

## **CHAPTER 7 – TOPICAL ISSUES**

### **7.1 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS**

#### **7.1.1 Overview of Growth Inducement**

Traditionally, significant growth is induced in one of two ways. In the first instance, a project is located in an isolated (meaning that it is not currently or routinely served by public service or utility infrastructure) area and when developed it brings sufficient urban infrastructure to cause new or additional development pressure on the intervening and surrounding land. This type of induced growth leads to conversion of adjacent acreage to higher intensity uses, either unexpectedly or through accelerated development. This conversion occurs because the adjacent land becomes more suitable for development and, hence, more valuable because of the availability of the new infrastructure. This type of growth inducement is typically termed “leap frog” or “premature” development because it creates an island of higher intensity developed land within a larger area of lower intensity land use.

The growth inducement issue is inherently tied to the land ownership issue because of the manner in which access and development of the Project site is envisioned and whether growth on adjacent land can be induced to occur as a result of a land owner’s decision to convert from a vacant property to a higher intensity use such as residential and commercial land use. For a project to be growth inducing it must cause certain changes in circumstances affecting development constraints that are required for growth and the adjacent properties must be available to support such growth.

Growth inducement may be caused when a project of large size, relative to the surrounding community or area, is developed within a community and impacts the surrounding community by producing a “multiplier effect,” which results in substantial indirect community growth, not necessarily adjacent to the development site or of the same type of use as the project itself. This type of stimulus to community growth is typified by the development of major destination recreation facilities, such as Disney World near Orlando, Florida, or around a military facility, such as the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center near Twentynine Palms. The Project does not propose any new major facilities that will cause growth “through a multiplier effect”, as is discussed below. As primarily residential communities, with small commercial components, the future growth will occur as a result of regional growth rather than driving or forcing regional growth. Therefore, the Project is not considered a “large project” that would indirectly drive area growth due to its presence.

#### **7.1.2 PP24883/CZ7782 Growth Inducement**

The analysis contained in this DEIR focused on single project – Scenario #1, and multiple potential development sites – Scenario #2. In the case of Scenario #1, only one facility shall be constructed, and none of the facilities associated with this construction could be considered growth inducing.

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.

## **7.2 IRREVERSIBLE AND/OR UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES WHICH WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED ACTION, SHOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED**

If the Project is effectively implemented, the following irreversible and/or unavoidable environmental changes are forecast to occur:

### **Transportation / Traffic**

According to the analysis in this DEIR, 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.

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 projects 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 projects 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 projects 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.

All other issues evaluated in Chapter 5 were found to be less than significant, either with or without mitigation.

## **7.3 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

The intent of a cumulative impact evaluation is to provide the public and decision-makers with an understanding of a given Project's contribution to area-wide or community environmental impacts when added to other development occurring in the region. Typically, cumulative impacts are discussed in relation to a list of past, present and reasonably anticipated projects or in relation to broad growth projections contained in general or regional plans (refer Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines). For the Project cumulative impacts are evaluated in the context of both types of cumulative impact forecasts. The cumulative impact projections were made using regional planning documents and site-specific technical studies. Cumulative impacts are discussed in each issue subchapter of Chapter 5 in this document. The following is a summary of cumulative impacts that are forecast to occur if the Project is implemented as

proposed, and is a restatement of the cumulative impacts from Chapter 5. It should be noted that the cumulative impacts addresses both Scenario #1, and Scenario #2. Please reference Table 2.5-1, *Cumulative Projects*, for a list of cumulative Projects in the vicinity of the Project.

### **Aesthetics**

Pursuant to Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the geographic scope of the cumulative aesthetics, light and glare analysis are: adjacent areas, and the immediate areas surrounding the Project site beyond the adjacent areas Implementation of the proposed Project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the broader project area, would contribute to the continued development of Wine Country.

#### **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.

#### **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.

### **Agricultural Resources**

Pursuant to Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the cumulative area for agricultural resource impacts is Riverside County.

#### **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 Sections 5.3.1 through 5.3.4 and the required standard conditions and mitigation measures contained in Section 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.

