

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 - Overview of the CEQA Process

On November 29, 2016, the County of Riverside (“County”) circulated a Draft EIR evaluating the San Gorgonio Crossing Project (project) for public review. Various comments were submitted during the public review period relative to the Draft EIR, including comments related to air quality, biological resources, noise, and traffic. After review of the comments, the County elected to revise and recirculate the Draft EIR in its entirety.

The decision to recirculate the Draft EIR was based, in part, upon a comment received from Caltrans after the close of the public comment period, stating that the traffic counts used for the traffic analysis may be significantly different from the current year and should be updated. In order to present the most accurate representation of all of the potential physical environmental impacts the project may cause, an updated traffic study was completed based upon the comments raised from Caltrans. Therefore, as a result of the new traffic study, updated air quality, greenhouse gas, health risk assessment, and noise studies have been prepared and incorporated into this Recirculated Draft EIR (RDEIR).

The revisions to the Draft EIR do not increase or alter the project’s development type or intensity but merely clarify information in the Draft EIR that, in turn, addresses expressed concerns regarding the Draft EIR and provide updated information. Although numerous comments were received on the Draft EIR, the County did not prepare a Response to Comments/Final EIR document, and the project was not considered for approval at a public hearing.

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 (f)(1), when an entire EIR is recirculated prior to certification, the lead agency is not required to provide written responses to previous comments that were received during the prior public review period. In such cases, the lead agency is only required to respond to those comments submitted in response to the recirculated, revised EIR. Nonetheless, the comments submitted on the prior Draft EIR were taken into consideration when preparing this RDEIR, and information has been added where feasible to address pertinent comments received. The comments submitted on the previous Draft EIR will be part of the overall administrative record for the project; however, because this RDEIR replaces the previous Draft EIR in its entirety, written responses will only be provided to new comments submitted on this RDEIR during the RDEIR public comment period.

This RDEIR is prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the San Gorgonio Crossing Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2014011009). This document is prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.), and County of Riverside rules EIR and regulations. This RDEIR is intended to serve as an informational document for the public agency decision-makers and the public regarding the project.

The purpose of the RDEIR is to disclose information to the public and to the decision-makers about the potential environmental effects of the project. An EIR does not recommend either approval or denial of a project; rather, it is intended to provide a source of independent and impartial analysis of the foreseeable environmental impacts of a proposed course of action. This RDEIR describes the project, analyzes its environmental effects, and discusses reasonable alternatives that would avoid, reduce, or minimize environmental impacts.

1.1.1 - Overview

The San Gorgonio Crossing Project site totals approximately 229 acres, of which approximately 16 acres are located within the City of Calimesa and would be used for project infrastructure purposes. Approximately 140.23 acres would be included within the developed portion of the project, and the remaining 84.8 acres would remain as natural open space (approximately 36 percent of the project site). The project consists of two high-cube warehouse buildings that will be designed to be eligible for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Certification. Building 1 will comprise approximately 811,000 square feet, and Building 2 approximately 1,012,760 square feet for a total of approximately 1,823,760 square feet of gross floor area. The two project buildings would include approximately 30,000 square feet of office space.

Both buildings will be designed to accommodate cross-dock usage, with 136 dock doors for Building 1 and 170 dock doors for Building 2. A public street—located between Building 1 and Building 2—would provide access to existing residences that are generally located to the north of the project site, which currently utilize access through the project site via a dirt road. The street proposed to replace the existing dirt road would be approximately 1,600 feet in length, designed to Riverside County standards, and would provide residents access through the project site. Additional development on the project site would include standard and trailer parking stalls, streets, and landscaping.

A water quality basin would be constructed to the west of Building 1. A rectangular concrete channel would be located north and south of Buildings 1 and 2. Additionally, a grouted riprap berm and a water quality infiltration trench would be located north of Building 2¹. Riprap berms would be located east of Building 2, and a water quality basin is planned west of Building 2. Additionally, a publicly maintained trapezoidal concrete channel would be located between the building sites and Cherry Valley Boulevard. As discussed, the project would utilize approximately 16 acres within the City of Calimesa for off-site drainage and flooding improvements. Improvements within the City of Calimesa are composed of drainage channels and appurtenances including a concrete trap channel, a concrete box culvert, two concrete outlet structures, and rip rap rock energy dissipaters. The Applicant has also agreed to construct a rock-lined berm to protect the adjacent property owners.

