

CHAPTER 1 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Executive Summary for the Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship Project - Plot Plan No. 24883 and Change of Zone No. 07782 (Project) Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) summarizes the environmental effects that are forecast to occur from implementation of the Project, which consists of two (2) scenarios. It also contains a summary of the Project background, Project objectives, and Project description. A table summarizing environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and mitigation responsibility is included at the end of this Executive Summary.

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The County of Riverside (County) received a request from the Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship proposing Plot Plan No. 24883 and Change of Zone No. 07782. Plot Plan No. 24833 (PP 24883) consists of the construction of a 2,480 square foot special occasions facility and restroom building, a 68,389 square foot open air wedding ceremony assembly area, a 768 square foot residence (Phase I), a 31,496 square foot church building comprised of classrooms, offices, assembly areas, and porches (Phase II), and a 49,379 square foot church building for the sanctuary, offices, restrooms, and porches (Phase III).

Change of Zone No. 07782 (CZ 7782) and its associated amendment to Ordinance No. 348 proposes to amend Riverside County Ordinance No. 348, Section 14.73 subsection b. to include churches, temples and other places of religious worship as a permitted use, subject to Plot Plan approval, in the Citrus/Vineyard Zone (C/V Zone), and amend Section 14.74 of Ordinance No. 348 to include development standards for churches, temples and other places of religious worship in the C/V Zone.

The County concluded that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to document the potential adverse environmental effects of implementing the Project and identifying required mitigation and alternatives, where appropriate. The County is serving as the Lead Agency for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) based on its responsibility for reviewing and making a decision on the proposed Project entitlements required to allow the physical development to proceed. The additional entitlements include the entitlements listed above as well as required off-site improvements to support implementation of the Project. This DEIR has been prepared to address the physical changes to the environment that may occur, if the County approves the Project.

The County of Riverside prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the project. The NOP review period began on June 6, 2014 and ended 30 days later, July 7, 2014. Respondents were requested to send their suggestions for and comments on environmental information and issues that should be addressed in the Draft EIR (DEIR) no later than 30 days after receipt of the NOP. The NOP was distributed to interested agencies, the State Clearinghouse, and surrounding property owners. Thirteen (13) letter responses to the NOP were submitted.

A scoping meeting was held at the Riverside County Administrative Center on July 7, 2014. Four (4) people submitted speaker slips and commented at the scoping meeting. A copy of the Notice of Preparation and the thirteen (13) letters are included in Section 9.1. The NOP Mailing List / NOP Comment Letters are included in Section 9.2. Agenda – July 7, 2014 Planning

Director's Hearing / Scoping Session Staff Report (Item 3.2) / Scoping Meeting Speaker Slips / Meeting Minutes from the scoping meeting are included in Section 9.3.

To accomplish this, the Project proponent will submit applications seeking approval from the County for a a Change of Zone, and a Plot Plan. These components of the Project are summarized in greater detail below, and presented in detail in Chapter 4, *Project Description*.

The Riverside County Board of Supervisors approved the Wine Country Community Plan (WCCP) on March 11, 2014. At the time of this Notice of Preparation, there are two Petitions for Writ of Mandate challenging the County's approval of the WCCP. In light of this pending litigation, this DEIR will analyze two (2) scenario assumptions as described below:

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect

This scenario assumes that the WCCP is in full effect and the proposed Project consists of PP 24883 and CZ 7782.

It should be noted that the parcels for PP 24883 (APNs 943-250-018 and 943-250-021) are not within the approved WCCP's boundary. Therefore, PP 24883 is not subject to the provisions of the WCCP. PP 24883 is subject to the provisions of the C/V Zone as set forth in Ordinance No. 348.

Under this scenario, this DEIR will include a site/project specific analysis for the Project.

Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

This scenario assumes that the WCCP does not remain in effect.

Under this scenario, this DEIR will include a site/project specific analysis for PP 24883 and will include a program level analysis for CZ 7782 and its associated amendment to Ordinance No. 348.

Where applicable, and most practical due to distinct differences between the analysis needed for Scenario #1, or Scenario #2, separate headings are provided. In an effort to reduce duplication, in instances where the analysis pertains to both Scenario #1 and Scenario #2, they have been grouped under the same heading. At no time has any analysis within this document not been consistent with this methodology and formatting.

1.2 INTENDED USE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This DEIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes and Guidelines, 2007, pursuant to Section 21151 of CEQA. The County is the local Lead Agency for the Project and has supervised the preparation of this DEIR. This DEIR is an information document which will inform and assist public agency decision makers and the general public of the potential environmental effects from implementing the Project, including any significant effects that will be caused by implementing the proposed Project. Possible ways to minimize significant effects of the Project and reasonable alternatives to the Project are also identified in this DEIR.

This document assesses the impacts, including unavoidable adverse impacts and cumulative impacts, related to the construction and operation of the proposed Project. This DEIR is also intended to support the permitting process of all agencies from which discretionary approvals must be obtained for particular elements of this Project.

1.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship is developing the Project, under the jurisdiction of the County of Riverside. These objectives have been developed based on the mandated spatial requirements of the Calvary Chapel Association, which requires an average distance of approximately 10 miles between existing and proposed facilities. There is an established etiquette for locating Bible fellowships in relation to other fellowships. There are existing fellowships in Temecula, Murrieta, French Valley, Menifee and Wildomar. The Project serves the need of the rural community in Wine Country. The fellowship started as a “Bible Study” in a residence in Wine Country. The fellowship grew and was purposely sited in its current location.

The Project’s objectives are as follows:

- Develop a master-planned special event and church facility.
- Develop a “complex” of facilities that function as a whole, in one location for all ages of fellowship members.
- Provide an affordable opportunity for parishioners to hold special events, including weddings, in the Wine Country, which has its unique ambience.
- Provide a controlled environment for spiritual events.
- Develop in a manner to be compatible and respectful to existing and proposed uses.
- Meet the needs of the religious community of the area.
- Conserve agricultural land through cultivation of 75% of the site in vineyard, in a manner consistent with the surrounding area.
- Allow for special event and church uses that are consistent with existing and proposed uses in the area.
- Develop a Project that maintains the rural character of the C/V Zone through implementation of a Project that is visually attractive, energy efficient, water efficient, and environmentally friendly.

1.4 PROJECT APPROVALS

Before any development can occur, the County must approve certain entitlements and grant other authorizations for development of the Project as proposed. As indicated above, other agency approvals (if required) for which this environmental document may be utilized include:

- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Rancho California Water District
- Eastern Municipal Water District
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Other Riverside County Departments, such as the County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Department of Environmental Health, and Regional Conservation Authority (RCA)

It is these collective approvals that will also allow Project development to proceed and cause the corresponding changes to the physical environment.

This DEIR will be used as the information source and CEQA compliance document for the following discretionary actions or approvals by the CEQA lead agency, the County:

- Adoption of the Change of Zone 7782; and
- Approval of Plot Plan No. 24883.

1.5 IMPACTS

Based on data provided in this DEIR, it is concluded the Project will result in significant impacts to transportation/traffic.

All other potential impacts were determined to be less than significant without mitigation or can be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of standard conditions or, the mitigation measures identified in this DEIR. Cumulative significant impacts are identified in this document based on findings that the Project's contributions to such impacts are considered to be cumulatively considerable (per the threshold identified in Section 15130, *Discussion of Cumulative Impacts*, of the State CEQA Guidelines). Table 1.5-1, *Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures Discussed in this Draft EIR*, summarizes all of the environmental impacts and proposed mitigation and monitoring measures.

The following issues have been determined to experience less than significant impacts based on the facts, analysis and findings in this DEIR.

Aesthetics Resources

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect

Development of the Project will contribute to the change of the general area with an intensification of development in addition to that which presently occurs on the site (vacant) or in the Project vicinity. There will be an associated change in views, both to and from the Project site. The existing visual settings will be altered; however, because of nature and scale of existing and proposed land uses, these views will be similar to what is anticipated in the area. County application materials, site-specific analysis, 75% vineyard planting requirement, architectural compatibility, aesthetic consistency, landscaping and plant palette quantity and quality, and conditions of approval will ensure that project specific and cumulative impacts to aesthetic resources are fully addressed. The scope of this visual transition is not considered to be a cumulative significant adverse visual impact.

Based on the discussion in Subchapter 5.2.4, implementation of the Project will not have a substantial effect upon aesthetic resources. There will be no direct, or indirect effects either in the short-term, or long-term that would result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact either individually, or cumulatively.

Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

It was determined that these parcels have very similar aesthetic settings to that of Scenario #1. These setting characteristics include, but are not limited to:

- Adjacent wineries;
- Adjacent vineyards;
- Adjacent residences; and
- Vacant parcels.

Because these potential sites are located in the same general vicinity, it is anticipated that the same impacts and conclusions of these impacts would apply to short-range, mid-range and long-range viewsheds. However, due to immediate proximity to adjacent residential uses, Parcels 7 and 10 would have slightly greater impacts than the other eight (8) parcels under Scenario # 2.

Similar to Scenario #1, intensification of development in addition to that which presently occurs on the site (vacant) or in the Project vicinity. There will be an associated change in views, both to and from the Project site. The existing visual settings will be altered; however, because of nature and scale of existing and proposed land uses, these views will be similar to what is anticipated in the area. County application materials, site-specific analysis, 75% vineyard planting requirement, architectural compatibility, aesthetic consistency, landscaping and plant palette quantity and quality, lighting and conditions of approval will ensure that project specific and cumulative impacts to aesthetic resources are fully addressed, including Parcels 7 and 10. The scope of this visual transition is not considered to be a cumulative significant adverse visual impact.

As also demonstrated in Chapter 5.2, due to the similar natures of the projects under Scenario #2 to the proposed Project in Scenario #1, all environmental impacts pertaining to aesthetic resources are either less than significant or remain less than significant with conditions of approval (Standard Conditions).

