

# HORSETHIEF CANYON RANCH

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1155, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7881, SPECIFIC PLAN  
AMENDMENT NO. 152A5 (SPA 5), TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 37002, AND  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 42821

## **ADDENDUM NO. 1 TO MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION NO. 38981**

**LEAD AGENCY:**

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
4080 LEMON STREET, 12<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR  
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

**PROJECT APPLICANT:**

SAM- HORSETHIEF, LLC  
1200 QUAIL STREET, SUITE 220  
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

**CEQA CONSULTANT:**



T&B PLANNING, INC.  
3200 EL CAMINO REAL, SUITE 100  
IRVINE, CA 92602

May 6, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section Name and Number</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>1.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Project Background.....	1-1
1.2 Project Summary.....	1-2
1.3 California Environmental Quality Act.....	1-3
1.4 Summary of Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 38981 .....	1-3
1.5 CEQA Requirements for an MND Addendum .....	1-4
1.6 Type of CEQA Compliance Document and Level of Analysis .....	1-5
1.7 Format and Content of this MND Addendum.....	1-6
1.8 Preparation and Processing of this MND Addendum.....	1-7
1.9 Initial Study Checklist.....	1-8
1.10 Existing Documents to be Incorporated by Reference.....	1-8
1.11 Points of Contact.....	1-8
<b>2.0 Project Description.....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 Project Location.....	2-1
2.2 Project Setting and Surrounding Land Uses .....	2-1
2.3 Proposed Project.....	2-6
2.3.1 Proposed Discretionary Approvals.....	2-6
2.4 County Review Process .....	2-14
<b>3.0 Environmental Checklist .....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Project Information.....	3-1
3.2 Applicable General Plan and Zoning Regulations.....	3-3
3.3 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected .....	3-5
3.4 Determination .....	3-6
<b>4.0 Environmental Analysis .....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1 Environmental Issue Assessment .....	4-1
4.1.1 Aesthetics .....	4-1
4.1.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources.....	4-5
4.1.3 Air Quality .....	4-8
4.1.4 Biological Resources .....	4-10
4.1.5 Cultural Resources.....	4-16
4.1.6 Energy .....	4-19
4.1.7 Geology and Soils.....	4-20
4.1.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	4-29
4.1.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	4-31
4.1.10 Hydrology and Water Quality.....	4-34

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section Name and Number</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.1.11 Land Use and Planning.....	4-40
4.1.12 Mineral Resources.....	4-41
4.1.13 Noise.....	4-42
4.1.14 Paleontological Resources.....	4-47
4.1.15 Population and Housing.....	4-50
4.1.16 Public Services.....	4-51
4.1.17 Recreation.....	4-56
4.1.18 Transportation.....	4-60
4.1.19 Tribal Cultural Resources.....	4-65
4.1.20 Utilities and Service Systems.....	4-66
4.1.21 Wildfire.....	4-72
4.1.22 Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	4-74
4.2 Earlier Analyses.....	4-76
<b>5.0 References.....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
<b>6.0 Mitigation Monitoring Program.....</b>	<b>6-1</b>

**LIST OF FIGURES**

<u>Figure Name and Number</u>	<u>Page</u>
Figure 2-1 Regional Map.....	2-2
Figure 2-2 Vicinity Map.....	2-3
Figure 2-3 USGS Topographic Map.....	2-4
Figure 2-4 Aerial Photograph.....	2-5
Figure 2-5 General Plan Amendment No. 1155.....	2-7
Figure 2-6 Specific Plan Amendment No. 152A5.....	2-8
Figure 2-7 Change of Zone No. 7881.....	2-10
Figure 2-8 Tentative Tract Map No. 37002.....	2-12

**LIST OF TABLES**

<u>Table Name and Number</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 2-1 Matrix of Approvals/Permits.....	2-15
Table 4-1 Project Construction Vibration Levels.....	4-45

---

**LIST OF TECHNICAL APPENDICES**


---

The technical studies appended to this Mitigated Negative Declaration are listed below. The technical studies are herein incorporated by reference and are available for review at the County of Riverside Planning Department, located at 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA, Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

- **Appendix A:** Air Quality Impact Analysis, prepared by Giroux & Associates (Giroux), April 6, 2015.
- **Appendix B1:** General Biological Assessment for a 48 Acre Property on Horsethief Canyon and De Palma Roads, prepared by Terracor Resource Management (Terracor), October 15, 2003.
- **Appendix B2:** Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) Analysis Report, prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc. (GLA), April 2005
- **Appendix B3:** Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Consistency Analysis, prepared by GLA, April 28, 2005
- **Appendix B4:** Oak Tree Assessment, prepared by GLA, April 5, 2005, Revised May 10, 2006
- **Appendix B5:** Habitat Acquisition and Negotiation Strategy (HANS) I Initial Review, prepared by County of Riverside Environmental Programs Department, July 20, 2005.
- **Appendix C1:** Pre-Construction Paleontological Assessment prepared by John Minch & Associates (JMA), April 2015.
- **Appendix C2:** Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by JMA, October 5, 2015.
- **Appendix C3:** Addendum to Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by JMA, June 6, 2019.
- **Appendix D1:** Geotechnical Liquefaction Study prepared by LGC Geotechnical, Inc (LGC), April 14, 2014
- **Appendix D2:** Summary of Infiltration Testing prepared by LGC, May 21, 2014
- **Appendix D3:** Updated Geotechnical Report prepared by LGC, April 13, 2020
- **Appendix E1:** Hydrology and Hydraulics Analysis Tract 32984 Horsethief Canyon County of Riverside prepared by Mayers & Associates, Inc., July 10, 2014
- **Appendix E2:** Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan Tract 32984 Horsethief Canyon Road, County of Riverside prepared by Mayers & Associates Civil Engineering Inc., July 1, 2014
- **Appendix F:** Noise Impact Analysis, prepared by Giroux & Associates (Giroux), April 6, 2015.
- **Appendix G1:** Horsethief Canyon Updated Trip Generation Review, Riverside County prepared by RK Engineering Group, Inc., July 23, 2014.

- **Appendix G2:** Horsethief Canyon Ranch (TTM No. 37002) Technical Memo prepared by Urban Crossroads, Inc., March 9, 2020.