Three access points would be provided off Cherry Valley Boulevard. Section 2, Project Description, provides a complete description of the project.

¹ Riprap is a foundation or sustaining wall of stones or chunks of concrete, which can be used to line channels.

1.1.2 - Purpose and Authority

This RDEIR provides a project-level analysis of the environmental effects of the project. The environmental impacts of the project are analyzed in the RDEIR to the degree of specificity required by Section 15146 of the State CEQA Guidelines. This document addresses the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts that may be associated with the planning, construction, or operation of the project. It also identifies appropriate and feasible mitigation measures and alternatives that may be adopted to significantly reduce or avoid potential impacts.

CEQA requires that an EIR contain, at a minimum, certain specific elements. These elements are contained in this RDEIR and include:

- Table of Contents
- Introduction
- Project Description
- Environmental Impact Analysis
- Cumulative Impacts
- Significant Unavoidable Impacts
- Alternatives to the Proposed Project
- Growth-Inducing Impacts
- Environmental Issues Determined not to be Significant

1.1.3 - Lead Agency Determination

The County of Riverside is designated as the lead agency for the project. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15367 defines the lead agency as “. . . the public agency, which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.” Other public agencies may use this RDEIR in the decision-making or permit process and consider the information in this RDEIR, along with other information that may be presented during the CEQA process.

Lists of organizations and persons consulted are provided in Section 7, Persons and Organizations Consulted. Report preparation personnel are provided in Section 8, List of Preparers of this RDEIR.

1.1.4 - Project of Statewide, Regional, or Areawide Environmental Significance

The project meets the following criteria, as specified in Section 15206 of the State CEQA Guidelines, of a project that is of statewide, regional, or areawide environmental significance:

- Potential environmental effects of the project could extend beyond the boundaries of unincorporated Riverside County.
- The project proposes a local general plan, element, or amendment thereof for which an EIR was prepared.
- The project proposes a high-cube warehouse project occupying more than 40 acres of land, and encompassing more than 650,000 square feet of floor area.

Therefore, the project will comply with the notification requirements of Section 15206, which require that a copy of the RDEIR be submitted to the State Clearinghouse for review.

1.2 - Scope of the EIR

The purpose of this EIR is to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the project and all related actions for the approval of the proposed general plan amendment.

1.2.1 - First Notice of Preparation

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued on April 24, 2013, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15082 (a), 15103, and 15375 (State Clearinghouse No. 2014011009). The NOP was circulated among responsible and trustee state agencies, local organizations, and interested individuals, to identify issues to be addressed in the Draft EIR. The 45-day circulation and review period required by CEQA concluded on June 1, 2013. Furthermore, the County held a scoping meeting that was open to the public for comments and questions on April 22, 2013. Copies of comment letters related to the scoping meeting and received in response to the NOP are included in Appendix A, and listed in Table 1-1.

Table 1-1: IS-NOP and Scoping Meeting Comments in 2013

Agency/Organization	Author	Date
Public Agencies		
City of Beaumont	Chris Tracy, AICP Associate Planner	04-11-2013
Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians	Joseph Ontiveros, Director of Cultural Resources	04-30-2013
Public Comments		
Cherry Valley Acres and Neighbors (CVAN)	Patsy Reeley, President	04-18-2013
	Susan Pratt	04-22-2013
	Jerry Guarracino	04-22-2013
	Philipp Goebels	04-22-2013
Cherry Valley Acres and Neighbors (CVAN) (<i>cont.</i>)	Adam Sampson	04-22-2013
	Dusty and Melissa Hanvey	04-22-2013
	Jeff Elser	04-22-2013
	Seleste Dunn (Sabatino)	04-22-2013
	Shirleyjean Heyne, Keith Heyne, and Sara M. Williams	04-22-2013
	Steve Mehlman	04-22-2013
	Ross K.	04-22-2013
	Composerx (email name)	04-22-2013