Based on this same analysis, the conditions of approval in Subchapter 5.2.5, and the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.2.6, the conclusions would be applicable to Scenario #2. No unavoidable, significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of a similar Project on any of the ten (10) sites under Scenario #2.

Agricultural Resources - Agriculture

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

According to the analysis contained in Subchapters 5.3.1 through 5.3.4, and the required standard conditions and mitigation measures contained in Subchapter 5.3.5, implementation of the Project will not exceed the established thresholds for agricultural resources. Since the Project impacts are below these thresholds, implementation of the Project will not have a cumulative impact that would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use;

conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve; cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm"); or, involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use. There will be no significant contribution to cumulatively considerable impacts to agricultural resources under either Scenario #1 or Scenario #2.

Based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.3.4, implementation of the Project is not considered to be a significant unavoidable adverse impact to the agricultural resources of Wine Country, and the County of Riverside. There will be no direct, or indirect effects either in the short-term, or long-term that would result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact either individually, or cumulatively. At least 75% of the property will be utilized for grape growing for the cultivation and processing of grape wine. All environmental impacts pertaining to agricultural resources are either less than significant or have been reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation measures and adherence to conditions of approval (Standard Conditions).

Based on this same analysis, the conclusions would be applicable to Scenario #2. Any of the identified sites under Scenario #2 would have the same requirement related to 75% of the property being utilized for cultivating and processing. All environmental impacts pertaining to agricultural resources are either less than significant or have been reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation measures and adherence to conditions of approval (Standard Conditions).

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect

Cumulative impacts have been included in the air quality modeling for construction and operation. The cumulative setting for greenhouse gasses is the planet Earth. Development of the Project will contribute air quality emissions during construction and during operation as well as greenhouse gas emissions. According to the analysis above, with adherence to standard conditions, Project emissions will not exceed established thresholds for any pollutants. Odors will also remain below thresholds. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Since the Project is below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant.

Based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.4.4, implementation of the Project is not considered to be a significant unavoidable adverse impact to the air quality and greenhouse gas resources within Riverside County, and the greater setting of the South Coast Air Basin. There will be no direct, or indirect effects either in the short-term, or long-term that would result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact either individually, or cumulatively. All environmental impacts pertaining to air quality and greenhouse gas resources are either less than significant or have been reduced to a less than significant level with the adherence to conditions of approval (Standard Conditions). No unavoidable significant adverse impacts are anticipated under Scenario #1.

Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites under Scenario #2 within the CV Zone will contribute air quality emissions during construction and during operation as well as greenhouse gas emissions. Impacts from development under Scenario #2 would likely be of similar intensity of development under Scenario # 1, and similar impacts would be expected to occur for Parcels 1, 2, 3 and 5. Impacts are anticipated to be slightly greater for Parcels 4, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11. It can be inferred that these future developments will perform their respective analyses, and be required to adhere to standard conditions. These standard conditions ensured that project emissions did not exceed established thresholds for any pollutants. The same conclusions would apply to odors, as they would also remain below thresholds. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to air quality emissions for construction and operations would be anticipated, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, the duration of construction can be increased to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant.

The construction and operational regional emissions would be similar to the proposed Project, as the Project in any of the locations under Scenario #2 would utilize similar construction methods, materials, and design criteria. Further, the operation of the Project at any of the locations under Scenario #2 would include similar impacts since operations would be the same, particularly related to emissions from traffic. Lastly, as GHGs are not a localized impact, and operational emissions are the same or similar to the proposed Project, any GHG emissions would be similar at any of the locations under Scenario #2.

Impacts from development under Scenario #2 would likely be of similar intensity of development under Scenario # 1, and similar impacts would be expected to occur for Parcels 1, 2, 3 and 5. Impacts are anticipated to be slightly greater for Parcels 4, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11.

With incorporation of Standard Conditions/Mitigation in Subchapter 5.4.5, and based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.4.6, the conclusions for Scenario #1 would be applicable to Scenario #2. No unavoidable, significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of a similar Project on any of the ten (10) sites under Scenario #2.

Biological Resources

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect

Development of the Project will contribute to the change of the general area with an intensification of development substantially greater than that which presently occurs on the site or in the surrounding vicinity. With the incorporation of mitigation and standard conditions, the Project will not cause adverse cumulative effects related to the reduction of sensitive vegetation communities present in western Riverside County because there are no such species located within the Project footprint and the Project can be implemented consistent with the criteria identified in the MSHCP.

Based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.5.4, implementation of the Project is not

considered to be a significant unavoidable adverse impact to the biological resources from the development within the MSCHP Plan Area as a result of build out of the Cities and County's General Plans. There will be no direct, or indirect effects either in the short-term, or long-term that would result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact either individually, or cumulatively. All environmental impacts pertaining to biological resources are either less than significant or have been reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation measures and adherence to conditions of approval (Standard Conditions).

Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Similar to Scenario #1, development of projects at similar sites within the CV Zone may have an impact to biological resources. Parcels 4, 7, 8 contain portions of the site that are "within areas of flooding sensitivity." Those portions of Parcels 4, 7, and 8 may include riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities within these areas. As is the case with Scenario #1, with implementation of mitigation measures 5.4-10 through 5.4-12, any impacts will remain less than significant. It can be inferred that these future developments will perform their respective analyses, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and be subject to project-specific mitigation (if applicable). These standard conditions will ensure that project impacts will not exceed established thresholds for any biological resources and ensure consistency with the MSHCP. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar biological resources impacts would be anticipated. Impacts would likely be less than significant since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, the avoidance and mitigation can be incorporated to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant.

Eleven (11) parcels, contained in Table 4.4-1, *Scenario #2 Vacant Parcels* identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN's) and acreage were originally selected for the Scenario # 2 analysis. These correspond to Figure 4.4-1, *Scenario #2 Vacant Parcels*. Ten (10) parcels, will be included as part of the analysis. One (1) parcel (Assessor's Parcel Number 964-160-003) was not utilized for the analysis, since approximately 85% of the site was determined to be needed for conservation purposes. Based on this information, the ten (10) parcels will have a comparable environmental setting to that of the proposed Project.

These other potential project locations are within the boundaries of the Riverside County Integrated Project Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

According to the RCIP Conservation Summary Report Generator (see Subchapter 9.4), only a habitat assessment for burrowing owl would be applicable to Parcels 1-11 (excluding Parcel 9, as is it is 85% constrained with biological resources). No habitat assessments would be required for: amphibia species, critical area species, mammalian species, narrow endemic species. Parcels 4, 7, 8 contain portions of the site that are "within areas of flooding sensitivity." Those portions of Parcels 4, 7, and 8 may include riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities within these areas. As is the case with Scenario #1, with implementation of mitigation measures 5.4-10 through 5.4-12, any impacts will remain less than significant.

Impacts from development under Scenario #2 would likely be of similar intensity of development under Scenario # 1, and similar impacts would be expected to occur. Should any impacts

exceed the Project in Scenario #1, the avoidance and mitigation can be incorporated to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

With incorporation of Standard Conditions/Mitigation in Subchapter 5.5.5, and based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.5.6, the conclusions for Scenario #1 would be applicable to Scenario #2. No unavoidable, significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of a similar Project on any of the ten (10) sites under Scenario #2.

Cultural Resources

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect

Implementation of the Project will not result in cultural resource impacts (including paleontological resources) that will exceed the established thresholds of significance. Because the implementation of the Project is not forecast to cause any direct, significant adverse impact to cultural resources (including paleontological resources), with implementation of identified mitigation measures, the Project has no potential to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cultural resource impacts (including paleontological resources), in the Project area or Riverside County in general.

Based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.6.5, implementation of the Project is not considered to be a significant unavoidable adverse impact to the historical, archaeological and paleontological resources in the Project vicinity, as well as the historic range of the tribes of the Luiseño Indians, Wine Country, and the County of Riverside. There will be no direct, or indirect effects either in the short-term, or long-term that would result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact either individually, or cumulatively. All environmental impacts pertaining to historical, archaeological and paleontological resources are either less than significant or have been reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will not have an impact to cultural and paleontological resources. It can be inferred that these future developments will perform their respective analyses, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and project specific mitigation measures. These standard conditions and mitigation measures will ensure that project impacts did not exceed established thresholds for any cultural and paleontological resources. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative and paleontological impacts.

It is anticipated that any impacts will be addressed and potentially mitigated on a project-by-project basis. According to the RCIT analysis (see Subchapter 9.4), all ten (10) parcels have a 'high potential' for archaeological resources. These future developments would have to conduct Native American Consultation, review literature, conduct site inspections, identify potential resources, avoid and/or fully mitigate any impacts in order to develop their respective sites. These are the options available to address historical and cultural resources. Under the current regulations, any impacts would be considered less than significant. No additional mitigation is required.

According to the RCIT analysis (see Subchapter 9.4), all ten (10) parcels have a 'high potential'

for paleontological resources. Impacts related to paleontological resources would be anticipated during construction and would be anticipated to be of similar intensity to that of Scenario # 1 (similar intensity of development would be expected to occur). Like Scenario #1, these impacts would likely be less than significant with the incorporation of a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP).

Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant.

With incorporation of Standard Conditions/Mitigation in Subchapter 5.6.5, and based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.6.6, the conclusions for Scenario #1 would be applicable to Scenario #2. No unavoidable, significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of a similar Project on any of the ten (10) sites under Scenario #2.