---

**ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**


---

AMSL	Above mean sea level
BACMS	Best available control measures
BAU	Business as Usual
BMP	Best Management Practices
CALTRANS	California Department of Transportation
CAP	Climate Action Process
CBSC	California Building Standards Code
CDC	California Department of Conservation
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFS	Cubic feet per second
COA	Condition of Approval
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon Dioxide
CR	Commercial Retail
CSA	Community Service Area
CZ 6777	Change of Zone No. 6777
DAMP	Riverside County Drainage Area Management Plan
DIFs	Development Impact Fees
DOF	Department of Finance
DU/AC	Dwelling units per acre
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EVMWD	Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FTA	Federal Transportation Administration
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPA 658	General Plan Amendment No. 658
HCRSP	Horsethief Canyon Ranch Specific Plan
HOA	Homeowner's Association
I-15	Interstate 15
JMA	John Minch & Associates
LEUSD	Lake Elsinore Unified School District
LGC	LGC Geotechnical, Inc.
LID	Low impact development
LSTs	Localized Significance Thresholds

MDR	Medium Density Residential
MGD	Million gallons per day
MHDR	Medium High Density Residential
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MM	Mitigation Measure
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
MMRP	Mitigation monitoring and reporting program
MRZ-3	Mineral Resources Zone 3
M-SC	Manufacturing-Service Commercial
MSHCP	Western Riverside Regional County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Program
MT/year	Metric Tons per Year
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NO <sub>x</sub>	Nitrogen Oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
OS-CH	Open Space – Conservation Habitat
PM <sub>10</sub>	Fine Particulate Matter (10 microns or smaller)
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Fine Particulate Matter (2.5 microns or smaller)
RACMS	Reasonably available control measures
RCA	Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority
RCCDR	Riverside County Center for Demographics Research
ROGs	Reactive Organic Gasses
R-R	Rural Residential
R/W	Right of Way
RWQCP	Riverside Water Quality Control Plant
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SF	Square foot
SMARA	Mineral Resources Zone 3
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur Dioxide
SP	Specific Plan
SPA 1	Specific Plan No. 152, Amendment No. 1
SPA 2	Specific Plan No. 152, Amendment No. 2
SPA 3	Specific Plan No. 152, Amendment No. 3
SP 152	Specific Plan No. 152
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TTM	Tentative Tract Map
VdB	Vibration Decibels
VHDR	Very High Density Residential
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
WRF	Horsethief Canyon Wastewater Reclamation Facility
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document is an Addendum to Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) No. 38981 (SCH No. 2005059038), prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This MND Addendum was compiled by the Planning Department of the Riverside County Transportation & Land Management Agency, serving as the Lead Agency for the proposed Project. See *CEQA Guidelines §§15050–15051*. The Lead Agency is defined as the agency with primary responsibility for approving and carrying out the project.

The following information is provided in this Introduction: 1) the principal requirements of CEQA; 2) the history of Specific Plan (SP) No. 152, MND No. 38981, and associated approvals; 3) a summary of the proposed Project; 4) the purpose of an MND Addendum; 5) the standards for adequacy of an MND Addendum pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines; 6) a description of the format and content of this MND Addendum; and 7) Riverside County's processing requirements to consider the proposed Project for approval. Following this introductory information is Riverside County's Environmental Assessment Form, which serves as the CEQA Initial Study for the proposed Project and that provides conclusive evidence that all potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed Project were previously and adequately analyzed in MND No. 3898.

The County of Riverside (hereafter "County") received an application from SAM-Horsethief, LLC (hereafter "Project Applicant") requesting approval of a General Plan Amendment (GPA No. 1155), a Specific Plan Amendment (SP 152A5 herein; referred to as "SPA 5"), a Change of Zone (CZ 7881), and a new Tentative Tract Map (TTM 37002) to implement the approved Specific Plan 152, Amendment No. 3 (SP 152A3 or "SPA 3"). Approval of proposed Project would reduce the total number of residential lots throughout the Specific Plan from 2,307 lots to 2,210 lots (a reduction of 96 lots), and would accommodate several additional changes to the approved SPA 3 as described more fully herein. The proposed Project is the subject of analysis in this document pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15367, the County is the lead agency with principal responsibility for considering the proposed Project for approval.

### 1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

Specific Plan No. 152, Amendment No. 3 (SPA 3) is an approved Specific Plan located south of De Palma Road and west of Horsethief Canyon Road. SPA 3 was approved by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in October 2004, along with General Plan Amendment No. 658 (GPA 658), Change of Zone No. 6777 (CZ 6777), and MND No. 38981. SPA 3 increased the Specific Plan area by 27 acres in the northern portion of the property (north of Broken Bit Circle) and increased the number of approved residential units by 175 units. GPA 658 amended the Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element and the Elsinore Area Plan (EAP) Land Use Plan land use designations as they pertain to the site from "Medium Density Residential," "Very High Density Residential," and "Right of Way," to "Medium Density Residential," "Very High Density Residential," "Recreation Center," and "Conservation Habitat." CZ 6777 changed the site's zoning classification from "Rural Residential (R-R)" to Specific Plan (SP)." Subsequently, an application for a fourth Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 4) was submitted to the County, but the application was ultimately abandoned without approval.

Prior to the approval to SPA 3, the County of Riverside Board of Supervisors approved the Specific Plan and two subsequent amendments. The original Specific Plan No. 152 (SP 152) was approved in 1982 by the County of Riverside Board of Supervisors. SP 152 provided for the development of an 801-acre site with 1,984 dwelling units. In 1988, the County of Riverside Board of Supervisors approved Specific Plan No. 152, Amendment No. 1 (SPA 1), which amended the permitted residential product types to include

attached townhomes. In 1992, the County of Riverside Board of Supervisors approved Specific Plan No. 152, Amendment No. 2 (SPA 2), which increased the Specific Plan area by 21.5 acres and increased the number of approved residential units by 148.

No known human-induced ground disturbances or substantial physical changes have occurred on the property since 2004 associated with SP 152. The property remains in the same physical condition at the present time (2015) as it did when analyzed by MND No. 38981. There are no substantial changed physical circumstances.