### **Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases**

Pursuant to Section 15130(b)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the cumulative Project list from the *Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship Traffic Impact Analysis*, prepared by Kunzman Associates, Inc., dated March 2, 2015, was utilized for the cumulative impacts within Riverside County, and the greater setting of the South Coast Air Basin. The SoCAB is currently designated nonattainment for state O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards and federal O<sub>3</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards. Cumulative growth in population, vehicle use, and industrial activity could inhibit efforts to improve regional air quality and to attain the ambient air quality standards.

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

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.

### **Biological Resources**

Pursuant to Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the geographic scope to cumulative biological impacts are defined as those impacts resulting from the development within the MSHCP Plan Area as a result of build out of the Cities and County's General Plans (MSHCP EIR/IES). The County, along with other jurisdictions in western Riverside County, participates in the MSHCP. The MSHCP is designed to protect over 150 species and conserve over 500,000 acres in western Riverside County. Project compliance with the MSHCP fully mitigates for impacts on covered species and ensures large segments of natural communities in western Riverside County will be preserved.

#### **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.

#### **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.

### **Cultural Resources**

Pursuant to Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the geographic scope of the cumulative cultural resources analysis is the Project vicinity. In addition, it can include the geographic areas of the historic range of the tribes of the Luiseño Indians. The cumulative setting associated with the proposed Project includes approved, proposed, planned, and other reasonably foreseeable projects and development in Wine Country. Developments and planned land uses, including the proposed Project, would cumulatively contribute to impacts to known and unknown cultural resources and paleontological resources in the area. The Existing Setting subsection provides an overview of cultural resources and the history of the region.

#### **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.

#### **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.

### **Geology and Soils**

Pursuant to Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the geographic scope for the cumulative projects setting for geology and soils resources is development in Wine Country, southwest Riverside County, within the larger context of Southern California due to regional seismicity.

#### **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 are 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.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Pursuant to Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the geographic scope of the cumulative setting for hazards and hazardous materials analysis is Wine Country and southwest Riverside County. Hazardous material, human health, and safety impacts as described in CEQA Appendix G are generally site-specific and not cumulative in nature, as impacts generally vary by land use, site characteristics, and site history. The cumulative setting for the proposed Project would be the Project as well as existing and future projects in the immediate vicinity.

#### **Scenario #1: The WCCP is in full effect**

Development of the Project may result in releases of hazards and hazardous materials. 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.

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.

*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.

**Hydrology / Water Quality**

Pursuant to Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the geographic scope of the cumulative project setting for hydrology and water quality resources is Wine Country and the Santa Margarita River Watershed.

*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 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.

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, 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.

**Land Use / Planning**

Pursuant to Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the geographic scope of the cumulative project settings for land use and planning resources are Wine Country, the Southwest Area Plan, and Riverside County. Development in the cumulative setting would change the intensity of land uses in the region and would provide additional spiritual and social opportunities.

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, 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.

Implementation of the Project will not present any significant cumulative impacts.

### **Mineral Resources**

Pursuant to Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the geographic scope of the cumulative mineral resources analysis are Southwest Riverside County and Southern California.

#### **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.

### **Noise**

Pursuant to Section 15130(b)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the cumulative Project list from the *Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship Traffic Impact Analysis*, prepared by Kunzman Associates, Inc., dated March 2, 2015, was utilized for the cumulative noise impacts.

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative noise impacts depends on the impact being analyzed. For construction impacts, only the immediate area around the proposed project site would be included in the cumulative context. For operational/roadway related impacts, the context is buildout of the County General Plan, including existing and future development of cumulative projects in the area, as well as adjacent communities (Temecula) that would be potentially impacted. This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed

project, in conjunction with ambient growth as discussed in Chapter 5.14, Transportation/Traffic, and other development in the vicinity of the proposed Project site. Noise is by definition a localized phenomenon and significantly reduces in magnitude as distance from the source increases. Consequently, only projects and growth in Wine Country, the County, and Temecula area would be likely to contribute to cumulative noise impacts.