1.2.2 - Second Notice of Preparation

A second NOP was issued on January 6, 2014, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines sections 15082(a), 15103, and 15375. The NOP was circulated to responsible and trustee state agencies, local organizations, and interested individuals, to identify issues to be addressed in the Draft EIR. The 45-day circulation and review period required by CEQA concluded on February 12, 2014. Furthermore, the County held a scoping meeting that was open to the public for comments and questions on January 27, 2014. Thirteen speakers made comments during the scoping meeting; the speaker identification cards for these comments are in Appendix A. The comments made by the speakers during the scoping meeting addressed topics such as concerns regarding air quality emissions and related health impacts, noise impacts, truck traffic, desire to preserve rural setting, conflicts with residential and senior residential land use, and capacity of existing freeway interchanges. Copies of comment letters received in response to the January 6, 2014 NOP are included in Appendix A.5 and listed in Table 1-2. Letters received after the close of the scoping period for the January 2014 NOP are included in Appendix A.6 of this document.

This Draft EIR complies with all requirements of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(d); a new NOP is not required as no substantial changes have been made to the project.

Table 1-2: EIR-NOP and Scoping Meeting Comments in 2014

Agency/Organization	Author	Date
Public Agencies		
Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC)	Not provided	01-10-2014
Department of Transportation	Daniel Kopulsky, Office Chief	01-09-2014
Southern California Edison	Louis Davis, Local Public Affairs Region Manager	02-05-2014
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	Jeff Brandt, Senior Environmental Scientist	02-04-2014
Beaumont Unified School District	Alice Grundman, Substitute Director of Facilities and Planning	02-04-2014
URS Corporation	Eric Carlson, Air Quality Scientist	02-06-2014
Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians	Joseph Ontiveros, Director of Cultural Resources	01-08-2014
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	Jonathan Nadler, Manager Compliance and Performance Assessment	01-30-2014
Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit	Scott Morgan, Director, State Clearinghouse	01-06-2014
Public Comments		
Cherry Valley Acres and Neighbors (CVAN)	Patsy Reeley, President	No date
	Almira Lenn	No date
	Bill Souder	No date

Table 1-2 (cont.): EIR-NOP and Scoping Meeting Comments in 2014

Agency/Organization	Author	Date
	Bob and Marty Ellsworth	No date
	Charles Bledsoe	No date
	Debbie Avakian	No date
	Deborah Terrell	No date
	Ed Cooper	No date
	Elaine Hernandez	No date
	Gary Autrey	No date
Cherry Valley Acres and Neighbors (CVAN) (cont.)	Hanna	No date
	Hope Amen	No date
	James Overturf	No date
	John and Shirley Russell	No date
	Joni Haynes	No date
	Joseph Kuhn	No date
	Julie Lewis	No date
	Katherine Talkington	No date
	Leigh Gileno	No date
	Leigh Stewart	No date
	Les & Rhonda Breeden	No date
	Marsha Wolfersberger	No date
	Quintanilla Household	No date
	Rhea Weber	No date
	Richard Hobson & Carol Mansell	No date
	Rob Peterson	No date
	Sandra Leoni	No date
	Shirley Lithgow	No date
	Silvia Mendez	No date
	Teri Walder	No date
	Tom and Linda Brown	No date
	Veronica Cano-Campos	No date
	Wendy Walder	No date
	Zach Taylor	No date
	Janet Gudgell and Patricia Peters	12-22-2013

Table 1-2 (cont.): EIR-NOP and Scoping Meeting Comments in 2014

Agency/Organization	Author	Date
	Janet Gudgeell and Patricia Peters	01-8-2014
	Composerx (email name)	01-13-2014
	Barbara and Henry Wener	01-13-2014
	Raymond W. Johnson (Johnson and Sedlack)	01-13-2014
	Judi Nightingale	01-13-2014
	Harvey and Anna Wimer	01-14-2014
	Diane Franklin	01-20-2014
	Mary A. Daniel	01-22-2014
	Dolores McCurry	01-22-2014
	Barbara W. Brown	01-23-2014
	Robert Bridges	01-23-2014
	Brenda Kreutzer	01-24-2014
	Michael and Carol Draney	01-24-2014
	Christy Sterling	01-24-2014
	Joan Paine	01-24-2014
	John and Kathleen Dyson	01-24-2014
	Kirk Brown	01-24-2014
	Lance Adams	01-24-2014
	Laura Cox	01-24-2014
	Lyndsey Oliver	01-24-2014
	Marc Sanders	01-24-2014
	Marina Lim	01-24-2014
	Mitch Hino	01-24-2014
	Sandi Joel	01-24-2014
	Scott Giacolett	01-24-2014
	Zach Taylor	01-25-2014
	Michele Delph	01-25-2014
	Tammy Hull	01-25-2014
	Trina Brown	01-25-2014
	Zach Taylor	01-25-2014
	Dr. Blair Ball	01-26-2014
	Chris Brown	01-26-2014