## 1.2 PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposed Project consists of an application for a General Plan Amendment (GPA No. 1155), a Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 5), a Change of Zone (CZ 7881), and Tentative Tract Map (TTM 37002).

The General Plan Amendment would amend the General Plan Land Use Map to incorporate 1.3 acres of vacated right-of-way into Specific Plan 152 as Medium High Density Residential, change the General Plan Designations of two Areas and revise the designation boundaries of Areas 22-26. The Amendment will change the designation of Planning Area 22 from Very High Density Residential (CD-VHDR) to Medium High Density Residential (CD-MHDR). Planning Area 23 will change from Medium Density Residential (CD-MDR) to Medium High Density Residential (CD-MHDR), Areas 24, 25 and 26 will retain the existing General Plan Designations, however their boundaries will be revised per Specific Plan No. 152A5.

Change of Zone No.07881 applies to Planning Areas 22-25 of Specific Plan No. 152. This Change of Zone CZ 7881 proposes to amend the approved Specific Plan Zoning Ordinance text for SPA 3 (Ordinance No. 348.4291) to provide amended land use and development standards for the site and formalize planning area boundaries that reflect the refinements proposed as part of SPA 5. This Change of Zone also proposes to change the zoning designation of the 0.7 acre of vacated and quitclaimed right of way located at the northeastern portion of the project sit from right of way (RW) Specific Plan (SP).

The Tract Map No. 37002 proposes a Schedule A subdivision of 49 gross acres into 229 proposed lots and one recreation site with a park on 1.6 acres and one recreation site with service road/trail on 3.8 acres; and one open space lot dedicated to the MSHCP open space on 6.2 acres to implement HCRSP Planning Areas 22, 23 and 24 and added Planning Area 25, and renumbered Planning Area 26.

The Specific Plan Amendment No. 5 to Specific Plan 152 proposes to modify the northern portion of the property which is summarized as follows:

- Eliminates the 210 townhomes and replaces them with 126 detached single family homes, resulting in a project wide decrease in 96 dwelling units.
- Reconfiguration of the boundaries of Planning Areas 22 through 25.
- Modifies the minimum lot sizes of Planning Areas 22 and 23.
- Incorporates 0.7 acres of right of way resulting in an increase of 2.3 acres to the boundaries of the specific plan, from 46.7 acres to 49 acres. This increase of the Project site (and the overall Specific Plan No. 152) by 2.3 acres, which would reflect more precise surveying measurements in Planning Areas 22 through 26 and would incorporate new 1.6-acre parcel that comprises vacated right-of-way located at the corner of De Palma Road and Horsethief Canyon Road into Planning Area 22.
- Re-designation of Planning Area 22 from “Townhomes” to “Medium High Density Residential” with a maximum allowable density of 6.5 du/ac, which would accommodate the development of 126 single-family detached dwelling units.
- Re-designation of Planning Area 23 from “Medium Density Residential”, which allows 5,000 square foot lots to Medium High Density Residential, with a maximum allowable density of 6.6 du/ac accommodating the development of 103 single-family detached dwelling units.
- Re-designation of Planning Area 24 from “Recreation Center” to “Open Space – Recreation”. The recreation center identified in Planning Area 24 would be replaced with a private park and the size of this planning area would be increased by 0.1 acre, resulting in a 1.6-acre recreation area.

- Addition of a new Planning Area 25 consisting of 3.8 acres designated “Open Space-Recreation” to accommodate a linear open space buffer between the Conservation Open Space in Planning Area 26 and residential development in Planning Areas 22 and 23 as well as a service road/trail.
- Re-numbering of Planning Area 25 to Planning Area 26 and re-designation from “MSHCP Open Space” to “Open Space – Conservation Habitat.”
- Removal of the previously identified operating gated entries on private roadways that would access the Project site from De Palma Road and Horsethief Canyon Road in order to allow ungated vehicular access. The Faux Gates at each entry have been retained.

Overall, the modifications to the Horsethief Canyon Ranch Specific Plan (HCRSP) proposed under SPA 5 would reduce the maximum number of residential units throughout the Specific Plan area (Planning Areas 1 through 25) from 2,307 units to 2,211 units, increase the residential acreage within the Specific Plan area from 849.5 acres to 851.8 acres, and reduce the overall Specific Plan target density from 2.7 du/ac to 2.6 du/ac. Additionally, SPA 5 would increase the amount of “Open Space-Recreation” acreage throughout the Specific Plan from 74 acres to 77.9 acres, while maintaining the amount of MSHCP Open Space at 6.2 acres.

### 1.3 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

CEQA, a statewide environmental law contained in Public Resources Code §§ 21000-21177, applies to most public agency decisions to carry out, authorize, or approve actions that have the potential to adversely affect the environment. The overarching goal of CEQA is to protect the physical environment. To achieve that goal, CEQA requires that public agencies inform themselves of the environmental consequences of their discretionary actions and consider alternatives and mitigation measures that could avoid or reduce significant adverse impacts when avoidance or reduction is feasible. It also gives other public agencies and the general public an opportunity to comment on the information. If significant adverse impacts cannot be avoided, reduced, or mitigated to below a level of significance, the public agency is required to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and balance the project’s environmental concerns with other goals and benefits in a statement of overriding considerations.

### 1.4 SUMMARY OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION NO. 38981

On October 19, 2004, the County of Riverside Board of Supervisors approved GPA 658, SPA 3, and CZ 6777. In conjunction with these approvals, and as required by CEQA, the County also approved a Mitigated Negative Declaration (this document is referred hereinafter as the “2004 MND”). An MND is a written statement by the Lead Agency briefly describing the reasons a project, which is not exempt from the requirements of CEQA, will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore does not require the preparation of an EIR (CEQA Guidelines § 15371). The CEQA Guidelines require the preparation of an MND if the Initial Study prepared for a project identifies potentially significant effects, but: 1) revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by the applicant before a proposed MND and Initial Study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur; and 2) there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the Lead Agency, that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment. If the potentially significant effects associated with a project cannot be mitigated to a level below significance, then an EIR must be prepared (CEQA Guidelines § 15070(b)).