Geology and Soils

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Development under either Scenario #1 or Scenario #2 will be affected by geotechnical constraints. None of the future Project-related activities are forecast to cause changes in geology or soils or constraints that cannot be fully mitigated, primarily through standard conditions of approval. Portions of Parcels 7 and 8 are within a County Fault Zone. Requisite analysis will be required during the project review stage to ensure that the fault is accurately identified and that any future development will not be adversely affected from site design and proximity to any potential faults. Geologic hazards are typically site-specific impacts and would not be anticipated to result in cumulative impacts. Therefore, the Project has no potential to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant geology or soils impact.

Based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.7.4, implementation of the Project under Scenario #1 is not considered to be a significant unavoidable adverse impact to the geology and soils resources of Wine Country, and the County of Riverside. There will be no direct, or indirect effects either in the short-term, or long-term that would result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact either individually, or cumulatively. All environmental impacts pertaining to geologic resources are either less than significant or have been reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation and adherence to conditions of approval (Standard Conditions).

According to the RCIT (reference Subchapter 9.4), the following would apply to parcels 1-11 (excluding Parcel 9, as is it is 85% constrained with biological resources):

Parcel	Fault Zone	Liquefaction	Subsidence
1	N/A	No Potential	Susceptible
2	N/A	No Potential	Susceptible
3	N/A	No Potential	Susceptible
4	N/A	Moderate Potential	Susceptible
5	N/A	No Potential	Susceptible
6	N/A	No Potential	Susceptible
7	County Fault Zone	Moderate Potential	Susceptible
8	County Fault Zone	Moderate Potential	Susceptible
10	N/A	Moderate Potential	Susceptible
11	N/A	Moderate Potential	Susceptible

With implementation of the recommended seismic design measures, structures and inhabitants of these structures would be adequately protected. Based on this same analysis, the conclusions would be applicable to Scenario #2, since all of the projects under Scenario #2 would be faced with similar potential for liquefaction, groundshaking, and other similar seismic risks and challenges. Further, the same or similar conditions of approval would apply to any of the Scenario #2 locations, as well as the need for site specific designs and application of all applicable State and local regulations related to geologic hazards.

Portions of Parcels 7 and 8 are within a County Fault Zone. Requisite analysis will be required during the project review stage to ensure that the fault is accurately identified and that any future development will not be adversely affected from site design and proximity to any potential faults. With incorporation of Standard Conditions/Mitigation in Subchapter 5.7.5, and based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.7.6, the conclusions for Scenario #1 would be applicable to Scenario #2. No unavoidable, significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of a similar Project on any of the ten (10) sites under Scenario #2.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect

Development of the Project may result in releases of hazards and hazardous materials. According to the analysis above, with adherence to standard conditions, and mitigation measures, Project impacts will not exceed established thresholds for hazards and hazardous materials. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Since the Project is below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant. On the other hand, as the County grows, the demand for public service resources to respond to hazard and hazardous material grows incrementally. The Project will add to the cumulative demand for such resources. As stated in Section 5.13.2.5, the Project will have an incremental impact to the County Fire Department's

ability to provide an acceptable level of service. These impacts are forecast to include an increased number of emergency and public service calls due to the increased presence of structures and population.

As stated above, each Project proponent shall participate in the Development Impact Fee Program as adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to mitigate a portion of these impacts. This will provide funding for capital improvements such as land, equipment purchases and fire station construction. The Project will contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts related to the need to reduce cumulative effects on Fire Services.

The Project's potentially significant or cumulative considerable impacts to FPER Services can be reduced to less than significant and payment of fees by all cumulative projects can effectively reduce the overall cumulative impacts to such services. Therefore, cumulative impacts are considered less than significant.

Based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.8.4 for Scenario #1, implementation of the Project is not considered to be a significant unavoidable adverse impact to the hazards and hazardous materials resources of Wine Country area, and the County of Riverside. There will be no direct, or indirect effects either in the short-term, or long-term that would result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact either individually, or cumulatively. All environmental impacts pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials resources are either less than significant or have been reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation measures and adherence to conditions of approval (Standard Conditions).

Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will have an impact to hazards and hazardous materials resources. It can be inferred that these future developments will perform their respective analyses, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and project specific mitigation measures. These standard conditions and mitigation measures will ensure that project impacts did not exceed established thresholds for any hazards or hazardous materials. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to hazardous materials on sites, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, the level of analysis and remediation can be increased to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant.

With incorporation of Standard Conditions/Mitigation in Subchapter 5.8.5, and based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.8.6, the conclusions for Scenario #1 would be applicable to Scenario #2. No unavoidable, significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of a similar Project on any of the ten (10) sites under Scenario #2.

Hydrology / Water Quality

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect

Development of the Project will have an impact to hydrology and water quality resources. According to the 2011 Hydrology and Hydraulics Report and 2011 WQMP, with adherence to standard conditions, Project emissions will not exceed established thresholds for hydrology or water quality resources. The total flow rates leaving the Project in the post-project condition are less than the pre-Project condition. Therefore, the Project does not adversely impact downstream properties. The Project mitigates increased runoff for the Project site utilizing the extended detention basin. The flows within the porous landscape detention basin are not mitigated; however, the total flows leaving the Project site do not exceed the total flows in the pre-project condition. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. With implementation of the proposed stormwater management design, as outlined in the Project specific 2011 Hydrology and Hydraulics Report - Appendix L1, 2016 Technical Memo – Appendix L2, 2016 Support Memo – Appendix L3, and 2011 WQMP – Appendix M, Volume 2, Technical Appendices to this DEIR, in the enclosed CD), and the above standard conditions, future stormwater runoff after development of the Project is not forecast to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to downstream flood hazards and water quality resources.

Based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.9.4, implementation of the Project under Scenario #1 is not considered to be a significant unavoidable adverse impact to the hydrology and water quality resources of Wine Country and the Santa Margarita River Watershed. There will be no direct, or indirect effects either in the short-term, or long-term that would result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact either individually, or cumulatively. All environmental impacts pertaining to the hydrology and water quality resources are either less than significant or have been reduced to a less than significant level with adherence to conditions of approval (Standard Conditions).

Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will have an impact to hydrology and water quality resources. Parcels 4, 7, 8 contain portions of the site that are “within areas of flooding sensitivity.” Development of those portions of Parcels 4, 7, and 8 may alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. It can be inferred that these future developments will perform their respective analyses above, and be required to adhere to standard conditions. These standard conditions ensured that project impacts did not exceed established thresholds for any pollutants. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to hydrology and water quality resources for construction and operations would be anticipated, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, project design modifications can be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant.

Based on the analysis for Scenario #1, the conclusions would be applicable to Scenario #2. It can be inferred that these future developments will perform their respective analyses, and be required to adhere to standard conditions. These standard conditions ensured that project impacts did not exceed established thresholds for any pollutants. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to hydrology and water quality resources for construction and operations would be anticipated, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, project design modifications can be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Parcels 4, 7, 8 contain portions of the site that are “within areas of flooding sensitivity.” Development of those portions of Parcels 4, 7, and 8 may alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. With incorporation of Standard Conditions/Mitigation in Subchapter 5.9.5, and based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.9.6, the conclusions for Scenario #1 would be applicable to Scenario #2. No unavoidable, significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of a similar Project on any of the ten (10) sites under Scenario #2.

Land Use / Planning

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

The Project sites are located within the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) of the General Plan and has a General Plan Land Use Designation of AG (Agriculture). The Projects are within the Agriculture Foundation Component. Development of the Project will not contribute to the change of the general area, even though it will result in development on the site (vacant). The proposed Project is consistent with the existing and proposed physical arrangement of the established community and is consistent with the General Plan land use designations. Wine Country is an established and burgeoning community in Riverside County. The existing setting in Wine Country, in the vicinity of the Project includes wineries, vineyards, inns, bed and breakfasts, resorts, and restaurants. Many of the wineries also provide facilities for concerts and special events (i.e., weddings, etc.). The scale of the proposed Project will be consistent with the existing and proposed physical arrangement of the established Wine Country.

The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan. No General Plan Amendment is proposed as part of the Project. A Change of Zone application is included as part of the application. Change of Zone No. 07782 (CZ 7782) and its associated amendment to Ordinance No. 348 proposes to amend Riverside County Ordinance No. 348, Section 14.73 subsection b. to include churches, temples and other places of religious worship as a permitted use, subject to Plot Plan approval, in the Citrus/Vineyard Zone (C/V Zone), and amend Section 14.74 of Ordinance No. 348 to include development standards for churches, temples and other places of religious worship in the C/V Zone.

Under either Scenario, the proposed Change of Zone will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area. County application materials, site-specific analysis, 75% vineyard planting requirement, architectural compatibility, aesthetic consistency,

landscaping and plant palette quantity and quality, and conditions of approval will ensure that project specific impacts to these resources are fully addressed.

As discussed in Subchapter 5.10.5, above, implementation of the Project will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area; affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries; be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning; be compatible with existing surrounding zoning; be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses; be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan); or, disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low- income or minority community).

Based on this information, implementation of the Project will not present any significant cumulative impacts.

The existing land use and planning setting of the Project site and surrounding area will be permanently altered as a result of Project implementation. There is an existing church, on the adjacent parcel including people who do live in Wine Country. Based on the analysis contained above in Subchapter 5.10.4, implementation of the Project is not considered to be a significant unavoidable adverse impact to the land use and planning resources of Wine Country, the Southwest Area Plan, and Riverside County. There will be no direct, or indirect effects either in the short-term, or long-term that would result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact either individually, or cumulatively. All environmental impacts pertaining to land use and planning resources are considered less than significant. No specific land use and planning mitigation measures are required. Based on this same analysis, the conclusions would be applicable to Scenario #2. No unavoidable, significant adverse impacts would occur as a result of a similar Project on any of the ten (10) sites under Scenario #2.

