



RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Charissa Leach
Assistant TLMA Director

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project/Case Number: CUP180006

Based on the Initial Study, it has been determined that the proposed project will not have a significant effect upon the environment.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION (see Environmental Assessment/Initial Study).

COMPLETED/REVIEWED BY:

By: Brett Dawson Title: Project Planner Date: November 28, 2018

Applicant/Project Sponsor: Core States Group

Date Submitted: 4/9/2018

ADOPTED BY: Board of Supervisors

Person Verifying Adoption: 

Date: 11/29/18

The Negative Declaration may be examined, along with documents referenced in the initial study, if any, at:

Riverside County Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501

For additional information, please contact Brett Dawson at (951) 955-0972 bdawson@rivco.org.

Please charge deposit fee case#: CEQ180034 ZCFG .

FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: CEQ180034
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): CUP180006
Lead Agency Name: Riverside County Planning Department
Address: P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409
Contact Person: Brett Dawson, Project Planner
Telephone Number: (951) 955-0972

Applicant's Address: 38122 Stone Meadow Drive, Murrieta, CA 92562

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description: A proposal for the demolition of an existing building and the construction of a 7-Eleven convenience store for 24-hour operation, sale of beer and wine for off-site consumption (subject to Type 20 License), and 6 multiple product dispensers (MPD) Fuel canopy, underground storage tanks (UST) Healy Tank. The project site is located at 43271 State Route 74, north of Putter's Lane, south of State Route 74/Florida Avenue, east of Lake Street, and west of New Chicago Avenue. The existing restaurant/bar on-site would be demolished to accommodate the proposed project.

B. Type of Project: Site Specific ☒; Countywide ☐; Community ☐; Policy ☐.

C. Total Project Area:

Residential Acres: 0	Lots: 0	Units: 0	Projected No. of Residents: 0
Commercial Acres: 1.14	Lots: 1	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: 3,062	Est. No. of Employees: 2 to 4 per shift
Industrial Acres: 0	Lots: 0	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: 0	Est. No. of Employees: 0
Other: 0			

D. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 551-240-046

E. Street References: The project site is located on the southwest corner of State Highway 74 and New Chicago Avenue.

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description: T5S, R1E, Section 8

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The project site is currently developed with a restaurant/bar that would be demolished to accommodate the proposed project. Adjacent uses include single-family residences immediately to the south and southeast across New Chicago Avenue, a Quik Korner convenience store and gas station to the east across New Chicago Avenue, a vacant lot immediately to the west, and a Walgreens pharmacy to the north across State Highway 74.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

- 1. Land Use:** The project site has a General Plan Land Use Designation of Community Development: Commercial Retail (0.20-0.35 FAR). The Commercial Retail land use designation, states it encourages, "Local and regional serving retail and service uses" for the

development of commercial retail uses at a neighborhood, community and regional level, as well as for professional office and tourist-oriented commercial uses. The Project is consistent with the Land Use Designation because the use is a gas station with convenience store, which will provide local and regional retail and services.

1. **Circulation:** The proposed project will add overall trips to the area however, the focused traffic assessment drafted by Trames Solutions Inc. has determined with incorporated mitigation, the impact to the study area intersections off of Florida Avenue, and Georgia Avenue are less than significant.
2. **Multipurpose Open Space:** The project is consistent with the policies of the Multipurpose Open Space Elements of the General Plan and the San Jacinto Valley Area Plan.
3. **Safety:** The proposed project is not located in a floodplain or a fault zone. The proposed project is in an area designated as having moderate liquefaction and is susceptible to subsidence. The proposed project meets all other applicable Safety element policies.
4. **Noise:** The proposed project will permanently increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. However, the project is for a commercial development and noise levels associated with the proposed project are not anticipated to be substantial. The proposed project meets all other applicable Noise element policies.
5. **Housing:** The proposed project is for a commercial use and will not result in a direct or indirect increase in population. The proposed project meets with all applicable Housing element policies.
6. **Air Quality:** The proposed project has been conditioned to control any fugitive dust during grading and construction activities. The proposed project meets all other applicable Air Quality Element policies.
7. **Healthy Communities:** The proposed project meets all applicable Healthy Community policies.

B. General Plan Area Plan(s): San Jacinto Valley

C. Foundation Component(s): Community Development

D. Land Use Designation(s): Commercial Retail (CR)

E. Overlay(s), if any: N/A

F. Policy Area(s), if any: Florida Avenue Corridor Policy Area

G. Adjacent and Surrounding:

1. **Area Plan(s):** San Jacinto Valley

2. **Foundation Component(s):** Community Development

3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Medium Density Residential (MDR), Commercial Retail (CR)

4. Overlay(s), if any: N/A

5. Policy Area(s), if any: Florida Avenue Corridor Policy Area

H. Adopted Specific Plan Information

1. Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any: N/A

2. Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any: N/A

I. Existing Zoning: Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S)

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: N/A

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S), One-Family Dwellings (R-1)

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below (x) would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | |

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED

☐ I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, **NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED** because (a) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have

been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible.

☐ I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An **ADDENDUM** to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.

☐ I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a **SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.

☐ I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a **SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any the following: (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration; (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration; (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or, (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

Signature

Date

For:

Printed Name

This map illustrates the geographical context of the study area. Key locations include Banning, Beaumont, San Jacinto, Hemet, Valle Vista, and French Valley. Major roads shown are I-10, SR-79, SR-243, and SR-74. Natural features include Lake Perris, Diamond Valley Lake, Lake Skinner, and the San Bernardino National Forest. A scale bar at the bottom left indicates distances up to 5 miles.

 Project Location



Figure 2 Project Site Location



Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2018.

[illegible]

V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000-21178.1), this Initial Study has been prepared to analyze the proposed project to determine any potential significant impacts upon the environment that would result from construction and implementation of the project. In accordance with California Code of Regulations, Section 15063, this Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the Lead Agency, the County of Riverside, in consultation with other jurisdictional agencies, to determine whether a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report is required for the proposed project. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the decision-makers, affected agencies, and the public of potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
AESTHETICS Would the project				
1. Scenic Resources				
a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a) As shown in Figure C-8, "Scenic Highways" of the County's General Plan, the project site is located along SR 74, which is listed as eligible for designation as a State scenic highway. Existing views of the project site are shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5. The project would be visible from SR 74; however, the highway has not yet been designated as an official State scenic highway. Furthermore, the project site is currently developed with urban uses, and the replacement of a restaurant/bar with a convenience store and gas station would not create a considerable change in the local environment visible from the SR 74 corridor. Impacts to scenic highway corridors would be less than significant.

b) The Multipurpose Open Space Element of the County's General Plan defines scenic resources as visually attractive areas that are visible to the public, including natural landmarks and prominent or unusual features of the landscape. Hillsides and ridges that are visible above urban or rural areas or highways are considered scenic backdrops, and access points which provide a view of the countryside are considered scenic vistas. The County's General Plan does not identify specific scenic resources (County of Riverside 2015). The closest scenic resources to the project site are the San Jacinto River/Bautista Creek located approximately 0.2 mile to the east, and the San Jacinto Mountains, located approximately 1.5 miles to the northeast. The San Jacinto River is not visible from the project site or from the surrounding area due to intervening commercial and residential development. The San Jacinto Mountains are visible from the project site and surrounding area but are partially obstructed by intervening street trees and existing residential and commercial development. The existing view of the San Jacinto Mountains from the project site is shown in Figure 6. Views of the San Jacinto Mountains

from single-family residences south of the project site are obstructed by an approximately eight-foot high wall that runs along the northern edge of these properties (see Figure 7). The existing one-story restaurant/bar would be demolished and replaced with a gas station canopy located on the central portion of the project site and a one-story convenience store located on the southern portion of the project site; therefore, views of the San Jacinto Mountains would not be substantially altered by the proposed development. Furthermore, the project site is currently developed, and the replacement of a restaurant/bar with a convenience store and gas station would not considerably alter the overall visual character of the existing environment and would not create an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

Figure 4 View of Existing Restaurant/Bar from SR 74 Looking Southeast



Figure 5 View of Existing Restaurant/Bar from Western Site Boundary Facing Northeast



Figure 6 View of San Jacinto Mountains from Western Boundary of Project Site Looking East



Figure 7 View of Adjacent Residences from Project Site Facing South



2. Mt. Palomar Observatory

a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?

☐☐☒☐

Source:

County of Riverside. 1988. Ordinance No. 655: An Ordinance of the County of Riverside Regulating Light Pollution. June 7, 1988. <https://www.rivcocob.org/ords/600/655.htm>

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is categorized as Zone B for lighting in accordance with the County of Riverside Ordinance 655. Zone B is defined as the area outside Zone A (the area within a 15-mile radius of Mt. Palomar Observatory) but within a 45-mile radius of Mt. Palomar Observatory. The proposed project would involve the demolition of the existing restaurant/bar and the construction of a convenience store and gas station. The proposed project would introduce new exterior light sources on the project site beyond those currently existing in the form of overhead lighting for fueling stations, sign lighting, and storefront lighting. The proposed project would be required to comply with Sections 6, 7, and 8 of Ordinance 655, which set requirements for lamp source, shielding, and placement and contain certain lighting prohibitions. Adherence to the applicable provisions of Ordinance 655 would ensure that impacts to the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

3. Other Lighting Issues

a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

☐☐☒☐

b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

☐☐☒☐

Sources: Project Description

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Development of the proposed convenience store and gas station would incorporate new exterior lighting sources on the project site in the form of overhead lighting for fueling stations, sign lighting, and storefront lighting. This type of lighting and signage would be similar to the Quik Korner convenience store and gas station located immediately to the east across New Chicago Avenue. The front of the proposed convenience store would face north towards SR 74; therefore, lighting from the convenience store would not spillover onto adjacent residential properties. The proposed convenience store building would partially shield adjacent residences from exterior light sources. In addition, the proposed project would be required to comply with Section 8.80.050 of the County's Municipal Code, which states that "all outdoor luminaries shall be located, adequately shielded, and directed such that no direct light falls outside the parcel of origin or onto the public right-of-way." Section 8.80.050 also prohibits the installation of blinking, flashing, or rotating outdoor luminaries.

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

The new exterior light sources would not substantially increase the overall levels of nighttime lighting because they would be subject to the provisions of Section 8.80.050 of the County's Municipal Code and would be similar to the existing light levels already present from lighting sources on surrounding commercial uses such as the Quik Korner convenience store and gas station east of the project site and the pharmacy north of the project site. Therefore, new lighting introduced by the proposed development would not create a new source of substantial light and glare or expose neighboring residential properties to light levels in excess of existing lighting conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES Would the project

4. Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2016a. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Accessed September 2018. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/>

_____. 2016b. Riverside County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016 Sheet 1 of 3. ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/Riverside_w_15_16_WA.pdf (accessed September 2018.)

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015. <http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a-d) Based on the California Department of Conservation (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program and Williamson Act maps, neither the project site nor adjacent properties are Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance or are enrolled in Williamson Act contracts (DOC 2016a and 2016b). The project site is zoned C-P-S (Scenic Highway Commercial) and is currently developed with a restaurant/bar and a surface parking lot. According to Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources" of the Riverside County General Plan, the project site is located on "urban built-up land" (County of Riverside 2015). All parcels within 300 feet of the project site are zoned C-P-S or R-1 (one-family dwellings). Therefore, the site is not located on or within 300 feet of agricultural land and would

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

not result in development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally-zoned property. Furthermore, the proposed project would redevelop a parcel with non-agricultural uses and would not involve any development that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

5. Forest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Govt. Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The project site is zoned C-P-S (Scenic Highway Commercial) and is currently developed with a restaurant/bar and a surface parking lot. According to Figure OS-3a "Forestry Resources Western Riverside County Parks, Forests, and Recreation Areas" of the Riverside County General Plan, the project site is not located on forest land, and the nearest forest land is approximately 7.5 miles to the east in the San Bernardino National Forest. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland. Furthermore, the proposed project would redevelop a parcel with existing non-agricultural uses and would not involve any development that could directly or indirectly result in the loss or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project

6. Air Quality Impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2016. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2005. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2016. Final 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). April 7, 2016. <http://scagrtpsc.net/Pages/FINAL2016RTPSCS.aspx>

South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2008. Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology. July 2008. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significance-thresholds/final-lst-methodology-document.pdf>

_____. 2009. 2006 – 2008 Thresholds for Construction and Operation with Gradual Conversion of NO_x to NO₂. October 21, 2009. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significance-thresholds/appendix-c-mass-rate-lst-look-up-tables.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

_____. 2015. SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds. March 2015. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf>

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (the Basin), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Basin is a 6,600-square-mile coastal plain bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the southwest and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east. The Basin includes the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, and all of Orange County.

As the local air quality management agency, the SCAQMD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that State and federal air quality standards are met and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet the standards. Depending on whether or not the standards are met or exceeded, the Basin is classified as being in "attainment" or "nonattainment." The primary criteria air pollutants regulated by state and federal standards include ozone, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, and lead.

According to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the project site is located in a nonattainment area for both the federal and State standards for ozone and small particulate matter with a diameter

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

between 2.5 and 10 micrometers (PM₁₀), and the State standard for fine particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less (PM_{2.5}). This nonattainment status is a result of several factors, the primary ones being the naturally adverse meteorological conditions that limit the dispersion and diffusion of pollutants, the limited capacity of the local airshed to eliminate pollutants from the air, and the number, type, and density of emission sources in the Basin. The regional climate in the Basin is semi-arid and is characterized by warm summers, mild winters, infrequent seasonal rainfall, moderate daytime onshore breezes, and moderate humidity. Air quality in the Basin is primarily influenced by meteorology and a wide range of emissions sources, such as dense population centers, substantial vehicular traffic, and industry. Due to its nonattainment status, the Basin is required to implement strategies to reduce pollutant levels to recognized acceptable standards. Accordingly, the SCAQMD has adopted an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) that provides a strategy for the attainment of State and federal air quality standards.