The 2004 MND evaluated the potential environmental effects that would result from implementation of GPA 658, SPA 3, and CZ 6777, and concluded that impacts to the following issue areas would be potentially significant, but would be reduced to a level below significance with the incorporation of mitigation measures: aesthetics; air quality; biological resources; geology/soils; hazards and hazardous

materials; hydrology/water quality; land use/planning; noise; population/housing; public services; recreation; transportation/traffic; utilities/service systems; and mandatory findings of significance. The 2004 MND concluded that with implementation of the identified mitigation measures, all impacts to the environment would be reduced to below a level of significance. In conjunction with the 2004 MND, the County also adopted a mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP), which: summarizes the various impacts that would result from implementation of GPA 658, SPA 3, and CZ 6777; identifies mitigation measures needed to reduce identified impacts to a level below significant; indicates the responsible and monitoring parties responsible for ensuring that the mitigation measures are implemented; and describes when each mitigation measure must be implemented. Mitigation measures identified as part of the 2004 MND would continue to apply to the proposed Project.

## 1.5 CEQA REQUIREMENTS FOR AN MND ADDENDUM

The CEQA Guidelines allow for the updating and use of a previously adopted MND for projects that have changed or are different from the previous project or conditions analyzed in the adopted MND. In cases where changes or additions occur with no new significant environmental impacts, an Addendum to a previously adopted MND may be prepared. See *CEQA Guidelines §15164*.

The following describes the requirements of an Addendum, as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15164:

- a. The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an Addendum to a previously adopted MND if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in §15162 calling for preparation of a Subsequent MND have occurred.
- b. An Addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the Final MND.
- c. The decision-making body shall consider the Addendum with the Final MND prior to making a decision on the project.
- d. A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a Subsequent MND pursuant to §15162 should be included in an Addendum to an MND, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.

As noted above, CEQA Guidelines §15164(a) allows for the preparation of an Addendum if none of the conditions described in §15162 are met. CEQA Guidelines §15162 describe the conditions under which a Subsequent EIR must be prepared, as follows:

- a. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- b. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, which will require major revisions of the previous MND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- c. 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 MND was adopted as complete, shows any of the following:
  - I. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous MND;

2. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous MND;
3. 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 measure or alternatives; or
4. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous MND would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

If none of these circumstances are present, and only minor technical changes or additions are necessary to update the previously adopted MND, an Addendum may be prepared (See *CEQA Guidelines §15164*). As described in detail herein, none of the above circumstances that warrant the preparation of a Subsequent MND are present.

## 1.6 TYPE OF CEQA COMPLIANCE DOCUMENT AND LEVEL OF ANALYSIS

This document is Addendum No. 1 to previously-adopted Final MND No. 38981. As such, this MND Addendum serves as the evidentiary basis for the County to determine whether the revised Project requires the preparation of a new MND or EIR because (i) substantial changes are proposed in the project which involve new significant environmental effects; (ii) substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project will be carried out due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects; or (iii) new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence shows the existence of more significant environmental effects than analyzed previously. As set forth in further detail below, the evidence demonstrates that none of these circumstances have occurred or have been triggered and therefore the County is precluded from requiring a subsequent MND pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines §15162*.

This MND Addendum provides the environmental information necessary for Riverside County (CEQA Lead Agencies) and CEQA Responsible and Trustee Agencies to make informed decisions about the environmental effects of the proposed Project, which consists of the actions summarized above in Subsection 2.0 and more fully described in the associated Project application materials on file with the Riverside County Planning Department (4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501), which are herein incorporated by reference (see *CEQA Guidelines §15150*). Serving as the CEQA Lead Agency (see *CEQA Guidelines §15050*), the Riverside County Planning Department determined that an Addendum to the previously-adopted MND No. 38981 should be prepared, rather than a Supplemental or Subsequent MND, based on the following facts:

- a. As demonstrated in the accompanying Environmental Assessment No. 42821 (EA 42821) and its associated analyses, the proposed Project would not substantially increase the severity of impacts to the physical environment nor would it create substantial increases in the severity of the environmental impacts previously disclosed in the MND No. 38981. In summary, proposed SPA 5 would: (1) incorporate 1.3 acres of vacated right of way located at the intersection of De Palma Road and Horsethief Canyon Road and amend the Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element and the EAP Land Use Plan land use designations as they pertain to the 1.3 acres area from “Commercial Retail (CR)” to “Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)”; (2) re-designate

Planning Area 22 from “Community Development: Very High Density Residential (VHDR)” to “Community Development: Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)”; (3) re-designate Planning Area 23 from “Community Development: Medium Density Residential (MDR)” to “Community Development: Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)”; (4) amend the land use designations of Planning Areas 24, 25, and 26 to be consistent with current nomenclature used in the Riverside County General Plan; (4) add Planning Area 25, renumber Planning Area 25 to Planning Area 26, and reconfigure the boundaries of Planning Areas 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26; (5) relocate Planning Area 24 from the east side of Street “A” to the west side of Street “A”; (6) remove the gated entries along De Palma Road and Horsethief Canyon Road; and (7) decrease the number of allowed residential units by 96 units. Overall, SPA 5 would result in impacts that are less than or equal to those addressed in Final MND No. 38981.

- b. The proposed Project does not involve the introduction of any land uses that were not previously evaluated in MND No. 38981.
- c. The proposed Project does not include any construction or operational characteristics that substantially differ from those that would have occurred from implementation of the project evaluated in MND No. 38981.
- d. Subsequent to the adoption of MND No. 38981, no new information of substantial importance has become available which was not known or could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time MND No. 38981 was prepared.
- e. Subsequent to the adoption of MND No. 38981, no substantial changes in the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken have occurred. The physical conditions of the property are the same, other than natural changes from wildfire and flooding events, which are natural occurrences.
- f. Mitigation measures identified in MND No. 38981, remain appropriate and feasible for the proposed Project.

Based on these facts, the Riverside County Planning Department determined that an Addendum to previously adopted MND No. 38981 is the appropriate type of CEQA document to prepare for the proposed Project. The purpose of this MND Addendum is to evaluate the proposed Project’s level of impact on the environment in comparison to the approved Project its accompanying adopted MND No. 38981.