Mineral Resources

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

The Project site(s) are designated MRZ-3a (areas where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist, however, the significance of the deposits is undetermined). Since the Project sites are designated MRZ-3a, implementation of the Project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. According to Figure OS-5, Mineral Resources, of the General Plan, the Project site is not located in a "State Designated Aggregate Resource Area." No mines are located in the areas of the Project. There will be no cumulative impacts to mineral resources due to implementation of the Project. There will be no unavoidable significant adverse impacts to mineral resources due to implementation of the Project.

Noise

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect

As discussed in Subchapters 5.12-1 through 5.12-4, development of the Project will result in increases to noise. According to the analysis, with adherence to standard conditions, and mitigation measures (referenced in Subchapter 5.12.6), Project impacts will not exceed established thresholds for noise materials. The thresholds have been established to address Project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Since the Project is below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant.

Based on the analysis contained in Subchapter 5.12.4, implementation of the Project is not considered to be a significant unavoidable adverse impact to the noise resources. There will be no direct, or indirect effects either in the short-term, or long-term that would result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact either individually, or cumulatively. All environmental impacts pertaining to noise resources are either less than significant or have been reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation and adherence to conditions of approval (Standard Conditions).

Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the C/V Zone will have an impact to noise resources. Parcels 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11 could potentially have greater noise impacts than the Project under Scenario #1, and thereby result in or expose persons to or generation of noise levels. Therefore, impacts would be the slightly greater as discussed under Scenario #1. It can be inferred that these future developments will perform their respective analyses, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and project specific mitigation measures. These standard conditions and mitigation measures will ensure that Project impacts did not exceed established thresholds for any noise. The thresholds have been established to address project-specific impacts, as well as their contribution to cumulative impacts. Regardless, similar impacts related to noise resources for construction and operations would be anticipated, and impacts would likely be less than significant, since similar intensity of development would be expected to occur. Should any impacts exceed the Project in Scenario #1, project design modifications can be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be below the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will remain less than significant.

Based on the analysis for Scenario #1, the conclusions would be applicable to Scenario #2, since all of the projects under Scenario #2 would be faced with similar potential for noise risks and challenges. Parcels 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11 could potentially have greater noise impacts than the Project under Scenario #1, and thereby result in or expose persons to or generation of noise levels. Therefore, impacts would be the slightly greater as discussed under Scenario #1. Further, the same or similar conditions of approval would apply to any of the Scenario #2 locations, as well as the need for site specific designs and application of all applicable State and local regulations related to noise.

Population / Housing

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

It is not anticipated that the Project would displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income; displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; affect a County Redevelopment Project Area; cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections; or, induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

Based on the methodology utilized for this DEIR, all Project sites are assumed to be vacant. Because the Project sites are vacant, they will not displace people; thereby, necessitating construction of replacement housing. There are no longer any Redevelopment Project Areas. Due to the nature of the Project it will neither affect population projections, nor induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly, or indirectly. No further analysis was conducted in the DEIR.

Public Services

Fire Services

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Under both Scenario #1 and #2, the Project will have an incremental impact to the County Fire Department's ability to provide an acceptable level of service. These impacts are forecast to include an increased number of emergency and public service calls due to the increased presence of structures and population.

As stated above, each Project proponent shall participate in the Development Impact Fee Program as adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to mitigate a portion of these impacts. This will provide funding for capital improvements such as land, equipment purchases and fire station construction. The Project will contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts related to the need to reduce cumulative effects on Fire Services.

The Project's potentially significant or cumulative considerable impacts to FPER Services can be reduced to less than significant and payment of fees by all cumulative projects can effectively reduce the overall cumulative impacts to such services. Therefore, cumulative impacts are considered less than significant.

Even though the Project will cause an unavoidable change or increase in demand for Fire Services within the SWAP, mitigation, in the form of payment of DIF and adherence to standard conditions, is available to reduce this potential impact through expansion of service capability to a less than significant impact level on these services. No unavoidable, significant adverse impacts would occur as a result implementation of the Project under

Scenario #1, or Scenario #2.

Sheriff Services

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Under both Scenario #1 and Scenario #2, the Project contributes a relatively small, incremental increase to the need for Sheriff Services. Thus, the Project will contribute to a cumulative adverse impact to the County Sheriff Department's ability to provide an acceptable level of service without mitigation. These impacts are forecast to include an increased number of emergency and public service calls due to the increased presence of urban/suburban uses and population.

As stated above, each Project proponent shall participate in the Development Impact Fee Program as adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to mitigate a portion of these impacts. This will provide funding for capital improvements such as land, equipment purchases and sheriff station construction. The Project will contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts related to the need to reduce cumulative effects on Sheriff Services. In addition to DIF, mitigation measure 5.13.2-1 shall also be included.

The Project's potentially significant or cumulative considerable impacts to Sheriff Services can be reduced to less than significant and payment of fees by all cumulative projects can effectively reduce the overall cumulative impacts to such services. Therefore, cumulative impacts are considered less than significant.

Even though the Project will cause an unavoidable change in the demand for Sheriff Services within the SWAP, mitigation is available to reduce this potential impact through expansion of Sheriff Services capabilities to a less than significant impact level. No unavoidable, significant adverse impacts would occur as a result implementation of the Project under Scenario #1, or Scenario #2.

Schools

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

According to the DEIR, The Project area is currently located within and served by the Temecula Valley Unified School District (TVUSD). According to the Developer Fee information, Unified School District, pursuant to Government Code 65995, fees cannot be levied on a facility that is used exclusively for religious worship. No impacts are anticipated under both Scenario #1 and Scenario #2. No mitigation is required under both Scenario #1 and Scenario #2. No cumulative impacts are anticipated and no unavoidable significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

Library Services

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

According to Ordinance No. 659 “An Ordinance of the County of Riverside Amending Ordinance No, 659 Establishing A Development Impact Fee,” since the Project site is in the C-V Zone, it will be required to pay fees based on a commercial designation. Commercially designated uses do not pay the libraries portion of the Development Impact Fee. Due to the nature of the use, no impacts to Library Services are anticipated under both Scenario #1 and Scenario #2. No mitigation is required under both Scenario #1 and Scenario #2. No cumulative impacts are anticipated and no unavoidable significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

Health Services

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

The Project, in conjunction with other projects anticipated within the SWAP will generate a population that is anticipated to incrementally increase the need for Health Service facilities. The County has established a structure to expand health service facilities based on future identified demand. Because the Project only presents a temporary shift in population, any impacts to Health Services will be incrementally cumulative and less than significant.

The Health Service system will not be unavoidably impacted by the Project. Because of the existing regulations and based on the analysis presented above, all potential direct impacts of the Project and cumulative impacts to the health system are considered to be less than significant with the existing County health system management program, the ability of the free market to meet demand for Health Services. Based on these findings, the Project will not cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts to the area of Health Services.

Recreation

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

It is not anticipated that, due to the nature of the Project, that the Project would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment; or, include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Based on this information, the Project would not have a significant effect on a C.S.A. or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees). No further analysis was conducted in the DEIR. No cumulative impacts are anticipated and no unavoidable significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

Transportation / Traffic

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect

Development of the Project will result in impacts that would 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; conflict with an applicable congestion management program, 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.

Implementation of the Project will not result in a cumulative change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks; alter waterborne, rail or air traffic; substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment); cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads; cause an effect upon circulation during the Project's construction; result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses; conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities; or, bike trails.

According to the analysis in Subchapter 5.14, with adherence to standard conditions, and incorporation of mitigation measures, the Project will still exceed thresholds for facilities that are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and the joint jurisdiction of the City of Temecula and the County. Any potential improvements to mitigate these impacts cannot be guaranteed by the lead agency (County). Therefore, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable and will require a statement of overriding consideration for the proposed Project. Since the Project is above the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will be significant.

The Project under Scenario # 1 are anticipated to be similar in nature in terms of trip assignment, trip distribution and trip generation rates. It is anticipated that impacts will be similar, and that the similar standard conditions will apply. Mitigation, unique to each project may be required. At a minimum, since there will be similar impacts, and there are improvements that are beyond the control of the lead agency (County), it is anticipated that any potential improvements to mitigate these impacts cannot be guaranteed by the lead agency (County). Therefore, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable and will require a statement of overriding consideration for the proposed Project.

Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Similar to Scenario #1, development of the Project at similar sites within the CV Zone will contribute to traffic in the area. It can be inferred that these future developments will perform their respective analyses, and be required to adhere to standard conditions and project-specific mitigation measures. It is also assumed that the scope and scale of the future development under Scenario #2 will be similar to that under Scenario #1; therefore, impacts are anticipated to be similar in scale and intensity. It is anticipated that these project-specific traffic analyses will include the same methodologies for analysis; a similar cumulative project list, and similar

roadway and intersection configurations (existing setting). Since the future development under Scenario #2 will be similar in nature to the Project under Scenario #1, trip assignment, trip distribution and trip generation rates would be comparable. It is anticipated that impacts will be similar, and that the similar standard conditions will apply. Mitigation, unique to each project may be required. At a minimum, since there will be similar impacts, and there are improvements that are beyond the control of the lead agency (County), it is anticipated that any potential improvements to mitigate these impacts cannot be guaranteed by the lead agency (County). Therefore, since it is anticipated that future projects will be above the established thresholds, cumulative impacts will be significant.

The Projects under Scenario #2 are anticipated to be similar in nature in terms of trip assignment, trip distribution and trip generation rates. It is anticipated that impacts will be similar, and that the similar standard conditions will apply. Mitigation, unique to each project may be required. At a minimum, since there will be similar impacts, and there are improvements that are beyond the control of the lead agency (County), it is anticipated that any potential improvements to mitigate these impacts cannot be guaranteed by the lead agency (County). Therefore, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable and will require a statement of overriding consideration for the proposed Project.