Criteria for determining consistency with the AQMP are defined in Chapter 12, Section 12.2 and Section 12.3 of the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook (1993). The indicators are discussed below:

- *Consistency Criterion No. 1: The proposed Project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP.*

The violations that Consistency Criterion No. 1 refers to are the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). CAAQS and NAAQS violations would occur if localized significance thresholds (LST's) were exceeded. However, the Project's construction- and operational-source emissions with standard regulatory requirements would not exceed applicable LST's as shown in section d), and a less-than-significant impact would occur. Accordingly, the proposed Project would be consistent with the first criterion.

- *Consistency Criterion No. 2: The Project will not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP based on the years of Project build-out phase.*

The 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) demonstrates that the applicable ambient air quality standards can be achieved within the timeframes required under federal law. Growth projections from local general plans adopted by cities in the SCAQMD are provided to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), which develops regional growth forecasts, which are then used to develop future air quality forecasts for the AQMP. The project proposes to develop the site with a convenience store and gas station, which is consistent with the Riverside County General Plan land use designation of Commercial Retail which allows for retail and service uses. Thus, development of the project would not exceed the growth projections in the County of Riverside's General Plan.

As indicated above, the Project would not result in or cause NAAQS or CAAQS violations. The proposed Project is consistent with the property's Commercial Retail land use designation reflected in the adopted Riverside County General Plan. Because land use intensity would be within the allowable range, the Project is considered to be consistent with the AQMP. Therefore, because the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air quality plan established for this region by being consistent with growth projects and not further impacting CAAQS and NAAQS through adherence to daily emission thresholds, impacts associated with a conflict with applicable air quality plans would be less than significant.

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

b-c) The SCAQMD recommends the use of quantitative thresholds to determine the significance of temporary construction-related emissions and long-term emissions associated with project operation. These thresholds are designed such that a project consistent with the thresholds would not have an individually or cumulatively significant impact to the Basin's air quality. These thresholds are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 SCAQMD Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Mass Daily Thresholds	
	Operation Thresholds (lbs/day)	Construction Thresholds (lbs/day)
NO _x	55	100
ROG ¹	55	75
PM ₁₀	150	150
PM _{2.5}	55	55
SO _x	150	150
CO	550	550
Lead	3	3

Notes: NO_x = nitrogen oxides, ROG = reactive organic gases, PM₁₀ = particulate matter with a diameter of 10 microns or less, PM_{2.5} = particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less, SO_x = sulfur oxides, CO = carbon monoxide

¹ Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) are formed during combustion and evaporation of organic solvents. ROG are also referred to as Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC).

Source: SCAQMD 2015.

The SCAQMD has also developed Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) for NO_x, CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. LSTs were devised in response to concern regarding exposure of individuals and local communities to these pollutants. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that will not cause or contribute to an air quality exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard at the nearest sensitive receptor, taking into consideration ambient concentrations in each source receptor area (SRA), project size, and distance to the sensitive receptor. However, LSTs only apply to emissions in a fixed stationary location during project construction and operation. LSTs do not apply to mobile sources, such as cars on a roadway (SCAQMD 2008a). Therefore, LSTs are typically applied only to construction emissions because the majority of operational emissions are associated with off-site project-generated vehicle trips.

The project site is located in Source Receptor Area (SRA) 28 and is approximately 1.14 acres in size. LSTs are provided for sites that are one, two, and five acres in size and for receptors at distances of 82, 164, 328, 656, and 1,640 feet from the project site boundary. For receptors located within 82 feet of a project site, SCAQMD recommends using the closest modeled distance of 82 feet (SCAQMD 2008). Therefore, this analysis conservatively uses LSTs for a one-acre site located in SRA 28 at a receptor distance of 82 feet as shown in Table 2.

SCAQMD has also established significance thresholds for toxic air contaminants (TACs), including carcinogens and non-carcinogens. Construction activity would generate emissions of diesel particulates, but the magnitude of construction associated with the project would not be great enough

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

to generate diesel particulate emissions that would create health risks exceeding applicable health risk thresholds.

Table 2 SCAQMD LSTs for Construction

Pollutant	Allowable emissions in SRA 28 for one-acre site at a receptor distance of 82 feet
Gradual conversion of NO _x to NO ₂	162
CO	750
PM ₁₀	4
PM _{2.5}	3
Source: SCAQMD 2008.	

Construction Emissions

Project construction would generate temporary air pollutant emissions. These emissions are associated with fugitive dust and exhaust emissions from heavy construction vehicles, as well as reactive organic gases (ROGs) released during the application of architectural coatings. Demolition, site preparation, and grading would involve the greatest use of heavy equipment and generation of fugitive dust. As shown in Table 3, estimated maximum daily construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD regional thresholds or the applicable LSTs.

Table 3 Estimated Construction Emissions

Construction Phase	Estimated Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Maximum Daily Emissions	2.4	23.0	15.5	< 0.1	3.6	2.2
<i>SCAQMD Regional Thresholds</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>55</i>
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Maximum On-site Emissions¹	2.3	22.7	14.9	< 0.1	3.5	2.1
<i>Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs)²</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>162</i>	<i>750</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>
Threshold Exceeded?	N/A	No	No	N/A	No	No

Notes: All numbers have been rounded to the nearest tenth. Emission data is pulled from "mitigated" results, which account for compliance with regulations and project design features. Emissions presented are the highest of the winter and summer modeled emissions.

See Appendix A for CalEEMod model output.

¹ LSTs only apply to on-site emissions and do not apply to mobile emissions (the majority of operational emissions). Therefore, only on-site construction emissions are compared to LSTs.

² LSTs for a one-acre site in SRA 28 at a receptor distance of 82 feet (Table 2).

Operational Emissions

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

Operational emissions associated with project operation would include emissions associated with vehicle trips (mobile sources); natural gas and electricity use (energy sources); and landscape maintenance equipment, consumer products, and architectural coatings associated with on-site operational activities (area sources). Table 4 summarizes the project's operational emissions, taking into account existing emissions. As shown below, the net increase in operational emissions as a result of the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for any criteria pollutant.

Table 4 Estimated Operational Emissions

Emissions Source	Estimated Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1
Energy	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1
Mobile	1.6	9.4	7.7	< 0.1	1.3	0.4
Proposed Project Emissions	1.6	9.4	7.7	< 0.1	1.3	0.4
Existing Use Emissions	0.8	3.4	6.9	< 0.1	1.5	0.4
Net Emissions (Proposed - Existing)	0.8	6.0	0.8	< 0.1	(0.2)	< 0.1
<i>SCAQMD Thresholds</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>55</i>
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

() denotes a negative number.

Notes: All numbers have been rounded to the nearest tenth. Emission data is pulled from "mitigated" results, which account for compliance with regulations and project design features. Emissions presented are the highest of the winter and summer modeled emissions.

See Appendix A for CalEEMod model output.

As shown in Table 3 and Table 4, construction emissions and net operational emissions from the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate or contribute to a violation of an air quality standard and would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria air pollutant; impacts would be less than significant.

d-e) Certain population groups are more sensitive to air pollution than others. Sensitive receptors include children, the elderly, and acutely ill and chronically ill persons, especially those with cardio-respiratory diseases. Sensitive land uses would include those locations where such individuals are concentrated, such as hospitals, schools, residences, and parks with active recreational uses. The sensitive receptors closest to the project site are single-family residences located immediately south of the project site.

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

Refueling activities at the proposed gas station would potentially release benzene into the air; however, benzene emissions can be reduced by more than 90 percent by the vapor recovery systems required at fuel pumps. Nevertheless, benzene emissions may result in near source health risk (CARB 2005). Therefore, CARB recommends siting sensitive land uses, such as residences, at least 50 feet from typical gasoline dispensing facilities and at least 300 feet from large gasoline dispensing facilities (i.e., facilities with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater) (CARB 2005). The proposed gas station would dispense approximately 1.8 million gallons of gas per year and would qualify as a typical gasoline dispensing facility. Fuel pumps would be located approximately 160 feet away from the nearest residence. Therefore, the proposed fuel pumps would be located outside the recommended buffer of 50 feet, which would ensure the nearby sensitive receptors are adequately protected from benzene emissions. Furthermore, SCAQMD has stringent requirements for the control of gasoline vapor emissions from gasoline dispensing facilities as set forth in SCAQMD Rule 461, Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing, which requires compliance with all equipment and operation standards as well as maintenance and inspection protocol. Compliance with SCAQMD Rule 461 would protect nearby residents from exposure to emissions related to the proposed gas station. The proposed project would involve the construction of a convenience store and gas station, which would not introduce new sensitive receptors within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose new residents or other sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and air quality impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

f) Objectionable odors typically come from sources such as exhaust from heavy equipment, restaurants, animal boarding facilities, feed lots, agricultural operations, food processing, compost waste, wastewater treatment plants, various industrial processes and landfills. The proposed convenience store and gas station are not identified as land uses associated with odor complaints by CARB (CARB 2005). In addition, the proposed project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance, which prohibits the discharge of air contaminants that cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or the public. Therefore, the project would not generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project

7. Wildlife & Vegetation				
a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Wildlife Service?				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2010. California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project: A Strategy for Conserving a Connected California. February 2010.
<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Planning/Connectivity/CEHC>

Regional Conservation Authority (RCA). 2018. MSHCP Information App. Available at:
<http://wrcrca.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2ba3285ccc8841ed978d2d825e74c5fa> (September 11, 2018).

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2018. "Wetlands Mapper."
<https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html> (accessed September 2018).

Findings of Fact: The project site is currently developed with a restaurant/bar and paved parking lot with ornamental landscaping and does not contain native biological habitat. Several mature trees are present on the northern portion and along the eastern edge of the project site. The project site is surrounded by SR 74 to the north, New Chicago Avenue to the east, residential development to the south, and a vacant parcel consisting of mowed grass to the west.

a) The project site is located within the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRMSHCP) within Criteria Cell 3611; however, it is not located within a special status species survey area (Regional Conservation Authority [RCA] 2018). The project site is currently developed and would not provide suitable habitat to special status plant or animal species covered under the WRMSHCP. In addition, because the site is currently developed with an existing previous entitlement, it would not be appropriate for reserve assembly within the Criteria Area. As such, the project would not conflict with the WRMSHCP. Impacts would be less than significant.

b-c) Due to the site's existing development and lack of native biological habitat, suitable habitat for special status species is not present on-site. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any federally-listed or state-listed endangered or threatened species. There would be no impacts to endangered and threatened species.

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

d) While common birds are not designated as special status species, destruction of their eggs, nests, and nestlings is prohibited by federal and state law. Several large ornamental trees are present on the project site and adjacent properties that could provide potential habitat for nesting birds. Project activities (e.g., vegetation trimming/removal) could affect nesting of these species, which are protected under the Migratory Birds Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code (CFGF). Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would ensure compliance with the MBTA and CFGF. Therefore, impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species would be less than significant with the incorporated mitigation.

According to the RCA MSHCP Information App, the project site is located in a WRMSHCP Criteria Area, but is not located on Public-Quasi Public Reserve Lands or in a Core or Linkage. Public-Quasi Public Reserve Lands are located approximately 1,000 feet northwest of the project site, but are separated from the site by a large commercial shopping center and surrounding paved roadways (RCA 2018). The project site is located in a developed urban area and surrounded by urban uses in all directions, including SR 74, commercial development, single family residences, and mowed vacant land. Given the urban nature of the surroundings, and the existing development on the project site, the site would not function as a significant wildlife corridor or linkage, nor as a native wildlife nursery site. The project site is not located in a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Essential Habitat Connectivity Area. The nearest wildlife corridor as identified by the CDFW Essential Habitat Connectivity Area (CDFW 2018) occurs approximately five miles southeast of the project site in the San Jacinto Mountains and would not be affected by implementation of the project. Therefore, there would be no impact on wildlife movement or wildlife nursery sites.

e-f) No riparian habitat, federally protected wetlands, or other water features that may be considered jurisdictional by the CDFW, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, or the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) are mapped or occur on the project site (United States Fish and Wildlife Service 2018). Therefore, there would be no impact on federally protected wetlands or other jurisdictional waters.

g) The project site is located in a fairly developed urban area surrounded by residential and commercial structures. There is no native biological habitat on-site, and the only vegetation includes several non-native mature trees located on the site. The County of Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 12.24 (Ordinance No. 559) protects native trees, which are defined as woody plants indigenous to Riverside County and all smog-resistant species introduced as part of a reforestation program, that attain height of at least 30 feet at maturity and are 12 inches in diameter at a height of 4.5 feet above the ground. Removal of these trees without County approval would conflict with the County's Municipal Code. Should the project applicant need to remove trees, a permit application to remove trees must be made to the planning director of the Riverside County planning department. Therefore, compliance with the County of Riverside Municipal Code would ensure that no conflicts with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measure and compliance with the MBTA and CFGF would be required to ensure impacts to nesting birds would be less than significant.

BIO-1 Nesting Birds. Birds and their nests are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Codes. Since the project supports suitable nesting bird habitat, removal of vegetation or any other potential nesting bird habitat disturbances shall be conducted outside of the avian nesting season (February 1st through August 31st). If habitat must be cleared during the nesting season, a preconstruction nesting

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

bird survey shall be conducted. The preconstruction nesting bird survey must be conducted by a biologist who holds a current MOU with the County of Riverside. If nesting activity is observed, appropriate avoidance measures shall be adopted to avoid any potential impacts to nesting birds. The nesting bird survey must be completed no more than 3 days prior to any ground disturbance. If ground disturbance does not begin within 3 days of the survey date a second survey must be conducted. In some cases EPD may also require a Monitoring and Avoidance Plan prior to the issuance of a grading permit. Prior to issuance of a grading permit the projects consulting biologist shall prepare and submit a report, documenting the results of the survey, to EPD to review.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through the condition of approval clearance process with the review of building permits. If vegetation trimming/removal occurs during the breeding season, the results of the pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be submitted by the qualified biologist to the County prior to beginning vegetation trimming/removal activities. If nests are found, weekly monitoring reports of nesting activities and buffer zones shall be submitted by the qualified biologist to the County.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

8. Historic Resources

a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source:

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon). 2018. 43271 State Highway 74 Project Cultural Resources Assessment Report. August 2018.

