a process to ensure environmentally safe disposal of waste that could not be diverted. Per the requirements of the Integrated Waste Management Act, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors adopted the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP)(adopted January 14, 1997), which outlines the goals, policies, and programs the County and its cities will implement to create an integrated and cost effective waste management system that complies with the provisions of AB 939 and its diversion mandates.

In order to assist the County of Riverside in achieving the mandated goals of the Integrated Waste Management Act, the Project Applicant would be required to work with future refuse haulers to develop and implement feasible waste reduction programs, including source reduction, recycling, and composting. Additionally, in accordance with the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991, the Project would provide adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials where solid waste is collected. The collection areas are required to be shown on construction drawings and be in place before building permit final inspection. The implementation of these requirements would reduce the amount of solid waste generated by the Project, which in turn would aid in the extension of the life of affected disposal sites. As such, the Project would comply with mandates of applicable solid waste statutes and regulations and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

49. Utilities

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

a) Electricity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-g) Implementation of the proposed Project would require the construction of numerous facilities as necessary to provide services to the site, including electrical facilities, natural gas lines, communication systems (telephone/cable), storm water drainage facilities, and street lighting. In addition, the Project would introduce new public roads on-site that would require maintenance by Riverside County. Impacts associated with the provision of utility service to the site are discussed below for each utility.

Electricity, Natural Gas, and Communications Systems

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Electrical service is currently available in the Project area and would be provided by Southern California Edison (SCE), natural gas would be provided by Southern California Gas Company, and communication systems would be provided by Verizon. Although PP25793 does not depict proposed electricity, natural gas, or communication systems facilities, as these would be identified in the future as part of implementing improvement plans, due to the presence of existing commercial and industrial uses to the north, east, and south of the site, it can reasonably be concluded that these facilities exist in the Project area. Any necessary connections to these existing points of connection would occur either on-site, or within off-site improved rights-of-way. Physical impacts associated with the construction of such facilities are evaluated throughout this environmental assessment. Where necessary, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce identified impacts to a level below significance. Accordingly, impacts due to the construction of new electrical facilities, natural gas lines, and communication systems as necessary to serve the Project would be less than significant.

Street Lighting

In accordance with Riverside County requirements, street lights would be provided along all roadways planned for improvement by the Project. Impacts associated with the construction of street lights have been evaluated in association with the physical impact of on- and off-site roadway construction throughout this environmental assessment. Any impacts due to construction of street lights would be less than significant.

Storm Water Drainage

All proposed improvements would occur entirely within the Project boundary or immediately adjacent to the Project boundary. Areas subject to physical impacts in association with the construction of storm water drainage facilities as needed to serve the proposed Project have been analyzed throughout this environmental assessment. Where necessary, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce identified impacts to a level below significance. Accordingly, impacts due to the construction of Project-related storm drainage facilities are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Public Facilities Maintenance

There would be no impacts to the environment resulting from routine maintenance of public roads or the water quality basin. Accordingly, no impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

Other Governmental Services

There are no other governmental services or utilities needed to serve the proposed Project beyond what is evaluated and disclosed above and throughout the remaining sections of this Initial Study. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

50. Energy Conservation

a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?

Source: Project Implementation Materials

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact: Project implementation would result in the conversion of the subject site from its existing, undeveloped condition to a commercial retail site that would feature two restaurants. This land use transition would increase the site's demand for energy. Specifically, the proposed Project would increase consumption of energy for space and water heating, air conditioning, lighting, and operation of miscellaneous equipment and appliances.

Planning efforts by energy resource providers take into account planned land uses to ensure the long-term availability of energy resources necessary to service anticipated growth. The proposed Project would develop the site in a manner consistent with the County's General Plan land use designations for the property; thus, energy demands associated with the proposed Project are addressed through long-range planning by energy purveyors and can be accommodated as they occur. Therefore, Project implementation is not anticipated to result in the need for the construction or expansion of existing energy generation facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Furthermore, the State of California regulates energy consumption under Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards were developed by the CEC and apply to energy consumed for heating, cooling, ventilation, water heating, and lighting in new residential and non-residential buildings. Adherence to these efficiency standards would result in a "maximum feasible" reduction in unnecessary energy consumption. As such, the development and operation of the proposed Project would not conflict with applicable energy conservation plans, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<p>51. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: As indicated in the discussion and analysis of Biological Resources (Section 7), Cultural Resources (Section 8), Archaeological Resources (Section 9), and Paleontological Resources (Section 10), implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
52. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects and probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in potentially significant cumulative effects associated with inconsistency with the ALUC Compatibility Plan. This potentially significant effect has been evaluated and disclosed in Section 23 (Airports). As indicated in this section, although the Project has the potential to result in cumulatively considerable effects, mitigation measures have been imposed to reduce all direct and cumulative impacts to below a level of significance. There are no other cumulatively considerable impacts associated with the proposed Project that are not already evaluated and disclosed throughout this environmental assessment.

53. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review, project application

Findings of Fact: The Project's potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings has been evaluated throughout this environmental assessment. There are no components of this project that could result in substantial adverse effects on human beings that are not already evaluated and disclosed throughout this environmental assessment. Accordingly, no additional impacts would occur.

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration as per California Code of Regulations, Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

Location Where Earlier Analyses, if used, are available for review:

Location: County of Riverside Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
Riverside, CA 92505

VII. AUTHORITIES CITED

Authorities cited: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21083.05; References: California Government Code Section 65085.4; Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095 and 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357;

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.