Utilities and Service Systems

Water and Sewer

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

According to RCWD, and EMWD, there is an adequate water supply and sewer capacity, respectively, to meet the demand of the Project(s). Based on the analysis in this DEIR and the referenced documentation, the water, wastewater management systems are capable of meeting the cumulative demand for these systems. Recycled water is available in the RCWD system, but is not available to the Project site(s). Thus, the Project will not cause cumulatively considerable significant adverse impacts on these systems.

Even though the Project will cause an unavoidable change in the demand for water and wastewater water utility systems, these various systems can be expanded to meet this increased demand and the facilities required to sustain these systems can be installed without causing an unavoidable significant adverse impact.

Electricity

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Development under Scenario #1, or, Scenario #2 would result in a permanent and continued use of electricity resources. Sufficient power and distribution capabilities exist to provide electrical services to the Project.

Since the project would constitute a small incremental increase of the current residential customer base and the Project has been required to install Energy Star-rated models of appliances and be served by existing service and transmission lines within and around the

Project area, this Project's cumulative energy impacts are concluded to be less than significant cumulative impact.

With adherence to and implementation of mitigation measures, General Plan policies, SCE programs, and existing regulations, the proposed Project's potential electric impacts, under either Scenario #1 or Scenario #2, can be controlled and will be reduced below a level of significance.

Natural Gas

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Natural gas is not available to the site; therefore, it will be served with propane. Based on this information, no additional analysis will be provided in this DEIR as it pertains to natural gas.

Solid Waste

Implementation of either Scenario #1 or Scenario #2 of the Project will result in the additional generation of construction and operational solid waste. Mitigation measures address construction debris recycling and reuse to achieve a reduction in waste beyond the County requirement of a 50 percent reduction by weight. Implementation of this measure would reduce the construction waste from the Project at a higher level than required by the County. The Project will comply with County Conditions of Approval and will exceed those requirements with implementation of mitigation measures.

Cumulative impacts to landfill capacity will be less than significant due to the Project construction debris and operational waste representing a less than substantial cumulative increment with mitigation. Therefore, due to available capacity and implementation of the above mitigation measures, which provide for recycling on site to reduce Project operational waste, cumulative impacts to the existing landfills resulting from waste generated by the Project during operations are considered less than significant.

Project impacts to landfill capacity from construction and demolition debris were found to be less than significant without mitigation. With the implementation of the mitigation measures, Project-specific impacts will remain less than significant. Project impacts related to operational solid waste were also found to be less than significant without mitigation. Based on the facts and findings presented in the analysis, the Project will not cause unavoidable significant adverse impacts to County's solid waste management system.

It is anticipated that development under Scenario #2, would be of the same nature and scale as that of the Project under Scenario #1. Project impacts to landfill capacity from construction and demolition debris were found to be less than significant without mitigation under Scenario #1. With the implementation of the mitigation measures, Project-specific impacts will remain less than significant. Project impacts related to operational solid waste were also found to be less than significant without mitigation under Scenario #1. Therefore, no unavoidable significant adverse impacts to County's solid waste management system would occur under Scenario #2.

Maintenance of Public Facilities and Other Governmental Services

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

Maintenance of public facilities was addressed in Section 5.13 (Public Facilities) and 5.14 (Transportation/Traffic). The proposed Project will not have an impact on other governmental services not discussed in other Sections of this DEIR. No significant cumulative impacts are anticipated. The Project will not cause unavoidable significant adverse impacts with any maintenance of public facilities and other governmental services. No impacts are anticipated. No mitigation will be required.

Adopted Energy Conservation Plans

Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect and Scenario #2: The WCCP does not remain in full effect

The Project will comply with all Title 24 energy conservation requirements. No conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans would occur if the proposed Project is implemented. Implementation of the proposed Project will serve to implement energy conservation plans. No impacts are anticipated. No significant cumulative impacts are anticipated. No unavoidable significant adverse impacts with any adopted energy conservation plans under Scenario #1. No mitigation is required.

It is anticipated that development under Scenario #2, would be of the same nature and scale as that of the Project under Scenario #1. All future development under Scenario #2 will be required to comply with all Title 24 energy conservation requirements. Similar to the Project under Scenario #1, no conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans would occur if the proposed Project is implemented. Implementation of the future development under Scenario #2 will serve to implement energy conservation plans. No impacts are anticipated. No significant cumulative impacts are anticipated. No mitigation is required. Therefore, no unavoidable significant adverse impacts with any adopted energy conservation plans under Scenario #2. For more detail and for a list of applicable mitigation measures, please refer to the following summary table of environmental findings relative to the Project.

1.6 ALTERNATIVES

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines require an evaluation of alternatives to the proposed action. Section 15126, *Consideration and Discussion of Environmental Impacts*, of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that the “discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives capable of eliminating any significant adverse environmental effects or reducing them to a level of not significant...” The State Guidelines also state that “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project... which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project” and “The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.”

Two (2) alternatives are compared to the Project as evaluated in this DEIR. At this stage of the review, not all of these alternatives are considered feasible and reasonable, so the evaluation dismisses these projects from further evaluation. These two (2) alternatives include:

1. No Project Alternative (NPA); and
2. Reduced Project Intensity Alternative (RPIA).

In addition to the No Project Alternative, a Reduced Project Intensity Alternative will be analyzed. No Alternate Location Alternative will be analyzed, as Scenario #2 provides ample alternative locations. Under Scenario #2, should the Project be approved, and the WCCP does not remain in full effect, development of similar projects may occur in the Citrus Vineyard (C/V) Zone. As contained in the Chapter 4, *Project Description*, ten (10) parcels have been identified as being similar in character to the parcel in Scenario #1. While the potential exists for all 10 parcels to be developed with a similar use, the potential also exists for less potential developments of this nature, or perhaps, even more. The DEIR analyzed these ten (10) parcels at a programmatic level; therefore, this analysis will suffice as the Alternate Location Alternative. This alternative has been deemed infeasible for the following reasons:

1. The applicant does not own any of these parcels;
2. As described in the Project Objectives, an adjacent parcel is required to allow for the development of a “complex” of facilities that function as a whole, in one location for all ages of fellowship members. None of the alternate locations are adjacent to the existing church facility; and
3. The Alternate Location Alternative does not meet the Project Objectives.

No other alternatives to the Project are given consideration or evaluated in Chapter 6, *Alternatives*, due to them either being impractical, or infeasible. Per the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6(c)), factors that may be considered when addressing the feasibility of alternatives include failure to meet most of the stated project objectives, and infeasibility, or inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. The following development scenarios were considered and rejected as potential alternatives to implementation of the proposed Project:

1. Parcels not Located on a General Plan Circulation Element Roadway.
2. Parcels that are not vacant.

Of the two (2) alternatives considered, the Reduced Project Intensity Alternative (RPIA) has been determined to be the environmentally superior alternative. Section 15126.6(e)(2) indicates

that where the no project alternative is environmentally superior, “the DEIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” The RPIA has been evaluated as not being a feasible alternative because it does not meet the majority of the Project objectives discussed in Subchapter 4.2 of this document and summarized above. With respect to the RPIA, the reduced development has a comparable negative effect on the ability of the Project to meet project costs, i.e., development feasibility and essential Project objectives may not be attained because certain on-site improvements and other infrastructure improvements may not be feasible.

The No Project Alternative (NPA) was evaluated and was also determined not to be an environmentally superior alternative. It is also unlikely that the NPA is feasible, since it would not meet the Project objectives and would not implement the General Plan. Under the NPA no fees and funding would be provided to upgrade regional transportation infrastructure; public services and utilities.

The Executive Summary of Project impacts are presented on the following pages.

**Table 1.5-1
 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES DISCUSSED IN THIS DRAFT EIR**

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Aesthetics No mitigation measures are necessary as no significant impacts will aesthetic resources will occur from implementation of the Project.		N/A, no mitigation is required.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
Implementation of the Project will not have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located; or substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view.	The analysis of aesthetic resource issues in the DEIR concluded that any Project impacts are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.	
Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Agricultural resources		
5.3-1 Prior to any application of pesticides to be made within 150 feet with a ground rig (or within 300 feet with an aircraft) of sensitive receptors (such as occupied residences or businesses or churches), the applicant shall contact any occupants and obtain permission (in writing) if applications need to be any closer to these sensitive receptors. No applications shall be made within 300 feet of field workers.		Riverside County Planning Department, and Riverside County Agricultural Commissioner.
5.3-2 At no time shall foliar applications be allowed within ¼-mile of a school (including daycare centers) in session with a ground rig or within ½ mile with an aircraft. In session means during regularly scheduled class times. Applications shall only be allowed before/after school and during weekends, holidays and vacations, provided that the school and school grounds are not being used for an event such as a public event, meeting, sports activity, etc.		Riverside County Planning Department, and Riverside County Agricultural Commissioner.
5.3-3 Prior to the application of pesticides which are difficult to control and contain during the application due to the dust formation (i.e., Sulfur Dust), the applicant shall acquire approval by the County Agricultural Commissioner and shall comply with the restrictions and conditions as imposed by the County Agricultural Commissioner. No application shall be made to prior to said approval.		Riverside County Planning Department, and Riverside County Agricultural Commissioner.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
Implementation of the Project would involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.	Agricultural resources impacts shall be reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measures 5.3-1, 5.3-2, and 5.3-3.	

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Air Quality / Greenhouse Gases No mitigation measures are necessary as no significant impacts will aesthetic resources will occur from implementation of the Project.		N/A, no mitigation is required.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
Implementation of the Project will not have a substantial effect to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the Project site to Project substantial point source emissions; or, involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter; generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	The analysis of air quality/greenhouse gasses resource issues in the DEIR concluded that any Project impacts are considered less than significant with adherence to standard conditions. No mitigation measures are required.	