Findings of Fact:

a-b) A Cultural Resources Assessment Report was prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) in August 2018 for the project site and is included as Appendix B. According to the Cultural Resources Assessment, historic topographic maps and aerial photographs reveal that a building was present in 1955, which has been altered several times since its original construction. Aerial photographs reveal that properties in the vicinity of the project site were subject to significant changes since 1966. The Cultural Resources Assessment Report concludes that the project site was not associated with important events or people at the national, state, or local level. The existing building is not representative of any particular architectural style, and it is unlikely that the project site will yield information deemed important to history or prehistory. Therefore, the project site does not appear eligible for listing in either the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A, B, C, or D or the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 1, 2, 3, or 4. In addition, the project site is not presently listed as a contributor to a County of Riverside Historic District and does not appear to meet the requirements for inclusion in an existing or potential Historic District (Rincon 2018, Appendix B). Therefore, although the proposed project would alter or destroy a historic site it would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. Archaeological Resources				
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source:

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon). 2018. 43271 State Highway 74 Project Cultural Resources Assessment Report. August 2018.

Findings of Fact:

a-d) As part of the Cultural Resources Assessment Report prepared for the project site, Rincon Archaeologist Lindsay Porras, MA, RPA conducted a pedestrian field survey of the project site on August 8, 2018. Ms. Porras walked 10- to 15-meter transects across the project site. The project site is currently developed and paved; therefore, survey efforts were focused on the overall condition of the project site rather than inspection for artifacts. Ground visibility on the project site was poor (less than 10 percent). While the neighboring properties located at the intersection of SR 74 and New Chicago Avenue are commercial in character, the majority of nearby land fronting SR 74 is either vacant or developed with agricultural uses. Landscaping on the property consists chiefly of mature palms and deciduous trees of several varieties, which are scattered throughout the property and along the New Chicago Avenue frontage. The record search results did not identify any prehistoric cultural resources within one mile of the project area and no resources are present within or around the project area. Because there are no archaeological resources present, there will be no impacts in this regard.

No religious or sacred uses exist on the project site or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would not restrict such uses within the potential impact area, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: none.

Monitoring: None

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project				
10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

Sources:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>
 _____. 2018. "Map My County." https://gis.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/?viewer=MMC_Public

Findings of Fact:

a-b) As shown in Figure S-2, "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," of the County's General Plan, the project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone or in any Riverside County Fault Zones (County of Riverside 2015). According to the Riverside County GIS database, the closest fault zone is the San Jacinto Fault Zone, located approximately 0.2 mile north of the project site. No known fault lines traverse the project site. The closest faults include the San Jacinto Fault located approximately 0.2 mile north of the project site, and the Casa Loma Fault located approximately 0.6 mile southwest of the project site (County of Riverside 2018). Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects associated with a fault zone or be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

11. Liquefaction Potential Zone

a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

☐
☐
☒
☐

Source:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a) Liquefaction is a condition that occurs when unconsolidated, saturated soils change to a near-liquid state during ground shaking. According to Figure S-3, "Generalized Liquefaction" of the County's General Plan, the project site is located in an area that has sediments moderately susceptible to liquefaction (County of Riverside 2015). However, typical measures which are requirements of California Building Code would address any potential impacts to acceptable levels. Appropriate techniques to minimize liquefaction and subsidence potential shall be prescribed by an engineering geologist and implemented by the project applicant. Suitable measures to reduce liquefaction and subsidence impacts could include specialized design of foundations by a structural engineer, removal or treatment of liquefiable soils to reduce the potential for liquefaction, drainage to lower the groundwater table to below the level of liquefiable soils, in-situ densification of soils, or other alterations to the ground characteristics. With the implementation of these standard measures as required by the California Building Code, which are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA impacts related to liquefaction would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None

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

Monitoring: None

12. Ground-shaking Zone

a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

☐
☐
☒
☐

Source:

California Department of Conservation. 2010. Fault Activity Map of California.
<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located in the highly seismic Southern California region where several fault systems are considered to be active or potentially active. The project site may be subject to ground shaking in the event of an earthquake originating along one of the active or potentially active faults designated in the vicinity of the project site. This hazard is common throughout California, and the proposed development would pose no greater risk to public safety or destruction of property than is already present for the region. The Casa Loma Fault is the most recently active fault in the vicinity of the project site. The project site is also located close to the San Jacinto Fault and the Hot Springs Fault, both of which have not been active in the last 200 years (California Department of Conservation 2010). The proposed project would be required to comply with the seismic safety requirements in the International Building Code (IBC), the California Building Code (CBC), and the Riverside County Municipal Code. Compliance with such requirements would reduce seismic ground shaking impacts to the maximum extent practicable with current engineering practices. Impacts related to seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

13. Landslide Risk

a) 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 on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?

☐
☐
☒
☐

Source:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a) The geologic character of an area determines its potential for landslides. Steep slopes, the extent of erosion, and the rock composition of a hillside all contribute to the potential for slope failure and landslide events. In order to fail, unstable slopes need to be disturbed; common triggering mechanisms of slope failure include undercutting slopes by erosion or grading, saturation of marginally stable slopes by rainfall or irrigation; and, shaking of marginally stable slopes during earthquakes. The project site is flat and is not in an area with a slope angle of 15 percent or greater according to Figure

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

S-5, "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope", of the County's General Plan (County of Riverside 2015). Furthermore, Figure S-4, "Earthquake Induced Slope Instability Map," of the County's General Plan shows that the project site and surrounding areas have a low to locally moderate susceptibility to seismically induced landslides and rockfalls (County of Riverside 2015). Therefore, impacts related to landslides, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

14. Ground Subsidence

a) 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?

☐
☐
☒
☐

Source:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a) Subsidence is the sudden sinking or gradual downward settling of the Earth's surface with little or no horizontal movement. Subsidence is caused by a variety of activities, which include, but are not limited to, withdrawal of groundwater, pumping of oil and gas from underground, the collapse of underground mines, liquefaction, and hydrocompaction. Lateral spreading is the horizontal movement or spreading of soil toward an open face. The potential for failure from subsidence and lateral spreading is highest in areas where the groundwater table is high and where relatively soft and recent alluvial deposits exist. Figure S-7, "Documented Subsidence Areas Map" of the County's General Plan shows that the project site is not located within an area with documented subsidence; however, the project site is identified as a susceptible area (County of Riverside 2015). Standard measures as noted in Section 9, *Liquefaction Potential Zone*, would reduce potential subsidence impacts by requiring the implementation of appropriate geotechnical techniques to remediate on-site subsidence potential. Impacts would be less than significant with the application of these Building Code required measures.

Mitigation: None.

Monitoring: None.

15. Other Geologic Hazards

a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?

☐
☐
☐
☒

Source:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>
 United States Geological Survey. 2017. California Volcano Observatory (CalVO).
<https://volcanoes.usgs.gov/observatories/calvo/>

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

Findings of Fact:

a) Seiches are large waves generated within enclosed bodies of water. The project site is not located in proximity to any lakes or reservoirs. Therefore, the project site would not be subject to inundation by seiche. As mentioned in Section 13, the project site and surrounding areas have a low to locally moderate susceptibility to seismically-induced landslides and rockfalls; therefore, the project site is also at low risk for mudslides. The project site is not in the vicinity of any volcanos. The closest volcanos include the Lavic Lake Volcanic Field, located approximately 70 miles northeast of the project site, and Salton Buttes Lava Dome, located approximately 80 miles southeast of the project site (United States Geological Survey 2017). However, both are classified as non-erupting volcanos because they exhibit typical background activity such as steaming, seismic events, etc., or little to no activity at all. There would be no impact related to seiches, mudflow, or volcanic hazards.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. Slopes				
a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The project site has a slope of approximately 3 percent in a southeast to northwest direction from approximately 1,744 feet above mean seal level (amsl) to 1,754 amsl. The project site is not in an area with a slope angle of 15 percent or greater according to Figure S-5, "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope", of the County's General Plan (County of Riverside 2015). Because the project site is relatively flat and currently developed with a restaurant/bar and surface parking lot, the proposed project would not involve substantial grading. Therefore, no change in topography or ground surface relief features would occur, and the proposed project would neither create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet nor result in grading that affects subsurface sewage disposal systems. No impact to slopes would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

17. Soils				
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source:

United States Department of Agriculture. 2017. "Web Soil Survey." Last modified: August 21, 2017.
<https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>

Findings of Fact:

a) Temporary erosion could occur during construction of the proposed project. However, the proposed project would not involve substantial grading, and the project site is flat and is classified as a low runoff area (United States Department of Agriculture 2017). The project site is not considered

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

subject to wind erosion according to Riverside County Municipal Code Section 16.52.020. The proposed project would be required to comply with the federal Clean Water Act, including adherence to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) standards (Clean Water Act Section 402), which require implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the elimination or reduction of non-stormwater discharges during project construction activities. NPDES compliance would ensure that best management practices (BMPs) for erosion, sedimentation, and flooding are implemented during project construction, thereby minimizing or avoiding adverse impacts. In addition, during operation, the proposed project would be required to comply with Chapter 5.72 "Business Storm Water Compliance Program" of the County's Municipal Code, which requires the business to register with the County's stormwater compliance program. The proposed project would be required to undergo water quality inspections per Section 5.72.060 of the County's Municipal Code. Impacts related to soil erosion and/or the loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

b) Expansive soils are generally clays, which increase in volume when saturated and shrink when dried. Soils on-site are primarily San Emigdio fine sandy loams. Therefore, the proposed project would not be located on expansive soils, and impacts would be less than significant.

c) The project would be connected to the local wastewater treatment system and would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

18. Erosion

a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

United States Department of Agriculture. 2017. "Web Soil Survey." Last modified: August 21, 2017. <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>

United States Geological Survey. 2018. National Map Viewer – National Hydrography Dataset. <https://viewer.nationalmap.gov/advanced-viewer/>

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project site currently contains an existing restaurant/bar and surface parking lot with minimal areas of bare soil. No surface water bodies are on or adjacent to the project site; the nearest water body is Bautista Creek located approximately 0.2 mile to the east (United States Geological Survey 2018). Soils on the project site are classified as well drained (United States Department of Agriculture 2017).

The proposed project would include the demolition of existing uses and the construction of a convenience store and gas station. The proposed project would include landscaping that would cover approximately 33 percent of the project site, which would increase the amount of pervious surfaces on-site as compared to existing uses. Due to intervening residential and commercial development between the project site and Bautista Creek, the proposed project would not result in deposition, siltation, or

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

erosion that may modify the creek channel. In addition, the proposed project would not result in an increase in water erosion on- or off-site due to the increase in pervious surfaces that would reduce off-site flows and minimize potential erosion. Compliance with NPDES and County Municipal Code stormwater requirements discussed in Section 17, *Soils*, would reduce potential adverse erosion impacts during construction and operation to a less than significant level.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

19. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.

☐
☐
☒
☐

a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?

Sources:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.

<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

United States Department of Agriculture. 2017. "Web Soil Survey." Last modified: August 21, 2017.

<https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is rated "high" for wind erodibility, as shown in Figure S-8, "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map" of the County's General Plan (County of Riverside 2015). However, Chapter 16.52 of the County's Municipal Code lists areas that are considered subject to wind erosion. The soils on the project site are classified as Emigdio fine sandy loam, which are not considered subject to wind erosion according to the County's Municipal Code (United States Department of Agriculture 2017). Section 8.16.010 of the County's Municipal Code restricts owners of sand or sandy loam land from substantially disturbing the surface of the land by excavating, leveling, or cultivating, or by depositing or spreading a substantial amount of a similar soil on the land, or any other act likely to contribute to wind erosion of the land without providing sufficient protection at the time of disturbing the surface of the land. Protection such as wind-breaks, walls, fences vegetation, and watering are required in order to prevent the soil on the land from being eroded by a wind and blown onto a nearby property or road. Compliance with these requirements would reduce potential adverse impacts associated with wind erosion to a less than significant level.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project				
20. Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

County of Riverside. 2015. County of Riverside Climate Action Plan. December 2015. http://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general_plan_2016/climate_action_plan/CAP_120815.pdf?ver=2016-04-01-101221-240

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2010. GHG CEQA Significant Threshold Stakeholder Working Group #15. [http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-\(ghg\)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/year-2008-2009/ghg-meeting-15/ghg-meeting-15-minutes.pdf](http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/year-2008-2009/ghg-meeting-15/ghg-meeting-15-minutes.pdf)

Findings of Fact: In guidance provided by the SCAQMD's GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group in September 2010, SCAQMD considered a tiered approach to determine the significance of GHG emissions from residential and commercial projects. The draft tiered approach is outlined in meeting minutes dated September 29, 2010 (SCAQMD 2010).

- **Tier 1.** If the project is exempt from further environmental analysis under existing statutory or categorical exemptions, there is a presumption of less than significant impacts with respect to climate change. If not, then the Tier 2 threshold should be considered.
- **Tier 2.** Consists of determining whether or not the project is consistent with a GHG reduction plan that may be part of a local general plan, for example. The concept embodied in this tier is equivalent to the existing concept of consistency in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), 15125(d) or 15152(a). Under this Tier, if the proposed project is consistent with the qualifying local GHG reduction plan, it is not significant for GHG emissions. If there is not an adopted plan, then a Tier 3 approach would be appropriate.
- **Tier 3.** Establishes a screening significance threshold level to determine significance. The Working Group has provided a recommendation of 3,000 million tons (MT) of CO₂e per year for mixed use and residential projects.
- **Tier 4.** Establishes a service population threshold to determine significance. The Working Group has provided a recommendation of 4.8 MT of CO₂e per year for land use projects.