Table 1-2 (cont.): EIR-NOP and Scoping Meeting Comments in 2014

Agency/Organization	Author	Date
	Dallin Ball	01-26-2014
	Danice Rose	01-26-2014
	Dennis Tankersley	01-26-2014
	Don Bohnsak	01-26-2014
	Fran Flanders	01-26-2014
	Jacqueline Smith	01-26-2014
	James and Jennifer Booth	01-26-2014
	Jeremy Ball	01-26-2014
	Jill Padilla	01-26-2014
	Donna Ingalls	01-26-2014
	John Burrows	01-26-2014
	Kim Knorr	01-26-2014
	Leta Porter	01-26-2014
	Dr. Linda Martinez	01-26-2014
	Lisa McCoy	01-26-2014
	Marshall Cammack	01-26-2014
	Michelle Mahdavi	01-26-2014
	Nancy Friedman	01-26-2014
	Larry and Pamela Bunker	01-26-2014
	Patrick Leahy	01-26-2014
	Robert and Renate Allen	01-26-2014
	Sara Sheeran	01-26-2014
	Sean Gill	01-26-2014
	Sherrie and Robert Vines	01-26-2014
	Stephanie Schlott	01-26-2014
	Martha Saenz	01-26-2014
	Steve Price	01-26-2014
	Mr. and Mrs. Richardson	01-27-2014
	Andy Ramirez	01-27-2014
	Kathy Krause	01-27-2014
	Jar22 (email name)	01-27-2014
	Cathy Schaefer	01-27-2014

Table 1-2 (cont.): EIR-NOP and Scoping Meeting Comments in 2014

Agency/Organization	Author	Date
	David Hoffman (All Seasons Hay Co.)	01-27-2014
	Debbie Whipple	01-27-2014
	Erin Baldwin	01-27-2014
	Gene De Fouw	01-27-2014
	The Hanveys	01-27-2014
	Heidi Miccio	01-27-2014
	James Honeyfield	01-27-2014
	Janelle Poulter	01-27-2014
	Jeffrie Saenz	01-27-2014
	Jerry Beeman	01-27-2014
	John Burrows	01-27-2014
	John E. Clark	01-27-2014
	Judy Bingham	01-27-2014
	Karin Starr	01-27-2014
	Kimberley Wolf	01-27-2014
	Mrs. L. Montoya	01-27-2014
	Alan Shubeck	01-27-2014
	Linda Schreiber	01-27-2014
	Liza West	01-27-2014
	Martha Van Rooijen	01-27-2014
	Michelle Harrison	01-27-2014
	Patricia J. Gerdine	01-27-2014
	Starla Saiz	01-27-2014
	Steven Hallbert	01-27-2014
	Dr. Jamie Elam	01-28-2014
	Sharon K.	01-28-2014
	Tamra Johnson	01-28-2014
	Cindy Burke	01-29-2014
	Cynthia F. Clay	01-29-2014
	Don and Kamara Belding	01-29-2014
	Iqbal Pittalwala	01-29-2014
	Victoria Wolf	01-29-2014

Table 1-2 (cont.): EIR-NOP and Scoping Meeting Comments in 2014

Agency/Organization	Author	Date
	Ron Roy	02-05-2014
	Joe Kuhn	02-12-2014

The primary issues of concern raised in scoping comments include:

- The project's contribution to air quality and greenhouse gas impacts
- Traffic congestion at the Cherry Valley Boulevard/Interstate 10 traffic interchange
- Changes in land use designation and zoning
- Maintaining the rural character of the Cherry Valley area
- Aesthetics/light pollution
- Noise
- Property value
- Health impacts
- Water supply
- Cumulative impacts
- Water quality
- Agricultural resources
- Recreation

Revisions made within this RDEIR are also made in response to issues raised in comment letters that were received following publication of the first Draft EIR in November 2016.