## 1.7 FORMAT AND CONTENT OF THIS MND ADDENDUM

The following components comprise the MND Addendum in its totality:

- a. This Introduction (Section 1.0) and the Project Description (Section 2.0).
- b. The completed Environmental Checklist Form and its associated analyses (Sections 3.0 and 4.0), which concludes that the proposed Project would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity environmental impacts beyond the levels disclosed in MND No. 38981.

- c. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program that accompanies EA 42821, which indicates all mitigation measures contained in MND No. 38981.
- d. Seventeen (17) technical reports and other documentation that evaluate the proposed Project, which are attached as MND Technical Appendices A-G.

Appendix A: Air Quality Impact Analysis

Appendix B1: General Biological Assessment

Appendix B2: Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) Analysis Report

Appendix B3: Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Consistency Analysis

Appendix B4: Oak Tree Assessment

Appendix B5: Habitat Acquisition and Negotiation Strategy (HANS) I Initial Review

Appendix C1: Pre-Construction Paleontological Assessment

Appendix C2: Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment

Appendix C3 Addendum to Phase I Cultural Resources Report Assessment

Appendix D1: Geotechnical Liquefaction Study prepared by LGC, April 14, 2014

Appendix D2: Summary of Infiltration Testing prepared by LGC, May 21, 2014

Appendix D3: Updated Geotechnical Report prepared by LGC, April 13, 2020

Appendix E1: Hydrology and Hydraulics Analysis

Appendix E2: Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan

Appendix F: Noise Impact Analysis

Appendix G1: Horsethief Canyon Updated Trip Generation Review

Appendix G2: Horsethief Canyon Ranch (TTM No. 37002) Technical Memo

- e. SP 152, Amendment No. 3, MND No. 38981, accompanying Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), which are all herein incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15150 and are available for review at the Riverside County Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501.

## 1.8 PREPARATION AND PROCESSING OF THIS MND ADDENDUM

The Riverside County Planning Department directed and supervised the preparation of this MND Addendum. Although prepared with assistance of the consulting firm T&B Planning, Inc., the content contained within and the conclusions drawn by this MND reflect the sole independent judgment of the County.

This MND Addendum will be forwarded, along with the previously-adopted MND No. 38981 to the Riverside County Planning Commission for review as part of their deliberations concerning the proposed Project. A public hearing(s) will be held before the Riverside County Planning Commission to consider the proposed Project and the adequacy of this MND Addendum. Public comments will be heard and considered at the hearing(s). The Planning Commission will make advisory recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on whether to approve, approve with changes, or deny the proposed Project. The Board of Supervisors would then hold a public hearing in which they will consider the information contained in the Project's MND Addendum and the Project's Administrative Record. The Board of Supervisors will

take public testimony and will make a decision as to whether to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the Project. If approved, the Board of Supervisors also would make findings relative to the Project's environmental effects as disclosed in the MND Addendum, and a Notice of Determination would be filed with the Riverside County Clerk.

## 1.9 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The County of Riverside prepared the proposed Project's Initial Study Checklist as suggested by CEQA Guidelines §§15063(d)(3). The CEQA Guidelines include a suggested checklist to indicate whether the conditions set forth in §15070, which would require a mitigated negative declaration, are met. Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of this MND contain a copy of the Initial Study prepared for the proposed Project.

There are four possible responses to each of the environmental issues included on the checklist:

1. **New Significant Impact.** This response is used to indicate when the Project has changed to such an extent that major revisions to MND No. 38981 are required due to the presence of new significant environmental effects.
2. **More Severe Impacts.** This response is used to indicate when the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken have changed to such an extent that major revisions to MND No. 38981 are required due to the fact that the severity of previously identified significant effects would substantially increase.
3. **New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact.** This response is used to indicate when new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time MND No. 38981 was adopted, indicates that there are new mitigation measures or alternatives available to substantially reduce significant environmental impacts of the Project, but the Project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measure(s) or alternative.
4. **No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** This response is used to indicate that the proposed Project would not create a new impact or substantially increase the severity of the previously-identified environmental impact.

The Initial Study Checklist and accompanying explanation of checklist responses (see Sections 3.0 and 4.0) provide the information and analysis necessary to assess environmental impacts of the proposed Project.

## 1.10 EXISTING DOCUMENTS TO BE INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

State CEQA Guidelines § 15150 and §15168(c)(3) and (d)(2) permit and encourage that an environmental document incorporate by reference other documents that provide relevant data. The documents listed in 5.0, *References*, are hereby incorporated by reference, and the pertinent material is summarized as needed within this MND. All documents incorporated by reference are available for review at the County of Riverside Planning Department, located at 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA, Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

## 1.11 POINTS OF CONTACT

The Lead Agency for this environmental document is the County of Riverside. Any questions about the preparation of this Initial Study and MND, its assumptions, or its conclusions should be referred to:



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

The point of contact for the Project Applicant is:

Erik Lunde  
SAM-Horsethief, LLC  
1200 Quail Street, Suite 220  
Newport Beach, CA 92660

---

## 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

Under existing conditions, the Project site comprises approximately 49.0 acres of land designated by the County of Riverside for residential and open space land uses. The discretionary approvals associated with the Project include a GPA 1155, SPA 152A5 (SPA 5), CZ 7881, and TTM 37002. Approval of GPA 1155, SPA 5, CZ 7881, and TTM 37002 (herein, the “Project” or “proposed Project”) would allow for ultimate development of the property with 229 single-family residential dwelling units.

### 2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed Project involves an amendment to the previously approved 801-acre specific plan. However, the proposed modifications would be limited to Planning Areas 22, 23, 24, and 25. Accordingly, for purposes of this Project Description and in all references throughout this MND Addendum, the “Project site” refers to these four planning areas that are subject to the proposed specific plan amendment.