The proposed project is not categorically exempt from environmental analysis; therefore, the Tier 1 approach is not applicable. The County of Riverside Climate Action Plan (CAP) is a qualified GHG reduction plan as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 (County of Riverside 2015). Therefore, Tier 2 would be the most applicable approach, and this analysis evaluates the proposed project's GHG emissions in light of the County's CAP.

The CAP demonstrates achievement of GHG reduction targets set by AB 32 for 2020 and is therefore applicable to the proposed project, which would be operational in 2020. Appendix F of the CAP states that GHG emissions impacts from small projects are less than significant and do not need to use the GHG mitigation analysis provided in the CAP if the following two efficiency measures are implemented:

- Energy efficiency of at least five percent greater than 2010 Title 24 requirements, and

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

- Water conservation measures that match the California Green Building Code in effect as of January 2011

The CAP defines small projects as those that emit less than 3,000 MT of CO₂e per year (County of Riverside 2015). Therefore, if the proposed project emits less than 3,000 MT of CO₂e per year and incorporates the energy efficiency and water conservation measures required by the CAP, GHG emissions impacts would be less than significant.

Construction of the proposed project would result in approximately 245.2 MT of CO₂e. Following the SCAQMD's recommended methodology for amortizing construction emissions over a 30-year period (the assumed life of the project), construction of the proposed project would generate approximately 8.2 MT of CO₂e per year, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5 Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Year	Emissions (MT of CO ₂ e)
2019	246.0
2020	0.6
Total	246.6
Amortized over 30 Years	8.2 per year

Operation of the proposed project would result in GHG emissions associated with energy use (electricity and natural gas), solid waste disposal, water use, project-generated vehicle trips, and area sources (consumer products, landscape maintenance equipment, and painting). Table 6 summarizes the long-term GHG emissions generated by project operation, taking into account emissions generated by existing uses. Net operational GHG emissions would be approximately 134 MT of CO₂e per year.

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

Table 6 Total Annual GHG Emissions

Emission Source	Annual Emissions (MT/yr CO ₂ e)
Construction	8.2
Operational	
Area	< 0.1
Energy	12.7
Solid Waste	4.6
Water	1.7
Mobile	
CO ₂ and CH ₄	444.2
N ₂ O	12.7
Total Proposed Emissions	484.1
Existing Emissions	350.6
Net Emissions (Proposed - Existing)	133.5
<i>County of Riverside Threshold</i>	<i>3,000</i>
Threshold Exceeded?	No

As shown in Table 6, combined construction and operational net emissions would be approximately 134 MT of CO₂e per year. According to the CAP, the proposed project would qualify as a small project because GHG emissions would not exceed 3,000 MT of CO₂e per year. However, the proposed project does not include the required energy efficiency and water conservation measures required by the CAP for small projects. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 and GHG-2 would be required to ensure that the proposed project is consistent with the County's CAP. Impacts would be less than significant with the incorporated mitigation.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures have been adapted from the County of Riverside CAP to reflect the most current versions of the California Green Building Code and Title 24 requirements. As such, these mitigation measures are more stringent than those included in the CAP and would ensure that GHG emissions impacts would be less than significant.

GHG-1 Energy Efficiency. The proposed project design shall demonstrate energy efficiency of at least five percent greater than the 2016 Title 24 requirements.

GHG-2 Water Conservation Measures. The proposed project shall incorporate the water conservation measures for nonresidential projects included in the California Green Building Code (CalGreen) in effect as of September 2018 (i.e., CalGreen 2016).

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through the condition of approval clearance process with the review of building permits. The project applicant shall submit documentation to the County that demonstrates energy efficiency that exceeds 2010 Title 24 requirements by at least five percent. The

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

applicable water conservation measures for nonresidential projects from CalGreen 2010 shall be included as conditions of approval.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project				
21. Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2005. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective. April 2005. <https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf>
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2018. Envirostor. <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/> (accessed September 2018).
- Riverside, County of. 2018. "Underground Storage Tanks." Last modified: 2018. <http://www.rivcoeh.org/HazMat/ust>
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2006. "Quik Korner Deli." September 22, 2006. https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0606500569 (accessed September 2018).
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2018. "SEMS Search." June 8, 2018. <https://www.epa.gov/enviro/sems-search> (accessed September 2018).

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed project would construct a convenience store and gas station on-site. The transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during the construction of the project would be conducted in accordance with all applicable State and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22. Because the existing building located on the project site was constructed in the mid-1950s, the building may contain asbestos-containing materials (ACM), which would pose a potential hazard during demolition activities. However, demolition activities would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 1403, which requires testing, remediation procedures, and work practice requirements to limit asbestos emissions during demolition. In addition, as part of any removal of construction-generated hazardous waste from the project site,

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

hazardous waste generators are required to use a certified hazardous waste transportation company, which must ship hazardous waste to a permitted facility for treatment, storage, recycling, or disposal.

During operation, the gas station would require the routine transport of petroleum fuels to the project site to refuel the underground storage tanks (USTs) that would supply the fuel pumps. Fuel tanker trucks would utilize SR 74 to access the project site either directly or via New Chicago Avenue, both of which are suitable for truck travel. Truck drivers would be subject to federal and state requirements that regulate the transport of hazardous materials and the operation of fuel tanker trucks. On the project site, tanker trucks would transfer fuels to USTs, which would be permitted by the County of Riverside's Department of Environmental Health's Hazardous Materials Management Branch (HMMB). Permitting requires the submission of UST plans to the HMMB prior to installations, modifications, repairs, or removals. Although inadequate maintenance of USTs may result in leaks, CCR Title 23, Chapter 16 and Riverside County Ordinance 617 mandate regular monitoring, maintenance, and inspection of USTs, which would ensure the safe and appropriate operation of these facilities (County of Riverside 2018). Gas station patrons would regularly use hazardous materials while dispensing gasoline from fuel pumps. Refueling activities release benzene into the air; however, benzene emissions can be reduced by more than 90 percent by the vapor recovery systems required at fuel pumps. Nevertheless, benzene emissions may result in near source health risk (CARB 2005). CARB recommends siting sensitive land uses, such as residences, at least 50 feet from typical gasoline dispensing facilities and at least 300 feet from large gasoline dispensing facilities (i.e., facilities with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater) (CARB 2005). The proposed gas station would dispense approximately 1.8 million gallons of gas per year and would qualify as a typical gasoline dispensing facility, and fuel pumps would be located approximately 160 feet away from the nearest residence. Therefore, the proposed fuel pumps would be located outside the recommended buffer of 50 feet. Improper handling of gasoline and other auto-related chemicals on-site may result in spills. However, the transport, use and storage of hazardous materials would be required to comply with all applicable state and federal regulations, such as requirements that spills be cleaned up immediately and all wastes and spills control materials be properly disposed of at approved disposal facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public 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. Impacts will be less than significant.

c) The project applicant would be required to comply with applicable County codes and regulations pertaining to emergency response and evacuation plans maintained by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department and the Riverside County Fire Department. All construction activities and staging would occur on-site, and no street or lane closures would be required during construction. In addition, the proposed project would be located entirely on a site that is currently developed with urban uses and would not involve the development of structures that could potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, construction activities would not interfere with emergency response activities by the Riverside County Sheriff's and Fire Departments. Impacts related to emergency response plans and evacuation plans will be less than significant.

d) There are no existing or planned schools within one-quarter mile of the project site; the closest schools are Valle Vista Elementary School, located approximately 0.7 mile to the southeast, and Bautista Creek Elementary School, located approximately 0.7 mile to the northwest. As discussed above, the transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during the construction of the project would be conducted in accordance with all applicable State and federal laws, such as the Hazardous

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

Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22. Additionally, operation of the proposed project would be subject to state and federal regulations regarding the route transport and handling of hazardous materials as well as UST maintenance and monitoring. Therefore, there will be no impact related to hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste near local schools.

e) The following databases and listings compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 were checked on September 13, 2018 for known hazardous materials contamination at the project site:

- United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA)
 - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System / Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) / Envirofacts database search
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
 - GeoTracker search for leaking underground storage tanks (LUST) and other cleanup sites
- Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
 - Envirostor database for hazardous waste facilities or known contamination sites

The project site is not located on a known hazardous or contaminated site. The SEMS database search did not produce any results associated with the project site, and a search of the Envirostor database did not identify any facilities or other cleanup sites within 0.25 mile of the project site (U.S. EPA 2018, DTSC 2018). A search of the Geotracker database identified one hazardous materials cleanup site, Quik Korner Deli, within 0.25 mile of the project site. The Quik Korner Deli site, which is immediately east of the project site across New Chicago Avenue, is a former Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Cleanup Site, which was completed and closed as of September 22, 2006 (SWRCB 2006). Therefore, impacts related to hazardous material sites will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

22. Airports				
a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

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

Riverside, County of. 2004. Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan – Volume 1. October 14, 2004. <http://www.rcaluc.org/Plans/New-Compatibility-Plan>

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015. <http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a-d) According to Figure S-20 “Airport Locations” of the Riverside County General Plan, the project site is not located in the vicinity of any public or private airstrips (County of Riverside 2015). The closest airport is the Hemet-Ryan Airport, located approximately 6.4 miles west of the project site. The project site is not located within any of the compatibility zones for the Hemet-Ryan Airport (County of Riverside 2004). Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan or require review by the Airport Land Use Commission. Due to its distance from the Hemet-Ryan Airport, the proposed project would not result in an airport-related safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

23. Hazardous Fire Area

a) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

☐
☐
☐
☒

Sources:

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2009. *Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LA As Recommended by CAL FIRE – Western Riverside County* [map]. Tabular digital data and vector digital data. 1:150,000. December 24, 2009. http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/riverside_west/fhszl_map.60.pdf

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015. <http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is currently developed and located in a developed urban area. According to Figure S-11 “Wildfire Susceptibility” of the Riverside County General Plan, the project site is not located in a very high fire hazard severity zone area as defined by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE; CAL FIRE 2009). Accordingly, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project				
24. Water Quality Impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) 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 or odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2008. Flood Map No. 06065C2110G. August 28, 2008.
 Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>
 United States Geological Survey. 2018. National Map Viewer – National Hydrography Dataset.
<https://viewer.nationalmap.gov/advanced-viewer/>

Findings of Fact:

a-b, g) The project site currently contains an existing restaurant/bar and surface parking lot with minimal areas of bare soil. No surface water bodies are on or adjacent to the project site; the nearest water body is Bautista Creek located approximately 0.2 mile to the east (United States Geological Survey 2018). The proposed project would include the demolition of existing uses and the construction of a convenience store and gas station. The proposed project would include landscaping that would cover approximately 33 percent of the project site, which would increase the amount of pervious surfaces on-site as compared to existing uses. The increase in pervious surfaces would reduce off-site flows. Due to intervening residential and commercial development between the project site and Bautista Creek and the increase in pervious surfaces, the proposed project would not

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

substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, and impacts would be less than significant.

As discussed in Section 17, *Soils*, construction of the proposed project would be required to comply with the federal Clean Water Act, including adherence to NPDES standards (Clean Water Act Section 402), and with Chapter 5.72 "Business Storm Water Compliance Program" of the County's Municipal Code. In addition, the proposed project would also be required to comply with Section 13.12.060 of the County's Municipal Code, which requires redevelopment projects to control stormwater runoff to prevent any deterioration of water quality. Section 13.12.060 also requires commercial facilities to comply with Ordinance Nos. 457 and 857, California Water Code Sections 13000 (Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act) and Title 33 United States Code Sections 1251 (Clean Water Act). Compliance with these requirements would reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level.

c) The proposed project would not construct groundwater wells or pumping facilities. As discussed in Section 46, *Water*, operation of the proposed convenience store and gas station would reduce on-site water demand by approximately 2.1 acre-feet per year as compared to existing uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly result in an exceedance of safe yield or a significant depletion of groundwater supplies. Therefore any impacts would be less than significant.

d) Since the site is currently paved, the proposed project would not result in an increase in stormwater runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems, and impacts would be less than significant.

e-f) The project site is located in "Zone X," an area between the limits of the 100-year floodplain and the 500-year floodplain (Federal Emergency Management Agency 2008). Therefore, the proposed project would not place housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore there is no impact.

h) The proposed project does not include any new or retrofitted Stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as water quality treatment basins or constructed treatment wetlands, that would result in significant environmental effects such as increased vectors or odors. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

25. Floodplains

Degree of Suitability in 100-Year Floodplains. As indicated below, the appropriate Degree of Suitability has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable ☒ U - Generally Unsuitable ☐ R - Restricted ☐

a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>
 United States Geological Survey. 2018. National Map Viewer – National Hydrography Dataset.
<https://viewer.nationalmap.gov/advanced-viewer/>

Findings of Fact:

a-b, d) The project site currently contains an existing restaurant/bar and surface parking lot with minimal areas of bare soil. Figure S-9, "Special Flood Hazard Areas" of the County's General Plan shows that the project site is not located in a Special Flood Hazard Area. No surface water bodies are on or adjacent to the project site; the nearest water body is Bautista Creek located approximately 0.2 mile to the east (United States Geological Survey 2018).