1.2.3 - Community Committee Meetings

Following the scoping periods, the County received numerous inquiries and concerns regarding the project. In early 2014, the project proposed two buildings totaling 2,560,000 square feet. To address public inquires, the County formed a committee of 11 representatives from the community to evaluate the project and work with the applicant to improve the proposed project. The committee was specifically charged with the following responsibilities and asked to report back to the County with its findings:

1. Review and evaluate the project and all related data and information.
2. Strive to make the project the best that it can be.
3. Determine if the project is good for the community.
4. Alternatively, determine and recommend the highest and best land use that is compatible with the area and is viable and sustainable.

The committee was scheduled to publicly meet monthly starting in April of 2014. Each meeting was intended to cover a specific topic (land use, air quality, transportation, etc.).

- The kick-off meeting was held on April 10, 2014 and covered a briefing on the project and its history.
- The second meeting was on May 8, 2014 and covered land use compatibility and amenities.

The committee voted and approved a motion to deny the project that was before them and recommend that the best use for the property is the existing land use/zoning. In doing so, the committee deviated from the identified responsibilities, did not take advantage of the opportunity to improve the project in conjunction with the project applicant.

While no further meetings were held, the meetings were an effective means for public involvement and comment. Having considered the input received during the meetings, as well as County Planning staff input, the project applicant decided to reduce the scope of the project. As a result, the project square footage was reduced from 2,560,000 square feet to 1,860,760 square feet, representing an overall reduction in project intensity of 28 percent. Thus, this EIR evaluates the impacts of this reduced intensity project.

1.2.4 - Environmental Issues Determined not to be Significant

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15063 provide that if a lead agency determines that an EIR will clearly be required for a project, an Initial Study is not required; therefore, no Initial Study was prepared for this project. The RDEIR is comprehensive in nature, evaluating all subject issues from the CEQA Appendix G Checklist. In particular, the following issues are addressed in the RDEIR:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems.

The RDEIR addresses the short and long-term effects of the project on the environment. It also evaluates the potential for the project to cause direct and indirect growth-inducing impacts, and includes a cumulative impact analysis. Alternatives to the project are also evaluated in the RDEIR. Mitigation has been proposed for any potentially significant impacts. After the public comment period and finalization of the RDEIR, a mitigation monitoring and reporting program will be developed as required by Section 15097 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Organization of the EIR

This RDEIR document is organized into the following main sections:

- **Executive Summary.** This section includes a summary of the San Geronio Crossing Project and alternatives that are addressed in the RDEIR. A brief description of the areas of

controversy and a table summarizing the impacts, mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation are included in this section.

- **Section 1: Introduction.** This section provides an introduction and overview describing the purpose of this RDEIR, its scope and components, and its review and certification process.
- **Section 2: Project Description.** This section includes a detailed description of the project, including its location, site, and project characteristics. A discussion of the project objectives, intended uses of the EIR, responsible agencies, and approvals needed for the project is also provided.
- **Section 3: Environmental Impact Analysis.** This section analyzes the environmental impacts of the project. Impacts are organized into major topic areas. Each topic area includes a description of the environmental setting, methodology, significance criteria, impacts, mitigation measures, and significance after mitigation. The specific environmental topics that are addressed within Section 3 are as follows:
 - Section 3.1—Aesthetics: Addresses the potential visual impacts of development of the project.
 - Section 3.2—Agriculture and Forestry Resources: Addresses the project’s potential impacts on local agriculture/farmland and forest land.
 - Section 3.3—Air Quality: Addresses the potential local and regional air quality impacts associated with the project implementation, as well as consistency with the South Coast Air Quality Management District policies.
 - Section 3.4—Biological Resources: Addresses the project’s potential impacts on habitat, vegetation, and wildlife; the potential degradation or elimination of important habitat; and impacts on the listed, proposed, and candidate threatened and endangered species.
 - Section 3.5—Cultural Resources: Addresses the potential impacts of project development on known historical resources and potential archeological and paleontological resources.
 - Section 3.6—Geology and Soils: Addresses the potential impacts the project may have on soils, and assesses the potential effects of project development in relation to geologic and seismic conditions.
 - Section 3.7—Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Addresses the potential impacts of the project regarding the generation of greenhouse gases.
 - Section 3.8—Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Addresses the likelihood of the presence of hazardous materials or conditions on the project site and in the project area that may have the potential to impact human health.
 - Section 3.9—Hydrology and Water Quality: Addresses the potential impacts of the project on local hydrological conditions, including drainage areas, and changes in the flow rates.
 - Section 3.10—Land Use and Planning: Addresses the potential related land use impacts associated with implementation of the project, including project compatibility with surrounding land uses and consistency with the Riverside County General Plan and other land use plans.
 - Section 3.11—Mineral Resources: Addresses potential project impacts on known mineral resources and availability of locally important mineral resources.