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Biological Resources		County Environmental Protection Division (EPD).
5.4-1	The biologically restricted areas shall be clearly delineated on the grading the grading plan.	County Environmental Protection Division (EPD).
5.4-2	The areas mapped as "BIOLOGICALLY RESTRICTED AREAS NO PLANTING ALLOWED" on PP24883 AMD. #2, dated 7/09/14, will be clearly delineated on the Grading Plan to ensure that no disturbances are proposed within these areas. These areas shall be mapped and labeled "Delineated Constraint Area (MSHCP Avoidance)" on the Grading Plan to the satisfaction of the Environmental Programs Department.	County Environmental Protection Division (EPD).
5.4-3	Prior to grading permit issuance a qualified biological monitor shall be contracted to provide biological monitoring of the grading and construction activities. A work plan shall be submitted to the EPD to review and approve, from the qualified biological monitor that may include but not be limited to Best Management Practices (BMPs), fencing of Open Space/Conserved Areas, and monitoring reports. The applicant must provide evidence that the qualified biologist had reviewed all construction activities to minimize impacts to any sensitive species and habitats. The EPD may require additional documentation in the form of biological reports and/or site visit(s) to confirm completion. Please contact EPD for further information.	County Environmental Protection Division (EPD).
5.4-4	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a deed restriction shall be recorded over the area delineated as "Biologically Restricted Areas No Planting Allowed" on Exhibit PP24883 AMD. #2, dated 7/09/14, to protect it from any disturbance in the future and maintain it for conservation purposes. The deed restriction language must be submitted to the Riverside County Planning Department, Environmental Programs Division (EPD) for review and approval, prior to recordation. For more information, including sample deed restriction language, please contact EPD at (951) 955-6892.	County Environmental Protection Division (EPD).
5.4-5	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a proposed permanent fencing and signage plan for the protection of all biologically sensitive areas. The areas mapped as "BIOLOGICALLY RESTRICTED AREAS NO PLANTING ALLOWED" on PP24883 AMD. #2, dated 7/09/14, shall be permanently fenced for protection as open space. The fencing shall provide a physical barrier to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal trespass or dumping in the Riparian/Riverine Conservation Area. The fence shall have a minimum height of three feet at its shortest point. Fence posts shall be no more than five feet apart. The fence design shall be such that a sphere with a diameter of three inches cannot pass through the plane of the fence at any point below the minimum height. The fencing plan will be reviewed and approved by the Riverside County Planning Department Environmental Programs Division (EPD). The fence shall not be installed until EPD staff has reviewed and approved the fencing plan. EPD staff shall have sole discretion in determining whether the proposed fencing will adequately protect the conservation area, and whether changes to the proposed fencing and signage plan are required.	County Environmental Protection Division (EPD).

<p>5.4-6 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the areas mapped as "BIOLOGICALLY RESTRICTED AREAS NO PLANTING ALLOWED" on PP24883 AMD. #2, dated 7/09/14, shall be permanently fenced for protection as open space according to the fencing plan approved by the Riverside County Planning Department Environmental Programs Division (EPD). The fencing shall provide a physical barrier to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal trespass or dumping in the MSHCP Conservation Area. The fence shall have a minimum height of three feet at its shortest point. Fence posts shall be no more than five feet apart. The fence design shall be such that a sphere with a diameter of three inches cannot pass through the plane of the fence at any point below the minimum height. EPD staff shall inspect the finished fence, and have sole discretion in determining whether the fence is consistent with the fencing plan.</p>	<p>County Environmental Protection Division (EPD).</p>
<p>5.4-7 Pursuant to Objective 6 and Objective 7 of the Species Account for the Burrowing Owl included in the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, within 30 days prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a pre-construction presence/absence survey for the burrowing owl shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and the results of this presence/absence survey shall be provided in writing to the Environmental Programs Department. If it is determined that the project site is occupied by the Burrowing Owl, take of "active" nests shall be avoided pursuant to the MSHCP and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. However, when the Burrowing Owl is present, relocation outside of the nesting season (March 1 through August 31) by a qualified biologist shall be required. The County Biologist shall be consulted to determine appropriate type of relocation (active or passive) and translocation sites. Occupation of this species on the project site may result in the need to revise grading plans so that take of "active" nests is avoided or alternatively, a grading permit may be issued once the species has been actively relocated. If the grading permit is not obtained within 30 days of the survey a new survey shall be required.</p>	<p>County Environmental Protection Division (EPD).</p>
<p>5.4-8 Vegetation removal activities occurring in the 4.7 acres of Riversidean sage scrub shall be scheduled outside the nesting season (September 1 to February 14 for songbirds; September 1 to January 14 for raptors) to avoid potential impacts to nesting birds.</p>	<p>County Environmental Protection Division (EPD).</p>
<p>5.4-9 Any construction activities that occur during the nesting season (February 15 to August 31 for songbirds; January 15 to August 31 for raptors) in the 4.7 acres of Riversidean sage scrub will require that all potential habitat be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist before commencement of clearing. If any active nests are detected, then a buffer of at least 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) will be delineated, flagged, and avoided until the nesting cycle is complete as determined by the biological monitor to minimize impacts.</p>	<p>County Environmental Protection Division (EPD).</p>
<p>5.4-10 In order to avoid violation of the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code, site-preparation activities (removal of trees and vegetation) shall be avoided, to the greatest extent possible, during the nesting season (generally February 1 to August 31) of potentially occurring native and migratory bird species. 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 recommend buffers around the vegetation containing the active nests. 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>County Environmental Protection Division (EPD).</p>
<p>5.4-11 Prior to final inspection, a qualified biological monitor shall submit final monitoring report to the Environmental Programs Department (EPD) to review and approve. The applicant/qualified biologist must provide evidence they reviewed all construction activities to minimize impacts to any sensitive species and habitats. EPD may require additional documentation in the form of biological reports and/or site visit(s) to confirm completion. Please contact EPD for further information.</p>	<p>County Environmental Protection Division (EPD).</p>
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation
<p>Implementation of the Project would conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan; have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12); have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Wildlife Service; have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural</p>	<p>Biological resources impacts shall be reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 through 5.4-11.</p>

community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; or, have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<p>Cultural Resources Archaeological Resources 5.5-1 The developer/permit holder or any successor in interest shall comply with the following codes for the life of this project: If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 (b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and their disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within the period specified by law. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the "Most Likely Descendant." The Most Likely Descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation with the County and the property owner concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Human remains from other ethnic/cultural groups with recognized historical associations to the project area shall also be subject to consultation between appropriate representatives from that group and the County Planning /Director. <i>(Reference Condition of Approval 10.PLANNING 035)</i></p>	<p>County Planning Department.</p>
<p>5.5-2 The developer/permit holder or any successor in interest shall comply with the following for the life of this project: If during ground disturbance activities, cultural resources are discovered that were not assessed by the archaeological reports and/or environmental assessment conducted prior to project approval, the following procedures shall be followed. A cultural resources site is defined, for this condition, as being three or more artifacts in close association with each other, but may include fewer artifacts if the area of the find is determined to be of significance due to it sacred or cultural importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resource shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the project archaeologist, the Native American tribal representative (or other appropriate ethic/cultural group representative), and the Planning Director to discuss the significance of the find. 2. At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed and after consultation with the Native American tribal (or other appropriate ethnic/cultural group representative) and the archaeologist, a decision is made, with the concurrence of the Planning Director, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resource. 3. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to the appropriate preservation or mitigation measures. <p><i>(Reference Condition of Approval 10.PLANNING 036)</i></p>	<p>County Planning Department.</p>
<p>5.5-3 As a result of information contained in archaeological study PD-A-4713R3, prepared by ASM Affiliates, dated September 14, 2011, and a letter from the Native American Heritage Commission, dated May 19, 2011, it has been established that the project is located within an area sensitive for prehistoric Native American cultural resources. While the archaeological survey did not identify any cultural resources on the ground surface, there is a potential for subsurface cultural deposits at the southwestern portion of the parcel, along Calle Contento, where a watercourse is located. Watercourses are known for increased potential for subsurface archaeological deposits and human remains.</p> <p>Therefore, prior to the issuance of grading permits, the developer/permit holder shall retain and enter into a monitoring and mitigation service contract with a qualified Archaeologist for services. This professional shall be known as the "Project Archaeologist." The Project Archaeologist shall be included in the pre-grade meetings to provide cultural/historical sensitivity training including the establishment of set guidelines for ground disturbance in sensitive areas with the grading contractors and any required tribal or special interest monitors. The Project Archaeologist shall manage and oversee monitoring for all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of the southwestern portion of the project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading, trenching, stockpiling of materials, rock crushing, structure demolition and etc. The Project Archaeologist shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and potential recovery of cultural resources in coordination with any required tribal or special interest monitors. If after a reasonable amount of monitoring has been completed and no cultural resources or human remains have been uncovered, the Project Archaeologist may recommend to the County Archaeologist that monitoring be reduced or stopped. The developer/permit holder shall submit a fully executed copy of the contract to the Riverside County Planning Department to ensure compliance</p>	<p>County Planning Department.</p>