The proposed project would include the demolition of existing uses and the construction of a convenience store and gas station. The proposed project would include landscaping that would cover approximately 33 percent of the project site, which would increase the amount of pervious surfaces on-site as compared to existing uses. The increase in pervious surfaces would reduce off-site flows. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in flooding on- or off-site, would not change the absorption rate of the site or the rate and amount of surface runoff, and would not change the amount of surface water in any water body. No impacts would occur.

c) Figure S-10, "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," of the County's General Plan shows that the project site is not located in a Dam Hazard Zone. Therefore, the failure of a dam would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

26. Land Use				
a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

Hemet, City of. 2012. 2030 General Plan. January 24, 2012.
<http://www.cityofhemet.org/index.aspx?NID=534>

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

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project site is designated Commercial Retail in the Riverside County General Plan. The Commercial Retail land use designation permits commercial retail uses at a neighborhood, community, and regional level, as well as professional office and tourist-oriented commercial uses (County of Riverside 2015). The project site is also located within the City of Hemet's Sphere of Influence and is designated Community Commercial in the City of Hemet General Plan. The Community Commercial designation permits general retail, markets, commercial services, restaurants, lodging, commercial recreation, professional offices, and financial institutions that are designed to serve the needs of the community at large (City of Hemet 2012). The project site currently contains a restaurant/bar and a surface parking lot and is located along SR 74. The proposed project would demolish these uses and would construct a convenience store and a gas station on-site. Therefore, the land use on-site would remain commercial retail use, and the proposed development would be consistent with development typically located along highways. Accordingly, the proposed project would not result in a substantial alteration of the present land use and would not affect land use within the City of Hemet's Sphere of Influence. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

27. Planning				
a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>
 _____. 2018. Riverside County Code of Ordinances. August 30, 2018.
https://library.municode.com/ca/riverside_county/codes/code_of_ordinances

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is zoned C-P-S (Scenic Highway Commercial). The proposed project would construct a convenience store and gas station and would not change the existing zoning. According to Section 9.50(A) of the County's Zoning Ordinance, parking lots are a permitted use in the C-P-S zone. According to Section 9.50(b) of the County's Zoning Code, gasoline service stations, convenience

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

stores including the sale of motor vehicle fuel, and underground bulk fuel storage tanks are permitted in the C-P-S zone provided that a Conditional Use Permit has been granted. The proposed project would be consistent with the allowable building height of 35 feet and the minimum front yard setback of 50 feet. According to Section 9.53(E), all roof-mounted equipment on structures in the C-P-S zone must be screened from the ground elevation view to a minimum sight distance of 1,320 feet. The plans for the proposed project includes parapets that would screen rooftop heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment. As such, impacts related to the existing zoning will be less than significant with the incorporated mitigation.

b-c) The parcel immediately to the west is zoned C-P-S and currently contains a vacant lot. The parcel immediately to the east is zoned C-P-S and currently contains a gas station and convenience store. Because the proposed project would construct a similar use to the eastern parcel and would be consistent with the C-P-S zoning, the proposed project would be compatible with the zoning designations and land uses to the west and east. The parcels immediately south of the project site are zoned R-1 (One-Family Dwellings) and currently contain single-family residences. As discussed in Section 3, *Other Lighting Issues*, Section 6, *Air Quality Impacts*, Section 21, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, and Section 33, *Noise Impacts by the Project*, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts related to lighting, air emissions, hazardous materials, and noise with the incorporated mitigation on the nearby residences. Therefore, impacts related to the existing surrounding zoning and existing and planned land uses will be less than significant.

d) The project site is designated Commercial Retail in the Riverside County General Plan. The Commercial Retail land use designation permits commercial retail uses at a neighborhood, community, and regional level, as well as professional office and tourist-oriented commercial uses. The following policies for commercial land use designations from the Land Use Element of the County's General Plan are applicable to the proposed project:

LU 29.3: *Site buildings along sidewalks, pedestrian areas, and bicycle routes and include amenities that encourage pedestrian activity.*

No designated bicycle routes exist in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Sidewalks are located on the northeastern corner of the project site; however, these sidewalks are limited and do not extend along the entire length of the northern and eastern frontages of the project site. The proposed project will include construction of sidewalks along these frontages and provide a pedestrian walkway to the building from Florida Ave, therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with Policy LU 29.3.

LU 29.5: *Concentrate commercial uses near transportation facilities and high density residential areas and require the incorporate of facilities to promote the use of public transit, such as bus turnouts.*

The proposed project would be located along SR 74 and would be within 145 feet of the Florida & New Chicago Avenue bus stop for Riverside Transit Agency Route 27.

LU 29.6: *Require that commercial projects abutting residential properties protect the residential use from the impacts of noise, light, fumes, odors, vehicular traffic, parking, and operational hazards.*

The proposed commercial project would abut single-family residential properties to the south. As discussed in Section 3, *Other Lighting Issues*, and Section 33, *Noise Effects by the Project*, the proposed project would not result in significant lighting or noise impacts. In addition, the convenience store building would be located on the southern portion of the site, which would block the line of sight

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

between residences and the proposed gas station, thereby reducing noise and light generated by the proposed project. Vehicle circulation and parking would occur at least 30 feet from the nearest residence, and the two access driveways would be constructed on the northern edge and the central portion of the eastern edge of the project site, which would ensure that vehicular traffic does not queue near existing residences. As discussed in Section 6, *Air Quality Impacts*, the project site could be considered a source of unpleasant odors by some given its proposed use; however, as discussed in Section 6, *Air Quality Impacts*, SCAQMD has stringent requirements for the control of gasoline vapor emissions from gasoline dispensing facilities and for odor-producing uses as set forth in SCAQMD Rules 461 and 402, respectively. With regards to fumes, CARB recommends siting sensitive land uses, such as residences, at least 50 feet from typical gasoline dispensing facilities (CARB 2005). The proposed fuel pumps would be located approximately 160 feet away from the nearest residence; therefore, fuel pumps would be located outside the recommended buffer of 50 feet. As discussed in Section 21, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, the proposed project would be subject to state and federal regulations regarding the route transport and handling of hazardous materials as well as UST maintenance and monitoring. Therefore, the proposed project would protect adjacent residential uses from the impacts of noise, light, fumes, odors, vehicular traffic, parking, and operational hazards.

LU 29.7: *Require that adequate and available circulation facilities, water resources, and sewer facilities exist to meet the demands of the proposed land use.*

The proposed project would demolish an existing restaurant/bar and would construct a convenience store and gas station. The project site is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of New Chicago Avenue and SR 74 and would be served by existing roadways. As discussed in Sections 46 through 49 under *Utility and Service Systems*, the proposed project would decrease water demand as well as wastewater and solid waste generation as compared to existing uses. Therefore, adequate and available circulation facilities, water resources, and sewer facilities exist to meet the demands of the proposed land use.

LU 29.9: *Require that commercial development be designed to consider their surrounding and visually enhance, not degrade, the character of the surrounding area.*

As discussed in Section 1, *Scenic Resources*, the proposed project would not substantially alter the overall aesthetics of the existing environment because the proposed project would replace an existing restaurant/bar with a convenience store and gas station and would be similar in visual character to the Quik Korner gas station and convenience market located immediately east of the project site across New Chicago Avenue. In addition, the proposed project would replace a run-down and poorly-maintained restaurant/bar with a new convenience store and gas station that would include landscaping in the northeastern and southern portions of the project site (see Figure 2 and Figure 3 for existing on-site conditions). As discussed in Section 3, *Other Lighting Issues*, the proposed project would not expose residences to substantial new sources of nighttime lighting above that created by existing uses, including the Quick Korner gas station and convenience market to the east and the pharmacy to the north. Therefore, the proposed project would enhance, not degrade, the visual character of the surrounding area as compared to existing use.

In general, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable General Plan policies for the Commercial Retail land use designation. Accordingly, impacts related to consistency with the County of Riverside General Plan land use designation and policies will be less than significant.

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

e) The proposed project would redevelop a parcel that currently contains urban land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not disrupt or divided the physical arrangement of an established community, and there will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

28. Mineral Resources				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a-b, d) According to Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-6, "Mineral Resources Area," the project site is classified as MRZ-3, an area where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist although the significance of the deposit is undetermined. The proposed project would involve the demolition of an existing restaurant/bar on-site and the construction of a convenience store and gas station. The project site is located in a suburban area that is largely developed with commercial and residential uses and is zoned for commercial use. No mining activities are currently occurring on-site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is of value on a statewide, regional, or local level; no impact would occur.

c) Policy OS 14.2 of the Riverside General Plan restricts incompatible land uses within the impact area of existing or potential surface mining areas. The project site is located in a commercial and residential area. The closest active mine is located approximately two miles south of the project site, and no abandoned mines are located in the project vicinity (County of Riverside 2015). Therefore, the proposed project would not be an incompatible land use adjacent to a surface mine and would not expose people to hazards from quarries or mines. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

NOISE Would the project result in

Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings

Where indicated below, the appropriate Noise Acceptability Rating(s) has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable

A - Generally Acceptable

B - Conditionally Acceptable

C - Generally Unacceptable

D - Land Use Discouraged

29. Airport Noise

a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐

b) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐

Sources:

Riverside, County of. 2004. Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. October 14, 2004.

<http://www.rcaluc.org/Portals/0/PDFGeneral/plan/newplan/01-%20Cover%20&%20Title%20Page%20Vol%201.pdf>

_____. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.

<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a-b) According to Figure S-20, "Airport Locations" of the County's General Plan, the project site is located approximately seven miles from the Hemet-Ryan Airport and is outside the noise contours for this airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not be impacted by noise generated by the operation of the Hemet-Ryan airport. No private airstrips exist in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, no airport noise impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

30. Railroad Noise

NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐

Source:

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.

<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

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

According to Figure C-1, "Circulation Plan," of the County's General Plan, no railways exist in the vicinity of the project site. The closest railway station is the Perris-Downtown Metrolink Station located approximately 19 miles west of the project site. Therefore, no railroad noise impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

31. Highway Noise

NA ☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Sources:

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2016. 2016 Annual Average Daily Truck Traffic on the California State Highway System.

http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/census/docs/2016_aadt_truck.pdf

Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. May 2006.

Accessed August 2016. Available online at:

https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf

Riverside, County of. 2015a. General Plan Noise Element Appendix I: Noise Element Data. Available:

http://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general_plan_2016/appendices/Appendix%20I-1_120815.pdf?ver=2016-04-01-142032-867

_____. 2015b. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.

<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

The dominant source of noise in the project area is traffic on SR 74 and New Chicago Avenue. The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips and increase traffic on area roadways. As discussed in Section 43, *Circulation*, full buildout of the project would generate approximately 1,023 daily trips, including 124 trips during the AM peak hour and 94 trips during the PM peak hour.

All vehicle trips would access the project site via SR 74 or New Chicago Avenue. To assess the effect of new vehicle trips, roadway noise at sensitive receptors along SR 74, New Chicago Avenue, and Lake Street were modeled under existing and existing plus project conditions using the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Day Night average level (DNL) Calculator, which utilizes the DNL method that adds 10 dBA to actual nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) noise levels to account for greater sensitivity to noise during that time period. DNL was used to analyze project impacts from roadway noise on nearby sensitive receptors. Because the County of Riverside does not have specific noise standards for mobile sources, this analysis relies on the recommendations of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for the allowable increase in roadway noise exposure due to a project. The project would have a significant effect if it would increase roadway noise levels beyond the recommended noise exposure increases in Table 7.

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

Table 7 Significance of Changes in Operational Roadway Noise Exposure

Existing Noise Exposure (dBA Ldn or Leq)	Noise Exposure Increase Significance Threshold (dBA Ldn or Leq)
45-50	7
50-55	5
55-60	3
60-65	2
65-74	1
75+	0

Source: FTA 2006.

According to the County of Riverside General Plan Appendix I (Noise Element Data), the vehicle mix for secondary roadways (i.e., New Chicago Avenue and Lake Street) in the County is 97.4 percent cars, 1.84 percent medium trucks, and 0.74 percent heavy trucks (County of Riverside 2015). In addition, the night fraction of ADT for secondary roadways in the County is 11.47 percent (10.22 percent cars, 0.9 percent medium trucks, and 0.35 percent heavy trucks) (County of Riverside 2015a and 2015b, Figure C-1). Because the DNL Calculator only permits whole numbers for the night fraction, a conservative night fraction estimate of 12 percent (10 percent cars, 1 percent medium trucks, and 1 percent heavy trucks) was used.

The vehicle mix for the segment of SR 74 closest to the project site is approximately 88.0 percent cars, 9.4 percent medium trucks, and 2.6 heavy trucks (Caltrans 2016). In addition, the night fraction of ADT for major roadways (i.e., SR 74) in the County is 13.6 percent (9.6 percent cars, 1.5 percent medium trucks, and 2.5 percent heavy trucks) (County of Riverside 2015a). Because the DNL Calculator only permits whole numbers for the night fraction, a conservative night fraction estimate of 15 percent (10 percent cars, 2 percent medium trucks, and 3 percent heavy trucks) was used.

As shown in Table 8, existing roadway noise is approximately 72 dBA Ldn on SR 74 and approximately 66 dBA Ldn on New Chicago Avenue. Because existing roadway noise on both SR 74 and New Chicago Avenue falls within the range of 65 to 74 dBA Ldn, an increase of 1 dBA due to project-related traffic would be considered significant (see Table 7). As shown in Table 8, the proposed project would not generate an increase in roadway noise that exceeds this threshold. Therefore, traffic noise impacts would be less than significant.

Table 8 Existing and Existing Plus Project Traffic Noise

Roadway Segment	Noise Level (dBA Ldn)			Significance Threshold ¹ (dBA Ldn)	Threshold Exceeded?
	Existing [1]	Existing Plus Project [2]	Change in Noise Level [2] – [1]		
SR 74 (New Chicago Avenue to Lake Street)	71.7	71.8	+0.1	1	No
New Chicago Avenue (south of SR 74)	65.6	65.8	+0.2	1	No

See Appendix C for HUD DNL Calculator worksheets.

¹ See Table 7.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

32. Other Noise

NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Findings of Fact: All project-related noise impacts are discussed in Sections 29 through 31 and Section 33. No impact related to other noise sources would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

33. Noise Effects by the Project

a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2016. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2.

Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc. 2017. Midpoint at 237 Loading Dock Noise Study. Available: <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/28907>

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2006. Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM).

_____. 2017. "Noise Barrier Design – Visual Quality." Last modified: June 28, 2017.

https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/noise/noise_barriers/design_construction/keepdown.cfm (accessed May 2018).

Gordon Bricken & Associates. 1996. *Acoustical Analysis Addendum to the Adopted EIR Disneyland Resort City of Anaheim. Table 16: Reference Parking Lot Levels*, p. 38. February 26, 1996.

Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. 2009. Wal-Mart Expansion, Williamson Ranch Plaza (Antioch, California) Environmental Noise Assessment. Available:

<http://www.ci.antioch.ca.us/CityGov/CommDev/PlanningDivision/docs/Walmart/DEIR-VOLII-APPENDICES-C-H/Appendix%20G%20Noise%20Assessment.pdf>

7-Eleven SWC New Chicago Ave and Florida Ave Noise Impact Study, Riverside County CA. August 18, 2018. MD Acoustics.

Findings of Fact:

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

a) A noise measurement was conducted on-site by Rincon Consultants, Inc. on September 7, 2018. The results of the noise measurement are shown in Table 9. The most common source of noise in the project site vicinity is vehicular traffic on SR 74 and New Chicago Avenue. Motor vehicle noise, primarily from cars and trucks, is of concern because it is characterized by a high number of individual events, which often create sustained noise levels. Ambient noise levels are generally highest during the daytime and rush hour unless congestion substantially slows speeds.

Table 9 Project Noise Monitoring Results

Measurement Location	Measurement Location	Sample Time	Approximate Distance to Primary Noise Source	Leq[15] ¹ (dBA)	Lmin (dBA)	Lmax (dBA)
1	Center of Project Site	11:16 - 11:31 a.m.	150 feet	64.4	46.8	83.8

See Appendix C for noise monitoring data.

¹ The equivalent noise level (Leq) is defined as the single steady A-weighted level that is equivalent to the same amount of energy as that contained in the actual fluctuating levels over a period of time (essentially, the average noise level). For this measurement, the Leq was over a 10-minute period (Leq[10]).

Source: Rincon Consultants, Inc. field measurements on September 7, 2018 using an ANSI Type II Integrating sound level meter

The Noise Element of the County's General Plan lists noise-sensitive receptors as schools, hospitals, reset homes, long term care facilities, mental care facilities, residential uses, places of worship, libraries, and passive recreation areas (County of Riverside 2015). The closest noise-sensitive receptors to the project site are single-family residences located immediately adjacent to the project site's southern boundary.

The Noise study for the project utilized the quietest hourly level (during Daytime and nighttime levels) and has compared the project's projected noise levels to said quietest ambient noise. The quietest daytime hourly level occurred between 3PM to 4PM. The quietest nighttime level occurred between 2AM and 3AM. The Noise study found that the project is anticipated to change the noise up to 0.2 dBA CNEL. It takes a change of 3dB or more to hear a perceptible difference. The change in noise level is less than significant as the noise increase is nominal (less than a 3 dBA change.) Therefore, permanent impacts to ambient noise levels would be less than significant.

b) Construction noise was estimated using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM) (2006). RCNM predicts construction noise levels for a variety of construction operations based on empirical data and the application of acoustical propagation formulas. RCNM provides reference noise levels for standard construction equipment, with an attenuation of 6 dBA per doubling of distance for stationary equipment and 3 dBA per doubling of distance for mobile equipment. The model does not take into consideration topographic variation or staging locations of construction equipment; therefore, this analysis represents a conservative evaluation of anticipated construction noise levels. Construction equipment modeled was based on default construction equipment lists provided by CalEEMod (see Appendix A).

shows the equipment assumed to be used during each construction phase, as well as the average hourly noise levels (dBA Leq) at distance of 10 feet from the source (i.e., the distance to the nearest noise-sensitive receptor). Construction noise estimates are based on the assumption that multiple pieces of construction equipment would operate simultaneously, and do not account for the presence

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

of intervening structures or topography, which could reduce noise at receptor locations. Therefore, the noise levels presented in represent a reasonably conservative estimate of actual construction noise.

Table 10 Construction Noise Levels by Phase

Construction Phase	Equipment	10 feet from Source	
		dBA Leq	dBA Lmax
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws, Rubber Tired Dozer, Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (3)	98.9	103.6
Site Preparation	Tractor/Loader/Backhoe, Grader, Rubber Tired Dozer	97.2	99.0
Grading	Excavator, Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (3), Grader, Dozer	98.8	99.0
Building Construction	Crane, Forklift, Tractor/Loader/Backhoe, Generator, Welders (3)	95.3	94.6
Paving	Cement and Mortar Mixer, Paver, Roller, Tracker/Loader/Backhoe, Paving Equipment	95.0	94.0
Architectural Coating	Air Compressor	87.7	91.6

See Appendix C for RCNM data sheets.

As shown in , construction would generate noise levels of up to approximately 99 dBA Leq and 104 dBA Lmax at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor. Policy N 13.4 of the County's General Plan requires that all construction equipment utilizes noise reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer, which would reduce construction noise (County of Riverside 2015). Adherence to construction hours as specified in Section 9.52.020(l) of the County's Municipal Code would ensure that project construction does not occur during noise-sensitive hours. Therefore, construction noise impacts would be less than significant with compliance with these existing requirements.

c) Traffic noise along Florida Avenue and New Chicago Avenue will be the main source of noise impacting the project site and the surrounding area.

A worst-case project generated traffic noise level was modeled utilizing the FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model FHWA-RD-77-108. Traffic noise levels were calculated 50 feet from the centerline of the analyzed roadway. The modeling is theoretical and does not take into account any existing barriers, structures, and/or topographical features that may further reduce noise levels. Therefore, the levels are shown for comparative purposes only to show the difference in with and without conditions. In addition, the noise contours for 60, 65 and 70 dBA CNEL were calculated. The potential off-site noise impacts caused by an increase of traffic from operation of the proposed project on the nearby roadways were calculated for the following scenarios.

Existing Year (without Project): This scenario refers to existing year traffic noise conditions.

Existing Year (Plus Project): This scenario refers to existing year + project noise conditions.

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

Table 3 compares the without and with scenario and shows the change in traffic noise levels as a result of the proposed project. It takes a change of 3dB or more to hear a perceptible difference. As demonstrated in Table 3, the project is anticipated to change the noise to to 0.2 dBA CNEL. Although there is a nominal increase along these two roadways, the proposed increase would still be below the 65dBA CNEL residential standard at any off-site receptors. As shown in Table 3, the Existing Plus Project 65dBA contour would extend an additional 1 from the centerline for the New Chicago Avenue.

The change in noise level is less than significant as the noise increase is nominal (less than a 3-dBA change.) No further mitigation is required.

Table 3: Existing Scenario - Noise Levels Along Roadways (dBA CNEL)

Existing Without Project Exterior Noise Levels

Roadway	Segment	CNEL at 50 Ft (dBA)	Distance to Contour (Ft)			
			70 dBA CNEL	65 dBA CNEL	60 dBA CNEL	55 dBA CNEL
Florida Avenue	Florida Avenue to Lake Street	76.6	231	731	2,310	7,305
Florida Avenue	Lake Street to New Chicago Ave	76.0	199	630	1,993	6,302
Florida Avenue	New Chicago to Ramona Expy	75.8	189	597	1,887	5,968
New Chicago Avenue	Ramona Expy to Florida Ave	59.8	5	16	49	155
New Chicago Avenue	South of Florida Ave	60.2	5	17	54	172

Existing With Project Exterior Noise Levels

Roadway	Segment	CNEL at 50 Ft (dBA)	Distance to Contour (Ft)			
			70 dBA CNEL	65 dBA CNEL	60 dBA CNEL	55 dBA CNEL
Florida Avenue	Florida Avenue to Lake Street	76.7	236	745	2,355	7,448
Florida Avenue	Lake Street to New Chicago Ave	76.1	204	645	2,038	6,446
Florida Avenue	New Chicago to Ramona Expy	75.9	193	611	1,933	6,111
New Chicago Avenue	Ramona Expy to Florida Ave	60.1	5	16	52	164
New Chicago Avenue	South of Florida Ave	60.4	6	18	57	180

Change in Existing Noise Levels as a Result of Project

Roadway ¹	Segment	CNEL at 50 Feet dBA ²			
		Existing Without Project	Existing With Project	Change in Noise Level	Potential Significant Impact
Florida Avenue	Florida Avenue to Lake Street	76.6	76.7	0.1	No
Florida Avenue	Lake Street to New Chicago Ave	76.0	76.1	0.1	No
Florida Avenue	New Chicago to Ramona Expy	75.8	75.9	0.1	No
New Chicago Avenue	Ramona Expy to Florida Ave	59.8	60.1	0.2	No
New Chicago Avenue	South of Florida Ave	60.2	60.4	0.2	No

Notes:
¹ Exterior noise levels calculated at 5 feet above ground level.
² Noise levels calculated from centerline of subject roadway.

Section 9.52.020(l) of the County's Municipal Code exempts construction noise from private construction projects located within 0.25 mile of residences provided that construction does not occur from 6:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. during the months of June through September or from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. during the months of October through May. As noted in the analysis previously in b) the construction from the project is anticipated to generate noise to nearby sensitive receptors. However, this noise is temporary and pursuant to the exemption for construction noise would be less than significant.

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

The primary on-site noise sources associated with operation of the proposed project would include vehicle circulation noise (e.g., engine startups, alarms, parking) and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment. These noise sources would be similar to those generated by the existing commercial use. However, the proposed project would involve a convenience store with rooftop HVAC equipment and associated parking on the southern portion of the site that would move noise sources closer to residences as compared to the existing restaurant/bar.

Section 9.52.040 of the County's Municipal Code prohibits the creation of noise that would cause the sound level at the adjacent noise-sensitive residences to exceed 55 dBA between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Section 9.52.020(L) of the County's Municipal Code exempts noise from heating and air conditioning equipment from these noise standards.

Nearby residences would be exposed to noise from parking lot activities on the project site. The major noise sources associated with parking lot activities include moving cars, engine start-ups, door slams, radios, car alarms, and tire squeals (human conversations are generally dominated by other sources of vehicle noise in a parking lot). Parking lot activity would generate instantaneous noise levels up to 66 dBA Lmax at 100 feet from the source (Gordon Bricken & Associates 1996). The closest on-site parking stall is located approximately 50 feet from the nearest residential property line south of the project site. Based on an attenuation rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance, the nearest residential property would be exposed to noise levels up to approximately 72 dBA Lmax at 50 feet from the source in the absence of any intervening barriers. However, the existing wall located on the northern boundary of adjacent residential properties would break the line of sight between the parking lot and residences, reducing noise by approximately 5 dBA to approximately 67 dBA Lmax. Furthermore, peak noise levels from parking lot noise would be intermittent and when averaged over a one-hour period would not exceed ambient noise levels on the site, which are dominated by traffic noise (see Table 8). Therefore, parking lot noise from the proposed project would not be expected to substantially increase existing noise levels at nearby receptors or adversely affect nearby residences.

A refueling area for the gas station's underground storage tanks would be located in the northeast portion of the project site (Figure 3). Tanker trucks would use this area for refueling activities. Noise-generating activities associated with refueling typically include engine noise (start up and stopping), backup alarms, air brakes, uploading/offloading activities, and idling engines. The noise sensitive receptor nearest to the refueling and loading areas are single-family residences south of the project site, approximately 165 feet from the refueling area. Delivery trucks are assumed to generate a noise level of approximately 68 dBA Lmax at 30 feet from the source (Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc. 2017). Based on an attenuation rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance, the maximum anticipated noise levels from tanker trucks at the nearest sensitive receptor would be approximately 53 dBA Lmax in the absence of any intervening barriers. This noise level would be further reduced by approximately 5 dBA by the existing wall adjacent to residences to the south, which would block the line-of-sight between the residence and the proposed project (FHWA 2017). Therefore, noise from tanker trucks would not exceed the County's sound level standards of 55 dBA between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. In addition, noise from tanker, delivery, and haul trucks would be intermittent and of short duration.

HVAC equipment would be included on the convenience market. This equipment typically has noise shielding cabinets, is placed on the roof or within mechanical equipment rooms, and is not usually a

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

significant source of noise. Noise from HVAC equipment ranges from 60 to 70 dBA Leq at 15 feet from the source (Illingworth & Rodkin 2009). For a conservative estimate, this analysis assumes that HVAC equipment generates a noise level of 70 dBA Leq at 15 feet from the source. Based on the project site plans, the convenience market would be located approximately 45 feet north of the nearest residential property line. Based on standard noise attenuation of 6 dBA per doubling of distance, noise from HVAC equipment would be approximately 61 dBA Leq at the nearest noise sensitive receptor. As discussed in Section 27, *Planning*, the proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure PL-1, which requires screening of HVAC equipment to ensure compliance with Section 9.53(E) of the County's Zoning Code. Screening typically reduces HVAC noise by at least 5 dBA; therefore, HVAC equipment noise at the nearest residence would be approximately 56 dBA Leq. Section 9.52.020(L) of the County's Municipal Code exempts noise from heating and air conditioning equipment from the noise standards set forth in Section 9.52.040. Therefore, noise from HVAC equipment would be less than significant.

Because the proposed project would not add substantial new sources of noise, operation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial permanent or periodic increase in ambient noise levels and would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance. Operational noise impacts would be less than significant.

d) Construction activity associated with the project would create groundborne vibration. Operation of the proposed project would not generate significant ground-borne vibration because the convenience store and gas station would not require the use of heavy industrial machinery. Therefore, this analysis considers vibration impacts only from project construction only.