- Section 3.12—Noise: Addresses the potential noise impacts during construction and at project buildout from mobile and stationary sources. The section also addresses the impact of noise generation on neighboring uses.
- Section 3.13—Population and Housing: Addresses the potential impact of development in terms of population growth, employment opportunities, housing affordability, and the jobs-to-housing balance.
- Section 3.14—Public Services: Addresses the potential impacts upon service providers including fire protection, police, and schools.
- Section 3.15—Recreation: Addresses the potential impacts on the local and regional roadway system, public transportation, bicycle, and pedestrian access.
- Section 3.16—Transportation and Traffic: Addresses the potential impacts on the local and regional roadway system, as well as potential impacts related to emergency access, parking, and alternative transportation.
- Section 3.17—Utilities and Service Systems: Addresses the potential impacts upon service providers including water treatment, wastewater treatment, stormwater, and solid waste.
- **Section 4: Cumulative Impacts Analysis.** This section discusses the cumulative impacts associated with the project, including the cumulative impact setting and cumulative impact analysis.
- **Section 5: Other CEQA Considerations.** This section provides a summary of significant environmental impacts, including growth-inducing impacts, and the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts.
- **Section 6: Alternatives to the Proposed Project.** This section compares the impacts of the project with various project alternatives.
- **Section 7: Persons and Organizations Consulted.** This section contains a list of persons and organizations that were consulted during the preparation of this RDEIR.
- **Section 8: List of Preparers.** This section contains a list of persons who prepared the RDEIR.
- **Section 9: References.** This section contains a full list of references that were used in the preparation of this RDEIR.
- **Appendices:** The material in the appendices includes all notices and other procedural documents pertinent to the RDEIR, as well as all technical material prepared to support the analysis.

1.3 - Documents Incorporated by Reference

As permitted by Section 15150 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this RDEIR has referenced several technical studies, analyses, and previously certified environmental documentation. Information from the documents, which have been incorporated by reference, has been briefly summarized in the appropriate section(s). The relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and the RDEIR has also been described. The documents and other sources that have been used in the preparation of this RDEIR include, but are not limited to:

- County of Riverside General Plan (2015)
- County of Riverside General Plan (2003)
- The Pass Area Plan (including the Cherry Valley Policy Area)

These documents are specifically identified in Section 9, References, of this RDEIR. In accordance with Section 15150(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, these referenced documents and other sources used in the preparation of the RDEIR are available for review at the County of Riverside address shown in Section 1.7, Review of the RDEIR, below.

Riverside County recently adopted General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 960, which was developed to ensure that the comprehensive plan of 2003 remains a useful blueprint for the County's growth. Specific changes were proposed throughout the various General Plan Elements, Area Plans, and appendices.² In conjunction with the GPA No. 960 effort, the County also prepared a Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report No. 521 and a Draft Climate Action Plan (CAP). The GPA and CAP were adopted on December 8, 2015.