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.

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.

**Public Services**

*Fire Services*

Pursuant to Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the geographic scope of the cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Response Services is Riverside County.

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.

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.

#### *Sheriff Services*

Pursuant to Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the geographic scope of the cumulative Sheriff Services is Riverside County.

#### *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.

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 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.

#### *Health Services*

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

Pursuant to Section 15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the geographic scope of the cumulative Health Services is Riverside County.

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.

### **Transportation / Traffic**

Pursuant to Section 15130(b)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the cumulative Project list from the *Calvary Chapel Bible Fellowship Traffic Impact Analysis*, prepared by Kunzman Associates, Inc., dated March 2, 2015, was utilized for the cumulative transportation/traffic impacts.

The geographic context for the is buildout of the County General Plan, including existing and future development of cumulative projects in the area, as well as adjacent communities (Temecula) that would be potentially impacted. This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with ambient growth, and other development in the vicinity of the proposed Project site.

In 2002, the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program was initiated in Western Riverside County. Under the TUMF, developers of residential, industrial and commercial property are required to pay a development fee to fund regional transportation projects, which mitigates cumulative impacts to the roadway segments and intersections included in the TUMF program. The TUMF funds both local and regional arterial projects. The applicant shall participate in the funding or construction of off-site improvements, including traffic signals that are needed to serve cumulative traffic conditions through the payment of required Western Riverside County TUMF, in addition to the County of Riverside Development Impact Fee (DIF) and other fair share contributions as directed by the County, including any future Road Bridge Building District.

The Project's contribution to the TUMF program as a fair share contribution would be considered sufficient (refer to Section 15130(a)(3) to address the Project's fair share toward a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate any potential cumulative impacts; however, these improvements are beyond the control of the applicant and will remain significant.

#### **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.

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.

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.

**Utilities**

*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.

*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 a less than significant cumulative impact.

*Solid Waste*

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

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 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.

*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. 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. The Project will not cause unavoidable significant adverse impacts with any adopted energy conservation plans. No mitigation is required. Please reference Appendix F Analysis in Chapter 7, Topical Issues.

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.

## **7.4 ENERGY CONSERVATION**

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

Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Appendix F requires a description (where relevant) of the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy caused by a project. In 1975, the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill 1575 (AB 1575) in response to the oil crisis of the 1970s. Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines provides guidance for assessing potential impacts that a project could have on energy supplies, focusing on the goal of conserving energy by ensuring that projects use energy wisely and efficiently. Because Appendix F does not include specific significance criteria, this threshold is based on the goal of Appendix F. Therefore, an energy impact is considered significant if the proposed project would:

Develop land uses and patterns that cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy or construct new or retrofitted buildings that would have excessive energy requirements for daily operation.

### **7.4.1 Project Energy Consumption**

#### ***Short-Term Construction***

In 1994, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) adopted the first set of emission standards (Tier 1) for all new off-road diesel engines greater than 37 kilowatts (kW). The Tier 1 standards were phased in for different engine sizes between 1996 and 2000, reducing NOx emissions from these engines by 30 percent. The EPA Tier 2 and Tier 3 standards for off-road diesel engines are projected to further reduce emissions by 60 percent for NOx and 40 percent for particulate matter from Tier 1 emission levels. In 2004, the EPA issued the Clean Air Non-Road Diesel Rule which will cut emissions from off-road diesel engines by more than 90 percent.

Depending on market conditions, the project is expected to be constructed in three phases with each phase taking approximately a year to a year and a half to complete. Construction would consist of site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coatings. Table 7.4-1, *Construction Fuel Consumption—Off-Road Equipment*, and Table 7.4-2, *Construction Fuel Consumption for On-Road Cars and Trucks*, provide an estimate of construction fuel consumption for on-road and off-road vehicles for the Project based on information provided by the CalEEMod air quality computer model; refer to Draft EIR Appendix D (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis).