<p>with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Planning Department shall clear this condition. NOTE: 1) The Project Archaeologist is responsible for implementing mitigation using current standard professional practices for archaeology. The Project Archaeologist shall consult with the County, developer/permit holder and any required tribal or special interest group monitor throughout the process. 2) This agreement shall not modify any approved condition of approval or mitigation measure. (Reference Condition of Approval 60.PLANNING 012)</p>		
<p>5.5-4 Prior to final inspection of the first building permit, the developer/permit holder shall prompt the Cultural Resources Professional to submit two (2) copies of a Phase IV Cultural Resources Monitoring Report that complies with the Riverside County Planning Department's requirements for such reports. The report shall include evidence of the required cultural/historical sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the pre-grade meeting. The Planning Department shall review the report to determine adequate mitigation compliance. Provided the report is adequate, the Planning Department shall clear this condition. (Reference Condition of Approval 90.PLANNING 022)</p>		County Planning Department.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
<p>Implementation of the Project could alter or destroy an historic site; or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5; alter or destroy an archaeological site; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5.; disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries; restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area.</p>	<p>Cultural resources – archaeological resources impacts shall be reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measures 5.5-1 through 5.5-4.</p>	
<p>Cultural Resources <u>Paleontological Resources</u> 5.5-5 The following shall be completed prior to the issuance of grading permits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist approved by the County of Riverside to create and implement a Project-specific plan for monitoring site grading/earthmoving activities (Project paleontologist). 2. The Project paleontologist retained shall review the approved development plan and grading plan and shall conduct any pre-construction work necessary to render appropriate monitoring and mitigation requirements as appropriate. These requirements shall be documented by the Project paleontologist in a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP). This PRIMP shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to issuance of a Grading Permit. <p>Information to be contained in the PRIMP, at a minimum and in addition to other industry standards and Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards, are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Description of the proposed site and planned grading operations. 2. Description of the level of monitoring required for all earth-moving activities in the Project area. 3. Identification and qualifications of the qualified paleontological monitor to be employed for grading operations monitoring. 4. Identification of personnel with authority and responsibility to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for recovery of large specimens. 5. Direction for any fossil discoveries to be immediately reported to the property owner who in turn will immediately notify the County Geologist of the discovery. 6. Means and methods to be employed by the paleontological monitor to quickly salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays. 7. Sampling of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. 8. Procedures and protocol for collecting and processing of samples and specimens. 9. Fossil identification and curation procedures to be employed. 10. Identification of the permanent repository to receive any recovered fossil material. *Pursuant the County of Riverside "SABER Policy", paleontological fossils found in the County of Riverside should, by preference, be directed to the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet. A 		County Planning Department and County Geologist.

<p>written agreement between the property owner/developer and the repository must be in place prior to site grading.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. All pertinent exhibits, maps and references. 12. Procedures for reporting of findings. 13. Identification and acknowledgement of the developer for the content of the PRIMP as well as acceptance of financial responsibility for monitoring, reporting and curation fees. The property owner and/or applicant on whose land the paleontological fossils are discovered shall provide appropriate funding for monitoring, reporting, delivery and curating the fossils at the institution where the fossils will be placed, and will provide confirmation to the County that such funding has been paid to the institution. <p>All reports shall be signed by the Project paleontologist and all other professionals responsible for the report's content (eg. Professional Geologist), as appropriate. Two wet-signed original copies of the report(s) shall be submitted to the office of the County Geologist along with a copy of this condition and the grading plan for appropriate case processing and tracking. These documents should not be submitted to the Project Planner, the Plan Check staff, the Land Use Counter or any other County office. In addition, the applicant shall submit proof of hiring (i.e. copy of executed contract, retainer agreement, etc.) a Project paleontologist for the in-grading implementation of the PRIMP. <i>(Reference Condition of Approval 60.PLANNING 001)</i></p>	
<p>5.5-6 The following shall be completed prior to the grading final inspection:</p> <p>“The applicant shall submit to the County Geologist one wet-signed copy of the Paleontological Monitoring Report prepared for site grading operations at this site. The report shall be certified by the professionally-qualified Paleontologist responsible for the content of the report. This Paleontologist must be on the County’s Paleontology Consultant List. The report shall contain a report of findings made during all site grading activities and an appended itemized list of fossil specimens recovered during grading (if any) and proof of accession of fossil materials into the pre-approved museum repository. In addition, all appropriate fossil location information shall be submitted to the Western Center, the San Bernardino County Museum and Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History, at a minimum, for incorporation into their Regional Locality Inventories.” <i>(Reference Condition of Approval 70.PLANNING 001)</i></p>	<p>County Planning Department and County Geologist.</p>
<p>Impact Description</p> <p>Implementation of the Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature.</p>	<p>Impact After Mitigation</p> <p>Cultural resources – paleontological resources impacts shall be reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measures 5.5-5 and 5.5-6.</p>

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Geology and Soils No mitigation measures are necessary as no significant impacts will aesthetic resources will occur from implementation of the Project.		N/A, no mitigation is required.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
Implementation of the Project could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death; be subject to rupture of a know earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; be subject to strong seismic ground shaking; be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potential result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading collapse, or rockfall hazards; be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in ground subsidence; be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard; change topography or ground surface relief feature; create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or high than 10 feet; result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; be located on an expansive soil, as defined in SECTION 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property; change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel or stream or bed of a lake; result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site; or, be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site.	The analysis of geology and soils resource issues in the DEIR concluded that any Project impacts are considered less than significant with the inclusion of standard conditions. No mitigation measures are required.	

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Hazards and Hazardous Materials <u>General Impacts</u> 5.8-1 Prior to grading permit final, and during construction, should an accidental release of a hazardous material occur, the following actions will be implemented: construction activities in the immediate area will be immediately stopped; appropriate regulatory agencies will be notified; immediate actions will be implemented to limit the volume and area impacted by the contaminant; the contaminated material, primarily soil, shall be collected and removed to a location where it can be treated or disposed of in accordance with the regulations in place at the time of the event; any transport of hazardous waste from the property shall be carried out by a registered hazardous waste transporter; and testing shall be conducted to verify that any residual concentrations of the accidentally released material are below the regulatory remediation goal at the time of the event. All of the above sampling or remediation activities related to the contamination will be conducted under the oversight of Riverside County Site Cleanup Program. All of the above actions shall be documented and made available to the appropriate regulatory agencies prior to closure of the contaminated area.		Riverside County Department of Environmental Health.
5.8-2 Prior to grading permit final, if an unknown contaminated area is exposed during construction, the following actions will be implemented: any contamination found during construction will be reported to the Riverside County Site Cleanup Program and all of the sampling or remediation related to the contamination will be conducted under the oversight of the Riverside County Site Program; construction activities in the immediate area will be immediately stopped; appropriate regulatory agencies will be identified; a qualified professional (industrial hygienist or chemist) shall test the contamination and determine the type of material and define appropriate remediation strategies; immediate actions will be implemented to limit the volume and area impacted by the contaminant; the contaminated material, primarily soil, shall be collected and removed to a location where it can be treated or disposed of in accordance with the regulations in place at the time of the event; any transport of hazardous waste from the property shall be carried out by a registered hazardous waste transporter; and testing shall be conducted to verify that any residual concentrations of the accidentally released material are below the regulatory remediation goal at the time of the event. All of the above actions shall be documented and made available to the appropriate regulatory agencies prior to closure of the contaminated area.		Riverside County Department of Environmental Health.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
Implementation of the Project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	Hazards and hazardous materials resources impacts shall be reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measures 5.8-1 and 5.8-2.	

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Hydrology and Water Quality		
No mitigation measures are necessary as no significant impacts will aesthetic resources will occur from implementation of the Project.		N/A, no mitigation is required.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
<p>Implementation of the Project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted); create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; otherwise substantially degrade water quality; include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors and odors); substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site; changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff; or, changes in the amount of surface water in any water body; place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map; or, place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows; or, expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area).</p>	<p>The analysis of hydrology and water quality resource issues in the DEIR concluded that any Project impacts are considered less than significant with adherence to standard conditions. No mitigation measures are required.</p>	

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Land Use and Planning No mitigation measures are necessary as no significant impacts will aesthetic resources will occur from implementation of the Project.		N/A, no mitigation is required.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
Implementation of the Project will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area; affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries; be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning; be compatible with existing surrounding zoning; be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses; be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan); or, disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low- income or minority community).	The analysis of land use and planning resource issues in the DEIR concluded that any Project impacts are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.	

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Mineral Resources No mitigation measures are necessary as no significant impacts will aesthetic resources will occur from implementation of the Project.		N/A, no mitigation is required.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
Implementation of the Project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State; result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan; be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine; or, expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines.	The analysis of mineral resource issues in the DEIR concluded that any Project impacts are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.	

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Noise		
<u>Construction</u>		
The following measures are recommended to reduce construction noise emanating from the proposed project, to reduce Project construction noise impacts to a less than significant level:		County Building and Safety Department.
5.12-1 The construction equipment staging and storage areas should be located as far from nearby residential uses as possible.		
5.12-2 All construction equipment should be properly maintained with operating mufflers and air intake silencers as effective as those installed by the original manufacturer.		County Building and Safety Department.
5.12-3 All construction activities should only take place between 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM in October through May, and 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM in June through September, as required by Riverside County Ordinance 847.		County Building and Safety Department.
5.12-4 Install temporary noise control barriers that provide a minimum noise level attenuation of 10.0 dBA when Project construction occurs near existing noise-sensitive structures. The noise control barrier must present a solid face from top to bottom. The noise control barrier must be high enough and long enough to block the view of the noise source. Unnecessary openings shall not be made.		County Building and Safety Department.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The noise barriers must be maintained and any damage promptly repaired. Gaps, holes, or weaknesses in the barrier or openings between the barrier and the ground shall be promptly repaired. The noise control barriers and associated elements shall be completely removed and the site appropriately restored upon the conclusion of the construction activity. 		
The following measures are recommended to reduce operational noise impacts associated with the proposed Project:		County Department of Environmental Health.
5.12-5 If more than one voice is proposed to be amplified outdoors, or if amplified music is proposed outdoors, the project operator will be required to conduct another noise analysis showing that the proposed amplification will not exceed County noise standards and shall obtain a single and/or continuous exemptions in accordance with Ordinance No. 847 Section 7.		
5.12-6 If complaints continue, Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship shall take ten minute measurements at each property line during the event to verify that the noise level does not exceed 65 dBA-10-minute Leq. The measurements shall be taken using a noise meter that complies with applicable requirements of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for either a Type I or Type II sound level meter. The meter shall be programmed to measure in a "slow" mode to record noise levels in "A" weighted form.		County Department of Environmental Health.
5.12-7 If complaints continue after Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship has measured and verified event noise levels, Office of Industrial Hygiene staff shall take measurements to verify noise levels.		County Department of Environmental Health.
5.12-8 If the County finds that the Noise Ordinance property line limits are being violated or that project conditions are being violated, the County shall reconsider allowed hours of operation, number of guests, amount of special events per year, or approval of the specific facility and the project operator shall be required to pay fees assessed per the Department's hourly rate pursuant to Ordinance No. 671.		County Department of Environmental Health.
5.12-9 Outdoor special events and associated deliveries and any sound amplifying equipment, and/or performance of live music shall be limited to the hours of 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM Monday through Sunday.		County Department of Environmental Health.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
Implementation of the Project could result in A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project; a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project; exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; or, exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.	Noise resources impacts shall be reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measures 5.12-1 through 5.12-9.	