Thereafter, a lawsuit was filed on January 6, 2016, alleging that the County failed to comply with CEQA in connection with its approval of the GPA update and CAP. Although the General Plan is presumed to be legally valid unless deemed otherwise by the court, this litigation is not anticipated to be resolved by the time this RDEIR is circulated for public review. Therefore, to ensure full disclosure and complete analysis, the relevant General Plan policies as stated in the 2015 General Plan are utilized in Section 3 of this document, while the policies of the 2003 General Plan are included separately in a comparison table contained in Appendix K, only to the extent that they differ from the policies listed in Section 3. In summary, the consistency determinations and environmental impact conclusions herein would remain the same under both versions of the General Plan.

1.4 - Documents Prepared for the Project

The stand-alone technical studies prepared for the project and included within the prior Draft EIR are listed below:

- Water Supply Assessment. October 8, 2013. Yucaipa Valley Water District.
- Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan. February 2015, Albert A. Webb Associates.
- Preliminary Hydrology Study. February 2015. Albert A. Webb Associates.
- Off-site Hydrology and Hydraulics Report. October 2014. Albert A. Webb Associates.
- Biological Technical Report. June 2015, HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
- Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation Report. January 2016. HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.

² In 2008, baseline General Plan documents were created, but never formally adopted, as prelude to the GPA No. 960 update project.

- Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis. July 2015. HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
- San Gorgonio Crossing Gross Fiscal Impact and Economic Benefit Analysis. September 2015. Kosmont Companies.
- Economic Impact of Gateway Distribution Center. January 8, 2014. Economics & Politics, Inc.
- Fault Investigation. September 22, 2008. Neblett & Associates, Inc.
- Report of Findings, Updated Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. April 6, 2009. RM Environmental, Inc.
- Grading Plan Review. January 7, 2013. Ginter & Associates, Inc.
- Grading Plan Review for the Revised TPM #36564 San Gorgonio Crossings. November 2014. Ginter & Associates, Inc.
- Infiltration Rate Evaluation. October 23, 2012. Ginter & Associates, Inc.
- Paleontological Resources Survey. April 9, 2013. FirstCarbon Solutions.
- Phase I Cultural Resources Survey. April 11, 2013. FirstCarbon Solutions.

In addition to the above studies, the following studies were prepared for the RDEIR:

- Traffic Impact Analysis. April 14, 2017. Urban Crossroads.
- Supplemental Traffic Analysis. April 18, 2017. Urban Crossroads.
- Supplemental Expanded Freeway Segment Analysis. April 18, 2017. Urban Crossroads.
- Supplemental Traffic Analysis-Future Beckwith Avenue. April 18, 2017. Urban Crossroads.
- San Gorgonio Crossing Alternatives Trip Generation Evaluation. April 18, 2017. Urban Crossroads.
- Air Quality, Health Risk, and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report. March 2017. FirstCarbon Solutions.
- Noise Impact Analysis. March 31, 2017. FirstCarbon Solutions.

1.5 - Lead Agency, Developer, and Consultant

The County of Riverside is the lead agency in the preparation of the RDEIR. The applicant/owner is TSG Cherry Valley, LLC. The Shopoff Group, L.P. is the developer of the project. FirstCarbon Solutions (formerly Michael Brandman Associates) is the environmental consultant for the project.

1.6 - Review of the RDEIR

Upon completion of the RDEIR, a Notice of Completion (NOC) will be filed with the State Office of Planning and Research to begin the public review period (Public Resources Code Section 21161).

Concurrent with the NOC, this RDEIR will be distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, surrounding cities, and interested parties, as well as all parties requesting a copy of the RDEIR, in accordance with Public Resources Code 21092(b)(3). During the 45-day public review period, the RDEIR, including the technical appendices, is available for review at the Riverside County Planning Department, located at 4080 Lemon Street. Agencies, organizations, and interested parties not previously contacted, or who did not respond to the NOP, currently have the opportunity to comment on the RDEIR during the public review period on the RDEIR.

Written comments on this RDEIR should be addressed to:

Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
Riverside, CA 92501
Attn: Mr. Brett Dawson

Upon completion of the public review period, written responses to all significant environmental issues raised will be prepared and made available for review in the Final EIR at least 10 days prior to Riverside County Board of Supervisors action on the project and the EIR. Comments received and the responses to comments will be included as part of the record for consideration by decision-makers for the project.