**Table 7.4-1  
 Construction Fuel Consumption–Off-Road Equipment**

Phase	Equipment	Quantity	HP <sup>1</sup>	Load Factor <sup>1</sup>	Fuel Use (gal/hour) <sup>2</sup>	Duration (total hours) <sup>3</sup>	Total Fuel Consumption (gallons) <sup>4</sup>
<b>Phase I</b>							
Site Grading	Excavators	2	162	0.38	2.46	360	885.6
Site Grading	Graders	1	174	0.41	2.85	360	1,026.0
Site Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	255	0.40	4.08	360	1,468.8
Site Grading	Scrapers	2	361	0.48	6.93	360	2,494.8
Site Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	97	0.37	1.44	360	518.4
Building Construction	Cranes	1	226	0.29	2.62	1071	2,806.0
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	89	0.20	0.71	1224	869.0
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	84	0.74	2.49	1224	3,047.7
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	97	0.37	1.44	1071	1,542.2
Building Construction	Welders	1	46	0.45	0.83	1224	1,015.9
Paving	Pavers	2	125	0.42	2.10	176	369.6
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	130	0.36	1.87	176	329.1
Paving	Rollers	2	80	0.38	1.22	176	214.7
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	78	0.48	1.50	144	216.0
<b>SUBTOTAL PHASE I</b>							<b>16,803.8</b>
<b>Phase II</b>							
Site Grading	Excavators	2	162	0.38	2.46	536	1,318.6
Site Grading	Graders	1	174	0.41	2.46	536	1,527.6
Site Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	255	0.40	4.08	536	2,186.9
Site Grading	Scrapers	2	361	0.48	6.93	536	3,714.5
Site Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	97	0.37	1.44	536	771.8
Building Construction	Cranes	1	226	0.29	2.62	1519	3,979.8
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	89	0.20	0.71	1736	1,232.6
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	84	0.74	2.49	1736	4,322.6
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	97	0.37	1.44	1519	2,187.4
Building Construction	Welders	1	46	0.45	0.83	1736	1,440.9
Paving	Pavers	2	125	0.42	2.10	352	739.2
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	130	0.36	1.87	352	658.2
Paving	Rollers	2	80	0.38	1.22	352	429.4
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	78	0.48	1.50	270	405
<b>SUBTOTAL PHASE II</b>							<b>24,914.5</b>
<b>Phase III</b>							
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	81	0.73	2.36	88	207.7
Demolition	Excavators	3	162	0.38	2.46	88	216.5
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	255	0.40	4.08	88	359.0
Site Grading	Excavators	1	162	0.38	2.46	264	649.4
Site Grading	Graders	1	174	0.41	2.85	264	752.4
Site Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	255	0.40	4.08	264	1,077.1
Site Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	97	0.37	1.44	264	380.2
Building Construction	Cranes	1	226	0.29	2.62	2142	5,612.0
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	89	0.20	0.71	2448	1,738.1
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	84	0.74	2.49	2448	6,059.5
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	97	0.37	1.44	2142	3,084.5

Construction							
Building Construction	Welders	1	46	0.45	0.83	2448	2,031.8
Paving	Pavers	2	125	0.42	2.10	176	369.6
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	130	0.36	1.87	176	329.1
Paving	Rollers	2	80	0.38	1.22	176	214.7
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	78	0.48	1.50	144	72
<b>SUBTOTAL PHASE III</b>							<b>25,102.1</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>							<b>66,820.4</b>

- 1 Horsepower data obtained from CalEEMod model, (AQ/GHG Analysis) - reference the Technical Appendices to this DEIR in the enclosed CD.
- 2 Consumption Rate = Horsepower x Load Factor x Fuel Consumption Factor (Fuel Consumption Factor for a diesel engine is 0.04 gallons per horsepower per hour).
- 3 Duration = Usage hours x number of days of equipment per phase.
- 4 Total Fuel Consumption calculated by multiplying Duration x Fuel Consumption Rate.