The Project site, as defined herein, consists of approximately 49.0 gross acres in the western portion of unincorporated Riverside County (see Figure 2-1, *Regional Map*). From a regional perspective, the Project site is located to the northwest of the City of Lake Elsinore and southeast of the City of Corona. Interstate 15 (I-15) is located approximately 0.02 mile north of the site’s northern boundary. Specifically, the Project site is located north of Broken Bit Circle, east of Horsethief Canyon Creek, south of De Palma Road, and west of Horsethief Canyon Road, as illustrated on Figure 2-2, *Vicinity Map*, and Figure 2-3, *USGS Topographic Map*. The subject property encompasses Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) 393-110-010, -011, -012, -013, -014, -015, and -016. The property is located in the northwest quarter of Section 17, Township 5 South, Range 5 West, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian.

### 2.2 PROJECT SETTING AND SURROUNDING LAND USES

As shown on Figure 2-4, *Aerial Photograph*, under existing conditions, and consistent with the conditions that existed at the time the 2004 MND Addendum was approved, the Project site is largely undeveloped. Historically, it appears that the property has been previously developed with scattered houses and a small citrus grove. Currently the property only contains remnants of previous development at the site, including building foundations. Elevations vary from 1,240 feet above mean sea level (amsl) in the northwest corner of the parcel to 1,320 feet amsl in the southwest corner. Primary access to the property is from Horsethief Canyon Road. (JMA, 2015a, p. 1) Existing vegetation on-site is generally composed of patchily distributed Riversidean sage scrub, non-native grasslands, disturbed land, and ruderal vegetation. The Project site also includes two natural drainages that support riparian habitat. Topographically, the Project site contains several small rolling hills. Additionally, two (2) natural drainage courses traverse the Project site from the northeast to the southwest.

Figure 2-1 Regional Map

Figure 2-2 Vicinity Map

Figure 2-3 USGS Topographic Map

Figure 2-4 Aerial Photograph

To the west of the Project site, near the northwestern portion of the site, is a single-family home, beyond which is the Cleveland National Forest. North of the Project site is I-15, beyond which are industrial land uses. East the Project site are two rural single-family homes and an approved but undeveloped medium density residential neighborhood referred to as “Renaissance Ranch.” To the south of the Project site is the existing medium density residential neighborhood that comprises a developed portion of Specific Plan No. 152.

## 2.3 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed Project would involve a Specific Plan Amendment to the previously approved Specific Plan No. 152 that would affect four planning areas (Planning Areas 22, 23, 24, and 25) in the northern portion of the Specific Plan area. The proposed changes would increase the Specific Plan boundary by 2.3 acres, which combines an increase in the Specific Plan area due to more precise surveying measurements and the incorporation of a new 1.3-acre parcel associated with the vacation of existing right-of-way-located at the intersection of De Palma Road and Horsethief Canyon Road. The proposed changes also would modify the land uses designations, which would reduce the maximum allowable number of residential units by 96 dwellings. The proposed Specific Plan Amendment would also adjust the boundaries of the four planning areas, add Planning Area 25, re-number Planning Area 25 to Planning Area 26, and relocate Planning Area 24 from the east side of the proposed Street “A” to the west side of Street “A”.

In addition to the proposed Specific Plan Amendment (SP 152 A4), the proposed Project consists of applications for a General Plan Amendment (GPA 1155), Change of Zone (CZ 7881), and Tentative Tract Map 37002. Copies of the entitlement applications for the proposed Project are herein incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA § 15150 and are available for review at the Riverside County Planning Department, located at 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA. A detailed description of the proposed Project is provided in the following sections.

### 2.3.1 Proposed Discretionary Approvals

#### A. *General Plan Amendment No. 1155*

Figure 2-5, *General Plan Amendment No. 1155*, depicts the site’s existing and proposed General Plan and EAP land use designations. The Project entails modifying and reconfiguring the adopted land use designations of Planning Areas 22, 23, 24, and 25 within Specific Plan No. 152 and the EAP. GPA 1155 also would modify the land use designations within the Specific Plan from 15.5 acres of Very High Density Residential (VHDR), 23.8 acres of Medium Density Residential (MDR), 1.2 acres of Open Space-Recreation (OS-R), and 6.2 acres of Open Space-Conservation Habitat (OS-CH) to 34.8 acres of Medium High Density Residential (MHDR), 5.4 acres of OS-R, and 6.2 acres of OS-CH, to provide for the development of 229 single-family homes and a 1.6-acre park, and the preservation of 6.2 acres of MSHCP Open Space. Additionally, GPA 1155 would entail incorporating a 1.3-acre parcel that is a vacated portion of right-of-way located at the intersection of De Palma Road and Horsethief Canyon Road into the Specific Plan area.

Under existing conditions, the 1.3-acre vacated portion of right-of-way is designated by the Riverside County General Plan and EAP for “Community Development: Commercial Retail (CR)” land use, which allows for local and regional serving retail and service uses, including professional office and tourist-oriented commercial uses. GPA 1155 proposes to amend the Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element and EAP Land Use Plan land use designations as they pertain to the 1.3-acre parcel from “CR” to “Specific Plan.” In accordance with proposed SPA 5, this area would be designated as “Community

*Figure 2-5 General Plan Amendment No. 1155*



*Figure 2-6 Specific Plan Amendment No. 152A5*

Development: Medium High Density Residential (MHDR),” which would allow for development of the site with residential uses having a density range of 5.0 to 8.0 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) (Riverside County, 2015a).

### B. Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 5)

As shown on Figure 2-6, *Specific Plan Amendment No. 152A5*, the previously-approved SPA 3 provides for the development of a 46.7-acre site with 325 dwelling units within the Project site, which results in a density of 6.9 du/ac. SPA 3 also provides for the development of a 1.2-acre park site with recreation center and 6.2 acres of Western Riverside Regional County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Program (MSHCP) open space. SPA 3 was approved and Mitigated Negative Declaration for Environmental Assessment No. 38981 was adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors on October 19, 2004. An application was subsequently filed for a fourth Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 4); however, the application was abandoned without approval. Thus, the currently proposed amendment to Specific Plan No. 152, amendment to SPA 3 is referred to herein as Specific Plan Amendment No. 5 (SPA 5). Figure 2-6, visually depicts the changes to the Project site that are proposed under SPA 5 which are summarized as follows:

- Reconfiguration of the boundaries of Planning Areas 22 through 25 and relocation of Planning Area 24 from the east side of Street “A” to the west side of Street “A.”
- Increase of the Project site (and the overall Specific Plan No. 152) by 2.3 acres, which would reflect more precise surveying measurements in Planning Areas 22 through 26 and would incorporate new 1.3-acre parcel that comprises vacated right-of-way located at the corner of De Palma Road and Horsethief Canyon Road into Planning Area 22.
- Re-designation of Planning Area 22 from “Townhomes” to “Medium High Density Residential” with a maximum allowable density of 6.5 du/ac, which would accommodate the development of 126 single-family detached dwelling units.
- Re-designation of Planning Area 23 from “Medium Density Residential”, which allows 5,000 square foot lots to Medium High Density Residential, with a maximum allowable density of 6.6 du/ac accommodating the development of 103 single-family detached dwelling units.
- Re-designation of Planning Area 24 from “Recreation Center” to “Open Space – Recreation”. The recreation center identified in Planning Area 24 would be replaced with a private park and the size of this planning area would be increased by 0.4 acre, resulting in a 1.6-acre recreation area.
- Addition of a new Planning Area 25 consisting of 3.8 acres designated “Open Space-Recreation” to accommodate a linear open space buffer between the Conservation Open Space in Planning Area 26 and residential development in Planning Areas 22 and 23 as well as a service road/trail.
- Re-numbering of Planning Area 25 to Planning Area 26 and re-designation from “MSHCP Open Space” to “Open Space – Conservation Habitat.”
- Removal of the previously identified gated entries on private roadways that would access the Project site from De Palma Road and Horsethief Canyon Road in order to allow ungated vehicular access.
- Relocation of Street “A” approximately to the east of Planning Area 24 and refinements to the proposed internal circulation system to accommodate the modifications to the land use plan.

Overall, the modifications to the Horsethief Canyon Ranch Specific Plan (HCRSP) proposed under SPA 5 would reduce the maximum number of residential units throughout the Specific Plan area (Planning Areas 1 through 25) from 2,307 units to 2,210 units, increase the residential acreage within the Specific Plan area from 849.5 acres to 851.8 acres, and reduce the overall Specific Plan target density from 2.7 du/ac to 2.6 du/ac. Additionally, SPA 5 would increase the amount of “Open Space-Recreation” acreage

*Figure 2-7 Change of Zone No. 7881*

throughout the Specific Plan from 74.0 acres to 78.2 acres, while maintaining the amount of MSHCP Open Space at 6.2 acres.

**C. Change of Zone No. 7881**

CZ 7881 proposes to amend the approved Specific Plan Zoning Ordinance for Specific Plan No. 152, Amendment No. 3 (SPA 3) (Ordinance No. 348.4291) to provide amended land use and development standards and formalize the boundaries of Planning Areas 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26 to reflect the refinements in SPA 5, which include an increase of 2.3 acres to the boundary of SPA 5. In addition, CZ 7881 proposes to change the zoning designation of the 1.3 acres of right of way from “Right of Way (RW)” to “Specific Plan (SP).” Figure 2-7, *Change of Zone No. 7881*, depicts the site’s existing and proposed zoning designations. The proposed SP zoning designation would be consistent with the zoning designation of the Specific Plan area and would implement the site’s proposed General Plan land use designation of MHDR.

**D. Tentative Tract Map No. 37002**

Tentative Tract Map No. 37002 (TTM No. 37002) is a proposed tentative tract map that would accommodate development in accordance with proposed SPA 5. TTM 37002 is shown on Figure 2-8, *Tentative Tract Map No. .* TTM No. 37002 would subdivide the a 49.0-acre Project site into 229 single-family residential lots on 37.4 acres; one (1) recreation site with a park on 1.6 acres; one (1) recreation site with service road/trail on 3.8 acres; and one (1) open space lot dedicated to MSHCP open space on 6.2 acres to implement HCRSP Planning Areas 22, 23 and 24 and added Planning Area 25, and renumbered Planning Area 26.

**1. Proposed Circulation Improvements**

As shown on Figure 2-8, the Project entails improvements to several public roadways on and off site. Access to the Project would be provided via two (2) full access connections. De Palma Road abuts the northern boundary of the property and would provide access to the site via proposed Street A. Horsethief Canyon Road abuts the eastern boundary of the property and would provide access to the site at proposed Street B. Primary access to the northern portion of the site would be provided via proposed Street A at De Palma Road. Primary access to the southern portions of the site would be from Street B via Horsethief Canyon Road. A description of the roadway improvements planned as part of the Project is provided below.

- **De Palma Road.** De Palma Road is an east-west oriented existing public roadway abutting the northern boundary of the Project site. The existing roadway includes two travel lanes with edges improved only with an existing concrete v-ditch to accommodate drainage, and no sidewalks or parkways. De Palma Road is proposed as a Public Modified Major Highway with a total right-of-way width of 102 feet with 70 feet of travel lanes and a 26-foot parkway on the south side, adjacent to the project. The parkway would include a 5-foot parkway separated sidewalk and a 10-foot community trail. The total right-of way of De Palma Road in proximity to the intersection with Horsethief Road is proposed to increase to 108 feet with 76 feet of travel lanes and a 26-foot parkway. As part of the Project, the portion of the roadway that is within the project site boundary would be dedicated and De Palma Road would be improved to provide a total right-of-way width of 102 feet with the right-of-way expanding to 108 feet in proximity to the intersection with Horsethief Road.
- **Horsethief Canyon Road.** Horsethief Canyon Road is a north-south oriented existing public roadway abutting the eastern boundary of the Project site. The existing roadway includes one travel lane in each direction adjacent to the Project site. The west edge of this existing roadway is improved

*Figure 2-8 Tentative Tract Map No. 37002*

with an existing concrete v-ditch to accommodate drainage and a 5-foot sidewalk, but without a parkway or trail. Horsethief Canyon Road is proposed as a Modified Major Highway with a total right-of-way width of 100 feet, including 64 feet of travel lanes, a 5-foot sidewalk on the east side, and a 5-foot sidewalk, 5-foot parkway and 8-foot community trail on the west side, adjacent to the project. As part of the Project, the portion of the roadway that is within the project site boundary would be dedicated and Horsethief Canyon Road would be improved to provide a 5-foot parkway and an 8-foot community trail on the west side of the road adjacent to the project site.