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Public Services <u>Sheriff Law Enforcement Services</u> 5.13.3-1 To assure that the future project development incorporates defensible space concepts, the design shall be reviewed with the Sheriff Department prior to submittal of any tract maps, conditional use permits or other entitlements.		County Planning Department and Sherriff Department.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
Implementation of the project could result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered sheriff service facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.	The Sheriff Law Enforcement analysis in the DEIR concludes that the change in demand for law enforcement services can be adequately mitigated to a less than significant direct and cumulative impact on the provision of this service.	

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Transportation / Traffic		
5.14-1	Construct Calle Contento from the north project boundary to south project boundary at the ultimate half-section width including landscaping and parkway improvements in conjunction with development, as necessary.	County Transportation Department.
5.14-2	Construct Bucharest Lane access at the end of the existing Bucharest Lane.	County Transportation Department.
5.14-3	The Project should participate in the phased construction of the off-site intersection improvements through payment of established County of Riverside fees, participation in the Western Riverside Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees program, assessment district and/or community facilities district financing, and construction of off-site facilities under appropriate fee credit agreements.	County Transportation Department.
5.14-4	Prior to any construction of any Project components within any existing roadway right-of-way, the developer shall submit a traffic control plan (TCP) for review and approval by the appropriate agency that has jurisdiction over that roadway.	County Transportation Department.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
Implementation of the Project could cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections; or, exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways.	Transportation/Traffic resources impacts shall be reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measures 5.14-1 through 5.14-4.	

Environmental Category / Issue and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
Utilities and Service Systems <u>Water</u> 5.15.2-1 The Project shall comply with the provisions contained in the Rancho California Water District, Water Shortage Contingency Plan, adopted July 10, 2008, revised August 14, 2014.		County Planning Department, County Building and Safety Department.
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
Implementation of the Project may 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; or, have insufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed.	Utilities and Service Systems – water resources impacts shall be reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure 5.15.2-1.	
<u>Energy (Electricity, and Dry Utilities)</u> 5.15.3-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To utilize energy efficiently, all residential buildings, large public buildings (library, public community center, schools, and joint-use facilities), large private recreation buildings and large commercial buildings (retail and office) shall exceed the 2008 California Energy Code – Title 24, Part 6 energy efficiency standards by 35%. To meet this rating standard, combinations of the following energy efficiency design elements or future elements shall be used to achieve at least a 35% energy savings compared to the 2008 Building Energy Standards: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Tankless water heaters ii) High efficiency lighting iii) Low energy HVAC systems with tighter HVAC ducts iv) Improved drywall, insulation and sealing installation v) “Cool roofs” reflect the sun’s light back to the sky vi) Heat-repelling radiant barrier roof foil reflect the sun’s heat back to the sky vii) Double-paned windows viii) Dual-glazed, Lo E2 windows ix) Other energy conservation measures developed between 2011 and 2017 when the propose project is envisioned to begin actual construction. 2. To utilize energy efficiently, homebuilders shall install Energy Star-rated model appliances, if the homebuilder chooses to install major appliances such as a dishwasher, washing machine, and refrigerator in the new residential units. 3. To utilize energy efficiently, major appliances installed in large public buildings (library, public community center, schools, and joint-use facilities) and large private recreation buildings shall be Energy Star-rated. 4. To utilize energy efficiently, street lights shall be installed with energy-efficient lighting, such as approved LED lights the meet the requirements of County Ordinance No. 655. 5. To increase renewable energy sources and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, large public buildings (library, public community center, schools, and joint-use facilities) and large private recreation buildings shall be installed with solar panels, photovoltaic cells, solar thermal systems or other renewable energy generating technology. 6. To increase renewable energy sources and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, homebuilders shall offer to home buyers solar panels, photovoltaic cells, solar thermal systems or other renewable 		County Building and Safety Department.

<p>energy generating technology as part of the homebuilder's option program.</p> <p>7. Where professional management is available, such as an HOA, recycled water shall be used in residential front-yards and backyards, i.e. private common area, and in adjacent street parkways, subject to RCWD and County approvals.</p> <p>8. Where professional management is not available, grass turf (live not artificial) shall be limited to 33% of the landscaped area of a conventional single-family detached lot.</p>	
<p>5.15.3-2 Prior to issuance of a grading permit by the County, the current or subsequent project applicant shall construct, or enter into an agreement and post security, in a form and amount acceptable to the Building and Safety Department, guaranteeing the undergrounding of proposed utility distribution lines in conformance with applicable County standards and the County's Capital Improvement Policy.</p>	<p>County Building and Safety Department.</p>
<p>5.15.3-3 Prior to issuance of a building permit, all electrical service lines (excluding transmission lines) serving development within the project will be installed underground. This includes existing service facilities that may have to be relocated temporarily during grading.</p>	<p>County Building and Safety Department.</p>
<p>5.15.3-4 Prior to grading permit final, the contractor shall temporarily relocate existing overhead facilities, as necessary to maintain service, while grading and installing the new underground system is underway.</p>	<p>County Building and Safety Department.</p>
<p>Impact Description</p>	<p>Impact After Mitigation</p>
<p>Implementation of the Project could impact electricity requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.</p>	<p>The analysis of energy issues in the DEIR concluded that the existing systems (electricity) have adequate capacity to expand to meet the Project's demands without causing any significant adverse impact.</p>
<p><u>Solid Waste</u></p> <p>5.15.4-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits, a Waste Recycling Plan (WRP) shall be submitted to the Riverside County Waste Management Department for approval. At a minimum the WRP must identify the materials (i.e., concrete, asphalt, wood, etc.) that will be generated by construction and development, the projected amounts, the measures/methods that will be taken to recycle, reuse, and/or reduce the amount of materials, the facilities and/or haulers that will be utilized, and the target recycling or reduction rate. During project construction, the project site shall have, at a minimum, two (2) bins: one for waste disposal and the other for recycling of Construction and Demolition (C&D) materials. Additional bins are encouraged to be used for further source separation of C&D materials. Accurate record keeping (receipts) for recycling of C&D materials and solid waste disposal must be kept. Arrangement scan be made through the franchise hauler.</p>	<p>County Waste Management Department.</p>
<p>5.15.4-2 Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, evidence (i.e., receipts or other type of verification) to demonstrate project compliance with the approved WRP shall be presented by the project proponent to the Planning Division of the Riverside County Waste Management Division.</p>	<p>County Waste Management Department.</p>
<p>5.15.4-3 Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit three (3) copies of a Recyclables Collection and Loading Area plot plan to the Riverside County Waste Management Department for review and approval. The plot plan shall conform to Design Guidelines for Recyclables Collection and Loading Areas, provided by the Waste Management Department, and shall show the location of and access to the collection area for recyclable materials, along with it dimensions and construction detail, including elevation/façade, construction materials and signage. The plot plan shall clearly indicate how the trash and recycling enclosures shall be accessed by the hauler.</p>	<p>County Waste Management Department.</p>
<p>5.15.4-4 Prior to final building inspections, the applicant shall construct the recyclables collection and loading area in compliance with the Recyclables Collection and Loading Area plot plan, as approved and stamped by the Riverside County Waste Management Department.</p>	<p>County Waste Management Department.</p>
<p>5.15.4-5 The project proponent is encouraged to consider incorporating the following measures to help reduce the anticipated project's solid waste impacts and enhance the County's efforts to comply with the State's mandate of 50% solid waste diversion from landfilling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of mulch and/or compost in the development and maintenance of landscaped areas within the project boundaries is recommended. Recycle green waste through either on-site composting of grass, i.e., leaving the grass clippings on the lawn, or sending the separated green waste to a composting facility. 	<p>County Waste Management Department.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider xeriscaping and the use of drought tolerant low maintenance vegetation in all landscaped areas of the project. • Hazardous materials are not accepted at the Riverside County landfills. Any hazardous wastes, including paint, used during construction must be properly disposed of at a licensed facility in accordance with local, state and federal regulations. 	
<p>5.15.4-6 In accordance with AB 341, at least one of the following actions to divert commercial solid waste from disposal shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source separate recyclable and/or compostable material from solid waste and donate or self-haul the material to recycling facilities. • Subscribe to a recycling service with a waste hauler. • Provide recycling service to their tenants (if commercial or multi-family complex). • Demonstrate compliance with the requirements of California Code of Regulations Title 14. 	<p>County Waste Management Department.</p>
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation
<p>Implementation of the project, such that it is served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or, comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)).</p>	<p>The analysis of solid waste issues in the DEIR concluded that the existing management system and facilities have adequate capacity to expand to meet the Project's demands without causing any significant adverse impact.</p>

This page left intentionally blank for pagination purposes.