CALL (951) 368-9222
EMAIL legals@pe.com

THE PRESS-ENTERPRISE

DATE	ORDER NUMBER	PO Number	PRODUCT	SIZE	Amount
11/22/17	0011043203		PE Riverside	3 x 79 Li	308.10
Invoice text: PP 25793					
					RECEIVED RIVERSIDE COUNTY CLERK OF SUPERVISORS 2017 NOV 28 AM 10:49
Placed by: Cecilia Gil					BALANCE DUE 308.10
Legal Advertising Memo Invoice					

*Planning
18.4 w/ 12/12/17*

SALES CONTACT INFORMATION		ADVERTISER INFORMATION			
		BILLING DATE	BILLED ACCOUNT NUMBER	ADVERTISER/CLIENT NUMBER	ADVERTISER/CLIENT NAME
Nick Eller 951-368-9229		11/22/2017	5209148	5209148	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS



THE PRESS-ENTERPRISE

Legal Advertising Memo Invoice

PLEASE DETACH AND RETURN THIS PORTION WITH YOUR REMITTANCE

ADVERTISER/CLIENT NAME		
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS		
BILLING DATE	BILLED ACCOUNT NUMBER	ADVERTISER/CLIENT NUMBER
11/22/2017	5209148	5209148
BALANCE DUE	ORDER NUMBER	TERMS OF PAYMENT
308.10	0011043203	DUE UPON RECEIPT

BILLING ACCOUNT NAME AND ADDRESS

REMITTANCE ADDRESS

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
'PO BOX 1147'
RIVERSIDE, CA 92502

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPERS PARTNERSHIP
Riverside Press-Enterprise
PO BOX 54880
LOS ANGELES CA 90054-0880

THE PRESS-ENTERPRISE

1825 Chicago Ave, Suite 100
Riverside, CA 92507
951-684-1200
951-368-9018 FAX

**PROOF OF PUBLICATION
(2010, 2015.5 C.C.P)**

Publication(s): The Press-Enterprise

PROOF OF PUBLICATION OF

Ad Desc.: PP 25793 /

I am a citizen of the United States. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to or interested in the above entitled matter. I am an authorized representative of THE PRESS-ENTERPRISE, a newspaper in general circulation, printed and published daily in the County of Riverside, and which newspaper has been adjudicated a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside, State of California, under date of April 25, 1952, Case Number 54446, under date of March 29, 1957, Case Number 65673, under date of August 25, 1995, Case Number 267864, and under date of September 16, 2013, Case Number RIC 1309013; that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in said newspaper in accordance with the instructions of the person(s) requesting publication, and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

11/22/2017

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: November 22, 2017
At: Riverside, California



Legal Advertising Representative, The Press-Enterprise

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
PO BOX 1147
RIVERSIDE, CA 92502

Ad Number: 0011043203-01

P.O. Number:

Ad Copy:

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY ON A FAST TRACK PLOT PLAN IN THE RANCHO CALIFORNIA - SOUTHWEST AREA, THIRD SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT AND NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a public hearing at which all interested persons will be heard, will be held before the Board of Supervisors of Riverside County, California, on the 1st Floor Board Chambers, County Administrative Center, 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, on **Tuesday, December 12, 2017 at 10:30 A.M.** or as soon as possible thereafter, to consider the application submitted by DMSD Property - Senery, on **Fast Track Plot Plan No. 25793**, which proposes to overrule the Airport Land Use Commissions inconsistency determination and approve Plot Plan No. 25793 allowing the construction and operation of a 4,565 square foot Denny's restaurant, and a 2,680 square foot El Pollo Loco restaurant featuring a drive through, 77 parking stalls, and all other required improvements on a 2.06 acre site ("the project"). The project is located southeasterly of Highway 79, southwesterly of Benton Road, northwesterly of Magdas Coloradoas Street and northerly of Briggs Road, Third Supervisorial District.

The Planning Department recommended that the Board of Supervisors approve the project and adopt the Negative Declaration for **Environmental Assessment No. 42788**.

The project case file may be viewed from the date of this notice until the public hearing, Monday through Friday, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at 4080 Lemon Street, 1st Floor, Riverside, California 92501, and at the Riverside County Planning Department at 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, California 92501.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION REGARDING THIS PROJECT, PLEASE CONTACT DAVID ALVAREZ PROJECT PLANNER, AT (951) 955-5719 OR EMAIL daalvarez@rivco.org.

Any person wishing to testify in support of or in opposition to the project may do so in writing between the date of this notice and the public hearing, or may appear and be heard at the time and place noted above. All written comments received prior to the public hearing will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors and the Board of Supervisors will consider such comments, in addition to any oral testimony, before making a decision on the project.

If you challenge the above item in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence to the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors at, or prior to, the public hearing. Be advised that as a result of the public hearing and the consideration of all public comment, written and oral, the Board of Supervisors may amend, in whole or in part, the project and/or the related environmental document. Accordingly, the designations, development standards, design or improvements, or any properties or lands within the boundaries of the project, may be changed in a way other than specifically proposed.

Alternative formats available upon request to individuals with disabilities. If you require reasonable accommodation, please contact Lisa Wagner at (951) 955-1063, 72 hours prior to hearing.

Please send all written correspondence to: Clerk of the Board, 4080 Lemon Street, 1st Floor, Post Office Box 1147, Riverside, CA 92502-1147

Dated: November 20, 2017 Kecia Harper-Ihem, Clerk of the Board
By: Cecilia Gil, Board Assistant

11/22