The County of Riverside has not adopted a significance threshold to assess vibration impacts during construction and operation. Therefore, the FTA guidelines set forth in the *FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Assessment* (2006), are used to evaluate potential impacts related to construction vibration for both potential building damage and human annoyance. Based on the FTA criteria, construction vibration impacts would be significant if vibration levels exceed 102 VdB, which is the general threshold where damage can occur to buildings, or 72 VdB at residences during nighttime hours (FTA 2006).

Vibration levels were calculated at sensitive receptors using the vibration level of the highest impact pieces of equipment that would be used during project construction. lists ground-borne vibration levels from a large dozer, loaded truck, and vibratory roller at 10 feet from the source (i.e., the distance to closest sensitive receptor).

Table 11 Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment	Vibration Level at 10 Feet (VdB)
Large Dozer	99
Loaded Truck	98
Vibratory Roller	106

As shown in , project construction would generate vibration levels that would exceed 72 VdB at the nearest residences; however, construction activities would be prohibited between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. as per Section 15.04.020(F)(1) of the County's Municipal Code. Compliance with the City's permitted hours of construction would ensure that adjacent noise-sensitive residential receptors

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

are not disturbed by construction vibration during nighttime sleep hours. Nonetheless, project construction would generate peak vibration levels of approximately 106 VdB at the nearest receptors, which would exceed the general threshold where damage can occur to buildings (102 VdB). Therefore, impacts from vibration would be potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure N-2 would require the use of a non-vibratory roller in order to reduce construction vibration to acceptable levels. Therefore, construction vibration impacts would be less than significant with incorporated mitigation.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures would ensure that noise and vibration generated by construction of the proposed project would not adversely impact adjacent residences and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

- N-1 Construction Hour Restrictions.** Construction of the proposed project shall not occur from 6:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. during the months of June through September or from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. during the months of October through May.
- N-2 Use of Non-Vibratory or Pneumatic Tired Rollers.** Construction activities shall use non-vibratory smooth wheel rollers or pneumatic tired rollers instead of vibratory rollers in order to reduce potentially significant groundborne vibration impacts on residences to the south of the project site.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through the condition of approval clearance process with the review of building permits.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

34. Paleontological Resources

- a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?

☐
☒
☐
☐

Sources:

Rincon Consultants, Inc (Rincon). 2018. 43271 State Highway 74 Project Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program. August 2018.

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

- a) Figure OS-8, "Paleontological Sensitivity," of the County's General Plan classifies the project site as "High" for paleontological sensitivity. Policy OS 19.6 requires that project sites with high paleontological sensitivity undergo a paleontological resource impact mitigation program (PRIMP) that must be filed with the County Geologist prior to site grading. According to the site-specific PRIMP prepared by Rincon in August 2018, the paleontological sensitivity of the geologic units mapped in the project site is low at ground surface and increases to high at four feet below ground surface (Rincon 2018, Appendix D). Due to the high paleontological sensitivity of the geologic deposits that underlie the project site, impacts to paleontological resources would be potentially significant if ground disturbance exceeds four feet in depth. Mitigation Measure PR-1 would reduce impacts to paleontological resources by ensuring that adequate construction monitoring occurs and that any paleontological resources discovered over the course of construction are handled in a suitable manner. Ground-disturbing

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

activities that do not exceed four feet in depth would not require paleontological monitoring. Impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant with incorporated mitigation.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measure would ensure that the proposed project does not adversely impact buried paleontological resources and would reduce impacts to paleontological resources to a less than significant level.

PR-1 Compliance with the PRIMP. This site is mapped in the County's General Plan as having a High potential for paleontological resources (fossils). Proposed project site grading/earthmoving activities could potentially impact this resource. HENCE:

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS:

1. The applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist approved by the County 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 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 approval prior to issuance of a Grading Permit. 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:
 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.

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

10. Identification of the permanent repository to receive any recovered fossil material.
*Pursuant the County "SABER Policy", paleontological fossils found in the County should, by preference, be directed to the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet. A written agreement between the property owner/developer and the repository must be in place prior to site grading.
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.

All reports shall be signed by the project paleontologist and all other professionals responsible for the report's content (eg. PG), as appropriate. One original signed copy of the report(s) shall be submitted to 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, Plan Check staff, 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.

Safeguard Artifacts Being Excavated in Riverside County (SABER)

Monitoring: Mitigation will be monitored through the condition of approval clearance process with the review of building permits. Monitoring shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in the 43271 State Highway 74 Project Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon 2018, Appendix D).

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project				
35. Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Sources:

Riverside, County of. 1986. Redevelopment Plan for Redevelopment Project No. 3. December 22, 1986.
<https://www.rivcoeda.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=Z%2fO0vvCwjs0%3d&tabid=1466>
 _____. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>
 Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2016. Final 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). April 7, 2016.
<http://scagrtpscscs.net/Pages/FINAL2016RTPSCS.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

a,c) The proposed project involves the demolition of a restaurant/bar and construction of a convenience store and gas station. The project would not displace residents or alter existing housing. As such, the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, and no impact would occur.

b, e, f) The estimated number of employed residents in unincorporated Riverside County in 2014 was 133,580 persons (County of Riverside 2015). SCAG forecasts an increase of 140,200 residents and 86,100 employees in unincorporated Riverside County from 2012 to 2040 (SCAG 2016). The proposed convenience store and gas station would require approximately two to four employees per shift. Given that the proposed project would involve the demolition of an existing restaurant/bar, which employs a similar number of persons per shift, the proposed project would not result in a net increase in employment opportunities in the County of Riverside. Due to the nature of these employment opportunities, employees would likely be drawn from the local workforce and would not result in the relocation of any new residents to the County of Riverside. Therefore, the project would not create demand for additional housing, cumulatively exceed official regional or local population programs, or induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly. No impacts would occur.

d) The project site is located in the Valle Vista Community, which is covered by County Redevelopment Project No. 3. Public improvements and facilities proposed in the Valle Vista Community include street construction; curb, gutter and street widening; bridge widening; street improvements (e.g., traffic signals); drainage improvements and flood control; water improvements; parks adjacent to Bautista Creek and at Park Hill; fire stations (east of Bautista Creek and the relocation of the existing station to SR 74 and Mountain Avenue); a senior center; a handicap facility; a library (expansion of the existing site); a community center; and school facilities (County of Riverside 1986). The replacement of a restaurant/bar with a convenience store and gas station would not affect the goals outlined in the Redevelopment Plan for Redevelopment Project No. 3. Impacts to the County's Redevelopment Project would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

36. Fire Services

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Sources:

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

Hemet, City of. 2012. 2030 General Plan. January 24, 2012.
<http://www.cityofhemet.org/index.aspx?NID=534>

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Findings of Fact:

The proposed project involves the demolition of an existing restaurant/bar and the construction of a convenience store and gas station. The Riverside County Fire Department (RVC Fire) provides fire protection, fire suppression, and emergency medical services for unincorporated Riverside County. The project site is served by the Valle Vista Station, located at 25175 Fairview Avenue approximately one mile northeast of the project site, and by the Little Lake Station, located at 25954 Stanford Street approximately 1.5 miles east of the project site. In 2010, the average first unit response time for fire and emergency medical calls was just under seven minutes (City of Hemet 2012). According to Figure S-11, "Wildfire Susceptibility," of the County's General Plan, the project site is not located in a Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) with a high susceptibility to wildfires (County of Riverside 2015). As discussed in Section 35, *Housing*, the proposed project would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population. Because the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with applicable codes and would not increase the service population of RVC Fire, there is no evidence that the proposed project would not alter the existing need for fire protection services and would therefore not affect response times or service ratios such that new or expanded fire facilities would be needed. The project shall comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to fire services. County Ordinance No. 659 establishes the utilities and public services mitigation fee applicable to all projects to reduce incremental impacts to these services. This is a standard Condition of Approval and pursuant to CEQA, is not considered mitigation. No impact to fire services would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

37. Sheriff Services

☐
☐
☐
☒

Source: Riverside County Sheriff's Department

Findings of Fact: Riverside County Sheriff's Department provides patrol, criminal investigation, traffic enforcement, accident investigation, and tactical team services. The project site would be served by Hemet Sheriff's Station located at 43950 Acacia Avenue Suite B, approximately one mile southeast of the project site. As discussed in Section 35, *Housing*, the proposed project would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population. Therefore, there is no evidence that the proposed project would not place additional demand on existing sheriff services and would not alter existing response times or necessitate construction of new sheriff facilities. The project shall comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to fire services. County Ordinance No. 659 establishes the utilities and public services mitigation fee applicable to all projects to reduce incremental impacts to these services. This is a standard Condition of Approval and pursuant to CEQA, is not considered mitigation. No impact to sheriff services would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

38. Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project site is served by Hemet Unified School District (HUSD), which includes 15 elementary schools, four middle schools, four high schools, seven alternative education schools, and seven other sites/programs. As discussed in Section 35, *Housing*, the proposed project would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population. The project is required to comply with School Mitigation Impact Fees to provide adequate school services. This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation under CEQA. Buildout of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities, and no impact to schools would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

39. Libraries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The proposed project involves the demolition of a restaurant/bar and the construction of a convenience store and gas station. As discussed in Section 35, *Housing*, the proposed project would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population. Because the proposed project would not introduce new residents to the area, there would be no need for new or physically altered libraries. No impact to libraries would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

40. Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The proposed project involves the demolition of a restaurant/bar and construction of a convenience store and gas station. As discussed in Section 35, *Housing*, the proposed project would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population. Buildout of the proposed plan would not result in the need for new or physically altered health service facilities. No impact to health services would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
RECREATION				
41. Parks and Recreation				
a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The proposed project involves the development of a convenience store and gas station and would not include the development or expansion of recreational facilities. As discussed in Section 35, *Housing*, the proposed project would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population. Therefore, the project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks. The proposed project would have no impact related to parks and recreation.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

42. Recreational Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact: The proposed project would replace an existing restaurant/bar and surface parking lot with a convenience store and gas station. The project site is located in a suburban area that is mostly developed with commercial and residential uses. No recreational trails are present on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site. As discussed in Section 35, *Housing* the proposed project would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on recreational trails.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project				
43. Circulation				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2016. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2.

Riverside, County of. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan. December 8, 2015.
<http://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC). 2011. 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program. December 14, 2011.
http://www.rctcdev.info/uploads/media_items/congestionmanagementprogram.original.pdf

Trames Solutions, Inc. 2018. 7-11 Valle Vista Traffic Impact Analysis. September 17, 2018.

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Trames Solutions, Inc. prepared the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed project. According to the TIA, trip generation estimates for both project sites were based upon trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), 10th Edition Trip Generation Manual (2017). Project trips were calculated using trip generation rates for super convenience market and gas station. As shown in

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

Table 12, the proposed project would generate approximately 1,023 average daily trips (ADT), including 124 trips during the morning peak hour and 94 trips during the afternoon peak hour (Trames Solutions, Inc. 2018).

Table 12 Estimated Project Trip Generation

Land Use	Quantity	Units	ITE Code	Morning Peak Hour			Afternoon Peak Hour			Daily
				In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
Trip Generation Rates										
Super Convenience Market/Gas Station		VFP	960	14.04	14.04	28.08	11.48	11.48	22.96	9.44
Total Trips Generated										
	12	VFP		62	62	124	47	47	94	1,023

Source: Trames Solutions, Inc. 2018

VFP = Vehicle Fueling Positions

Impacts were evaluated utilizing the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) methodology for signalized intersections and the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) for unsignalized intersections. The ICU methodology compares the volume of traffic using the intersection to the capacity of the intersection. The volume to capacity ratio is then correlated to a performance measure known as Level of Service (LOS) ranging from LOS A (free-flow conditions) to LOS F (extreme congestion and system failure). Level of Service (LOS) designations are defined in Table 13. Similarly, the HCM methodology compares the volume of traffic using the intersection to the capacity of the intersection to calculate the delay associated with the traffic control at the intersection. The intersection delay is then correlated to an LOS performance measure.

Table 13 Level of Service (LOS) Definitions

LOS	Description
A	Free-flow conditions; minor disruptions to flow are easily absorbed without a change in travel speed.
B	Free flow conditions, although the presence of other vehicles becomes noticeable; less freedom to maneuver.
C	Ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is clearly affected by other vehicles; minor disruptions can cause serious local deterioration in service.
D	Ability to maneuver is restricted due to traffic congestion; travel speed is reduced by the increasing volume.
E	Operations at or near capacity; vehicles are operating with the minimum spacing for maintaining uniform flow.
F	Forced or breakdown; vehicles experience brief periods of movement followed by stoppages.

Source: Trames Solutions, Inc. 2018

The following six study intersections were evaluated in the TIA. Of these, two study intersections consist of the proposed driveway intersections along SR 74 and New Chicago Avenue that would provide site access.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Soboba Street/Florida Avenue ▪ Lake Street/Florida Avenue ▪ New Chicago Avenue/SR 74 ▪ Ramona Expressway/SR 74 ▪ North Project Driveway/SR 74 ▪ New Chicago Avenue/East Project Driveway 				

The following scenarios were evaluated for each of the six intersections:

- Existing Conditions
- Existing plus Project Conditions

Policy C2.1 sets a minimum target of LOS D for development proposals within the San Jacinto Valley Area Plan. Therefore, impacts to the circulation system would be significant if project-related traffic caused the LOS at the six study intersections to exceed LOS D. SR 74 is part of the Riverside County Transportation Commission's (RCTC) Congestion Management Program (CMP) (RCTC 2011). According to the 2011 CMP, the minimum threshold for highways that are part of the CMP is LOS E; therefore, the project would conflict with the CMP if project-related traffic caused the LOS at the five study intersections that include SR 74 to exceed LOS E. The calculated LOS for the study intersections are shown in Table 14 for existing and existing plus project intersection conditions.