**Table 7.4-2  
Construction Fuel Consumption for On-Road Cars and Trucks<sup>1</sup>**

Activity	Total Miles <sup>2</sup>	Average Economy (miles per gallon)	Total Fuel Consumption (gallons)
<b>Phase I</b>			
Haul	0	6.1	0
Vendor	33	6.1	201.3
Workers	137	21.6	2,959.2
<b>SUBTOTAL PHASE I</b>			<b>3,160.5</b>
<b>Phase II</b>			
Haul	0	6.1	0
Vendor	36	6.1	219.6
Workers	145	21.6	3,132.0
<b>SUBTOTAL PHASE II</b>			<b>3,333.3</b>
<b>Phase III</b>			
Haul	15	6.1	91.5
Vendor	8	6.1	48.8
Workers	70	21.6	1,512.0
<b>SUBTOTAL PHASE III</b>			<b>1,652.3</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>8,146.1</b>

- 1 Includes earthwork and demolition hauling, vendor deliveries, and construction crew commuting.
- 2 Total Miles data obtained from CalEEMod model, (AQ/GHG Analysis) - reference the Technical Appendices to this DEIR in the enclosed CD.

### **Long Term Operations**

#### *Transportation Energy Demand*

Pursuant to the Federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975, the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration (NHTSA) is responsible for establishing additional vehicle standards and for revising existing standards. Since 1990, the fuel economy standard for new passenger cars has been 27.5 miles per gallon (mpg). Since 1996, the fuel economy standard for new light trucks (gross vehicle weight of 8,500 pounds or less) has been 20.7 mpg. Heavy-duty vehicles (i.e., vehicles and trucks over 8,500 pounds gross vehicle weight) are not currently subject to fuel economy standards. Compliance with federal fuel economy standards is not determined for each individual vehicle model.

Rather, compliance is determined based on each manufacturer's average fuel economy for the portion of their vehicles produced for sale in the United States.

As indicated in Table 7.4-3, *Total Construction Fuel Consumption for On-Road and Off Road*, the operation of the Project is estimated to consume approximately 74,966 gallons of fuel. However, the Project would not result in any unusual characteristics that would result in excessive long-term operational fuel consumption. Fuel consumption associated with vehicle trips generated by the project would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary in comparison to other similar developments in the region.

**Table 7.4-3  
Total Construction Fuel Consumption for On-Road and Off Road**

<b>Source</b>	<b>Gallons of Fuel</b>
Off-Road	66,820
On-Road	8,146
<b>Total</b>	<b>74,966</b>

Sources: Table 7.4-1 and Table 7.4-2

### *Building Energy Demand*

With implementation of standard conditions, which requires the Project to follow the applicable Title 24 Standards, install ENERGY STAR appliances, install lighting that use an average of 5 percent less energy than conventional lighting, and use low VOC paints, the proposed Project would be expected to demand approximately .507 million kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity per year. There will be no natural gas demand, as the site is served by propane. These figures were obtained from AQ/GHG Analysis) - reference the Technical Appendices to this DEIR in the enclosed CD.

The Project would involve operations typical of church uses, requiring electricity for typical lighting, climate control, and day-to-day activities. Additionally, the proposed project would incorporate several water, energy, solid waste, and land use efficiency measures through compliance with various plans, programs, and policies and various project design features. Therefore, the project would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary in comparison to other similar church facilities of its size and function within the region.

### *Energy Efficiency Measures*

Title 24, California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-residential Buildings, was established by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to create uniform building codes to reduce California's energy consumption, and provide energy efficiency standards for residential and non-residential buildings. In 2013, the CEC updated Title 24 standards with more stringent requirements. The 2013 Standards are incorporated within the California Building Code and are expected to substantially reduce the growth in electricity and natural gas use. Additional savings result from the application of the Standards on building alterations, and these savings are cumulative. Implementation of the project's design features (PDFs) (i.e., high efficiency lighting, energy efficient appliances, low-flow faucets, toilets, water-efficient irrigation systems,) would further reduce energy consumption.

The Project would adhere to all Federal, State, and local requirements for energy efficiency, including the Title 24 standards, as well as the Project's design features. The proposed Project

would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of building energy. This analysis is consistent with and meets the requirements of Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines regarding energy conservation.