Table 14 Existing and Existing Plus Project Intersection Conditions

Intersection	Existing LOS		Existing Plus Project	
	AM	AM	AM	PM
Soboba Street/SR 74	B	B	B	B
Lake Street/SR 74	C	B	C	B
New Chicago Avenue/SR 74	B	B	B	B
Ramona Expressway/SR 74	A	B	B	B
North Project Driveway/SR 74	A	B	B	B
New Chicago Avenue/East Project Driveway	A	B	B	B

Source: Trames Solutions, Inc. 2018

As shown in Table 14, all study intersections currently operate at LOS B or better during the peak hours under existing conditions, with the exception of Lake Street/SR 74, which currently operates at LOS C during the morning and afternoon peak hours. As shown in Table 14, all study intersections would operate at LOS B during the peak hours under existing plus project traffic conditions, with the exception of Lake Street/SR 74, which would continue operating at LOS C during the morning and afternoon peak hours. Project-related traffic would degrade existing LOS during the AM peak hour at the Ramona Expressway/SR 74, North Project Driveway/SR 74, and New Chicago Avenue/East Project Driveway intersections from LOS A to LOS B. The proposed project would not cause any intersection to degrade to LOS D or worse. Therefore, the project would not exceed the thresholds established by the County's General Plan and the RCTC CMP, and impacts to the circulation system and the CMP would be less than significant.

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

- c) The proposed convenience store and gas station would be one-story in height and would replace an existing one-story structure. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect air traffic patterns.
- d) Due to the nature of development, the proposed project would attract local and regional patrons that would access the site via vehicles, public transit, cycling, or walking. In addition, the proposed project would redevelop an existing commercial site. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to waterborne, rail, or air traffic.
- e) The proposed project would include two access driveways, one on the northern edge and one on the eastern edge of the project site. Vehicles turning out of these driveways may cause significant traffic hazards if appropriate traffic controls and sign distances are not provided. Implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1 would require stop sign controls, signaling and striping, and the inclusion of minimum sight distances. Therefore, impacts due to design features or incompatible uses would be less than significant with incorporated mitigation.
- f) The proposed project would be served by existing roads (i.e., SR 74 and New Chicago Avenue) and would not cause a substantial effect upon or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g) Project construction would occur over approximately eight months. According to CalEEMod, construction activities would require up to 13 worker trips per day, one vendor trip per day to deliver building materials and equipment, and up to 8 haul truck trips per day during the demolition phase (see Appendix A for CalEEMod results). These trips would only occur during construction and would add a negligible amount of traffic to area roadways. Construction equipment staging would occur entirely on the project site and would not obstruct SR 74 or New Chicago Avenue. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on circulation during project construction.
- h) The proposed project would redevelop a site that currently contains a restaurant/bar and bar and would provide access that complies with County requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would not include any features that would result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses. No impact would occur.
- i) The proposed project would be located along SR 74 and would be within 145 feet of the Florida & New Chicago Avenue bus stop for Riverside Transit Agency Route 27. The project would not include any features that would impair public transit facilities. No designated bicycle routes exist in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Sidewalks are located on the northeastern corner of the project site; however, these sidewalks are limited and do not extend along the entire length of the northern and eastern frontages of the project site. As discussed in Section 27, *Planning*, implementation of Mitigation Measure PL-2, which requires the construction of sidewalks along both project frontages, would be necessary to ensure consistency with the County's General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely impact public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities. Impacts would be less than significant with incorporated mitigation.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measure would ensure that the proposed project would not create a traffic hazard due to a design feature. See Mitigation Measure PL-1 under Section 27, *Planning*, for mitigation related to pedestrian facilities. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts to transportation and traffic to less than significant levels.

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

T-1 Driveway Design. Stop sign control shall be provided at the project driveways for vehicles exiting the project site. On-site traffic signaling and striping shall be implemented in conjunction with detailed construction plans for the project. Minimum sight distances shall be provided at the project driveways.

Monitoring: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the County shall verify that the project applicant has indicated traffic controls, striping, and sight distances on the project site plans.

44. Bike Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact: The proposed project would replace an existing restaurant/bar and surface parking lot with a convenience store and gas station. The project site is located in a suburban area that is mostly developed with commercial and residential uses. No bike trails exist on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site. As discussed in Section 35, *Housing*, the proposed project would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on bike trails.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

45. Tribal Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

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

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

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 for the purpose of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance to a California Native tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Tribal consultation

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

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Tribal cultural resources are defined in Public Resources Code 21074 as sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either:

- Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources
- Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1

In accordance with AB 52, separate notices regarding the proposed Project were mailed to all requesting Tribes on April 30, 2018. Staff received requests to consult from the Morongo Band of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians. Staff followed up with Morongo via emails on May 21, 2018 and September 5, 2018, and Morongo requested to close consultation on the project September 5, 2018. The County Archaeologist met up with Soboba on July 30, 2018 and provided the tribe with the standard conditions of approval, whereby the consultation was concluded. No tribal cultural resources were identified by any of the tribes. Therefore there will be no impacts in this regard.

According to the Cultural Resources Assessment Report, the project site is in the traditional tribal territory of the Cahuilla and near the boundaries of several other Native American groups identified by anthropologists in the early 20th century (e.g., Kroeber 1908). The historically-identified territories occupied by the Cahuilla, Juaneño, and Luiseño, all exist within a 15- to 20-mile range of the project site (Appendix B).

As discussed in Section 9, *Archaeological Resources*, the project site is developed and paved. Despite the lack of visible cultural resources on the surface of the project site, tribal cultural resources may be encountered during project-related development and ground-disturbing activities. Impacts would be significant if construction activities (including grading, excavation, and other ground-disturbing activities) result in the destruction, damage, or loss of important tribal cultural resources. Compliance with Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2 listed in Section 9 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level by providing a process for evaluating and, as necessary, avoiding impacts to any identified tribal cultural resources or prehistoric human remains through Native American and NAHC consultation. Impacts would be less than significant with incorporated mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

46. Water

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

Source:

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2016. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2.

Lake Hemet Municipal Water District. 2016. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. June 2016. https://www.lhmwd.org/files/UWMP_2015_v2.pdf

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Water service to the project site would be provided by the Lake Hemet Municipal Water District (LHMWD) which serves approximately 14,500 domestic and 51 agricultural customers in Hemet, San Jacinto and Garner Valley. The LHMWD's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) accounts for existing and forecasted development in its development of supply and demand forecasts. Because the proposed project would involve the replacement of an existing restaurant/bar with a convenience store and gas station and would not result in a net increase in employees above existing uses (see Section 25, Housing), the proposed project would be covered by the 2015 UWMP. The 2015 UWMP forecasts a supply surplus of 470 acre-feet per year (AFY) in 2035 under a multiple dry-year scenario (LHMWD 2015).

According to the CalEEMod results, the proposed project would demand approximately 1.1 AFY, which would result in a net decrease of 2.1 AFY as compared to existing uses (see Appendix A for CalEEMod results). Therefore, the proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of water treatment facilities and sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. No impact to water supplies would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

47. Sewer

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Sources:

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2016. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2.

Eastern Municipal Water District. 2016. "Treatment Process." Last modified: October 2016. <https://www.emwd.org/services/wastewater-service/treatment-process>

Lake Hemet Municipal Water District. 2016. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. June 2016. https://www.lhmwd.org/files/UWMP_2015_v2.pdf

Findings of Fact:

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

a-b) Wastewater collection services for the project site are provided by LHMWD. Wastewater generated in the LHMWD is treated by the Eastern Municipal Water District's (EMWD) Perris Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility (RWRF) or the San Jacinto Valley RWRF (LHMWD 2016). The Perris Valley RWRF currently treats approximately 13.9 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater and has a treatment capacity of approximately 22 mgd. The San Jacinto Valley RWRF currently treats seven mgd of wastewater and has a treatment capacity of 14 mgd (EMWD 2016).

According to CalEEMod, the proposed project would demand approximately 1.1 AFY, which result in a net decrease of 2.1 AFY as compared to existing uses (see Appendix A for CalEEMod results). Assuming that wastewater generation is 80 percent of total water demand, the proposed project would generate approximately 800 gpd of wastewater, which would result in a net decrease of 1,465 gpd as compared to existing uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate wastewater such that the combined capacity of the two existing facilities would be exceeded, and the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities would not be required. Therefore, no impacts to sewer systems would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
48. Solid Waste				
a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources:

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2016. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2.

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. 2018. "Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill (33-AA-0007)." Last modified: September 6, 2018.

<https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/swfacilities/Directory/33-AA-0007/>

Riverside County Department of Waste Resources. 2018. "Construction and Demolition (C&D) Waste." Last modified: 2018. <https://www.rcwaste.org/Waste-Guide/CandD>

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Construction and operation of the proposed project would result in the generation of solid waste. The project site would be served by the Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill located in Beaumont, California. The Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill has a current average daily throughput of approximately 1,759 tons per day and a maximum permitted throughput of 5,000 tons per day (California Department of Resource Recovery and Recycling 2018).

Construction of the proposed project would generate construction and demolition (C&D). The proposed project would be required to submit a waste recycling plan and a waste reporting form to the Riverside County Building and Safety Department to demonstrate compliance with the California Green Building Standards Code, which mandates C&D recycling (Riverside County Department of Waste Resources 2018). As discussed in Section 21, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, if asbestos are encountered during demolition of the existing structure on-site, demolition waste would be considered hazardous. The removal of construction-generated hazardous waste from the project site would require the use of a certified hazardous waste transportation company, which must ship hazardous waste to a permitted facility for treatment, storage, recycling, or disposal. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to solid waste services.

According to CalEEMod, the proposed project would generate approximately 0.03 tons of solid waste per day, which would result in a net decrease of 0.07 tons per day as compared to existing on-site uses. Therefore, the project would not affect the capacity of Lamb Canyon Landfill. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations and would participate in local solid waste recycling programs. No impact to solid waste services would occur as a result of the operation of the proposed project.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
49. Utilities				
Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
a) Electricity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source:

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2016. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2.

Findings of Fact:

a-g) The proposed project would involve the replacement of an existing restaurant/bar with a convenience store and gas station. The project site is currently served by existing electricity, natural gas, communication, and stormwater infrastructure as well as existing street lighting, roads, and other governmental services. According to the CalEEMod results, the proposed project would demand approximately 38,673 kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity per year and 6,798 thousand British thermal units (kBtu) per year. As such, the proposed project would result in a net decrease of 115,855 kWh of electricity per year and 869,458 kBtu per year (see Appendix A for CalEEMod results). As discussed in Section 24, *Water Quality Impacts*, the proposed project would increase pervious surfaces on-site and would not result in an increase in stormwater runoff. The proposed project would include sufficient exterior lighting for the convenience store and fueling pumps such that no additional street lighting would be required. Therefore, the proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of existing utility facilities, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

50. Energy Conservation

a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source:

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2016. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2.

Findings of Fact:

a) As discussed in Section 49, *Utilities*, the proposed project would result in a net decrease in energy usage compared to existing on-site uses. No impact to energy conservation plans would occur.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

☐
☒
☐
☐

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: As noted under Section 7, *Wildlife & Vegetation*, no native biological habitat exists on the project site. The proposed project would replace an existing restaurant/bar with a convenience store and gas station and would not substantially change the land use on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

The project site does not contain any known archaeological or tribal cultural resources. As discussed in Section 7, *Historic Resources*, the existing building on the project site is not considered a historic resource. As discussed in Section 8, *Archaeological Resources*, and Section 45, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, the proposed project would have the potential to adversely impact unknown buried archaeological and tribal cultural resources that may represent important examples of California prehistory. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 would ensure that any archaeological or tribal cultural resources discovered over the course of project construction are handled in an appropriate manner. Therefore, the proposed project would not eliminate an important example of major periods of California history or prehistory, and impacts would be less than significant with incorporated mitigation.

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

Source:

Trames Solutions, Inc. 2018. 7-11 Valle Vista Traffic Impact Analysis. September 17, 2018.

Findings of Fact: According to the TIA, the following five planned and pending projects in the County of Riverside are located in the project site vicinity (Trames Solutions, Inc. 2018):

- Residential development with 72 multi-family dwelling units and 16 single-family dwelling units
- Residential development with 17 single-family dwelling units
- Commercial development with a 9,100-sf shopping center
- Residential development with 187 single-family dwelling units and a 300-unit mobile home park
- Residential development with 66 single-family dwelling units

The Cities of Hemet and San Jacinto were also contacted and reported minimal development activity in the study area (Trames Solutions, Inc. 2018). All five planned and pending projects are located outside a 0.5-mile radius of the project site.

As described in Sections 1 through 51, with respect to all environmental issues, the proposed project would have no impact, a less than significant impact, or a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. Construction-related impacts to biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and transportation/traffic would be specific to the project site; therefore, impacts to these resources areas would not contribute to any significant cumulative impacts related to these issues. According to the Traffic Impact Analysis, the proposed project would not have a significant cumulative impact on transportation and traffic, taking into account planned and pending projects in the study area (Trames Solutions, Inc. 2018). Operation of the proposed project would result in a net decrease in demand for utility and service systems. The proposed project would have no adverse long-term environmental impacts and, therefore, would not contribute to cumulative environmental changes that may occur due to planned and pending development. Consequently, the proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to any significant cumulative environmental impacts, and impacts would be less than significant with incorporated mitigation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
53. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Staff review, project application

Findings of Fact: In general, impacts to human beings are associated with air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise impacts. As detailed in Section 6, *Air Quality Impacts*, and Section 21, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, the project would not result, either directly or indirectly, in adverse hazards related to air quality or hazardous materials. Compliance with applicable rules and regulations and implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1 and N-2 would reduce potential impacts on human beings to a less than significant level.

V. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any: None.

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

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

VI. AUTHORITIES CITED

Authorities cited: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21083.05; References: California Government Code Section 65088.4; Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095 and 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.