- **Private Local Entry Streets A and B.** Streets A and B are proposed as the main entries into the site. The entry portions of these streets would be improved to provide a total right-of-way width of 64 feet, with 48 feet of travel lanes, a 6-foot median, and 5-foot curb-adjacent sidewalks on each side of the street.
- **Private Local Streets.** Private Local Streets are proposed within the Project. These local streets would be provided with a total right-of-way width of 46 feet, including 36 feet of travel lanes and 5-foot curb-adjacent sidewalks on each side of the street.

## 2. Proposed Drainage and Water Quality Improvements

On-site stormwater runoff would be conveyed through public street improvements and storm drains which generally would convey all runoff towards a water quality/infiltration basin proposed in the northwestern portion of the Project site, within Planning Area 22. Storm water flows would discharge from the water quality/infiltration basin into Horsethief Canyon Creek following water quality treatment.

## 3. Proposed Water Service Improvements

Water service would be provided to the Project site by Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EMVMD). The Project would be required to construct a new 12" water line within Horsethief Canyon Road from De Palma Road to Street B. A 12" water line within De Palma Road would be constructed by others; however, for purposes of analysis herein, it is assumed that the Project would be required to construct this water line. New 8" inch water lines would provide internal water service to residential lots internally throughout the Project site. The internal water lines would connect to the main water lines at De Palma Road at Street "A" and at Horsethief Canyon Road at Street "B", forming a water loop within the project.

## 4. Proposed Sewer Service Improvements

Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD) is the current provider of sewer services to the Project area. On-site wastewater would be conveyed via a series of eight-inch sanitary sewer lines to be constructed within the on-site streets to an 8-inch line within A Street and continuing west within De Palma Road for approximately 650 feet connecting to a lift station that is to be constructed by others. A force main (to be constructed by others) would connect to the lift station and continue east within De Palma Road, then south within Horsethief Canyon Road to the existing wastewater treatment facility located in Planning Area 19 of SP 152. Although the force main and lift station would be constructed by others, for purposes of analysis herein it is assumed the Project Applicant would be required to implement these improvements.

## 2.4 COUNTY REVIEW PROCESS

The proposed Project and its technical aspects were reviewed in detail by Riverside County, including, but not limited to, the Riverside County Planning and Transportation Department. Riverside County has primary approval responsibility for the proposed Project. As such, the County is serving as the Lead Agency pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15050. The Riverside County Planning Commission will consider the Project's requested GPA 1155, SPA 5, CZ 7881, and TTM 37002, and will recommend to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors whether to approve, conditionally approve, or deny approval of the proposed Project. The Board of Supervisors will then consider the information contained in MND No. 38981, this Addendum No. 1, and the Project's Administrative Record in its decision-making processes and will approve, conditionally approve, or deny the proposed Project, and also will make findings relative to the Project's environmental effects. Upon approval or conditional approval of the above-described Project actions and upon adoption of this Addendum No. 1 to MND No. 38981, the County would conduct subsequent administrative reviews and grant ministerial permits and approvals to implement Project requirements and conditions of approval. A list of the primary discretionary and administrative actions under County jurisdiction is provided in Table 2-1, *Matrix of Approvals/Permits*.

Table 2-1 Matrix of Approvals/Permits

Public Agency	Approvals and Decisions
<b>Riverside County</b>	
<b>Proposed Project – Riverside County Discretionary Approvals</b>	
Riverside County Planning Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide recommendations to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors regarding adoption of the Project’s MND Addendum.</li> <li>• Provide recommendations to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors whether to approve General Plan Amendment No. 1155, Change of Zone No. 7881, Specific Plan Amendment No. 152A5 (SPA 5), and Tentative Tract Map No. 37002.</li> </ul>
Riverside County Board of Supervisors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reject or adopt this MND Addendum along with appropriate CEQA findings.</li> <li>• Approve, approve with modification, or deny, Specific Plan Amendment No. 152A5 (SPA 5), and Tentative Tract Map No. 37002.</li> <li>• Approve or deny General Plan Amendment No. 1155.</li> <li>• Approve or deny Change of Zone No. 7881.</li> </ul>
<b>Subsequent Riverside County Discretionary and Ministerial Approvals</b>	
Riverside County Subsequent Implementing Approvals: Planning Department and/or Building & Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve implementing Final Maps.</li> <li>• Issue Grading Permits.</li> <li>• Issue Building Permits.</li> <li>• Approve Road Improvement Plans.</li> <li>• Issue Encroachment Permits.</li> <li>• Accept public-right-of way dedications, if required.</li> <li>• Issue Conditional Use Permits, if required.</li> </ul>
<b>Other Agencies – Subsequent Approvals and Permits</b>	
Regional Water Quality Control Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issuance of an NPDES stormwater permit.</li> </ul>
Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of planned drainage improvements.</li> </ul>
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issuance of permits/approvals for required water service.</li> </ul>
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issuance of permits/approvals for required sewer service.</li> </ul>



### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

#### 3.1 PROJECT INFORMATION

**Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number:** EA 42821

**Project Case Type (s) and Number(s):** Specific Plan Amendment No. SP 152A5 (SPA 5), General Plan Amendment No. 1155 (GPA 1155), Change of Zone No. 7881 (CZ 7881), and Tentative Tract Map No. 37002 (TTM 37002).

**Lead Agency Name:** County of Riverside Planning Department

**Address:** P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409

**Contact Person:** Erik W. Lunde

**Telephone Number:** 714-318-3500

**Applicant's Name:** SAM – Horsethief, LLC

**Applicant's Address:** 1200 Quail Street, Suite 220, Newport Beach, CA 92660

**A. Project Description:** The Project would involve a Specific Plan Amendment to the previously approved Specific Plan No. 152 that would affect five planning areas in the northern portion of the Specific Plan area. The proposed changes would increase the residential acreage within the Specific Plan while reducing the maximum number of residential units, which would have a corresponding reduction in the residential density within the planning areas. The proposed Specific Plan Amendment also would adjust the boundaries of the planning areas, which would increase the recreation open space while decreasing the amount of conservation habitat acreage. The Project would also involve a General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone, and Tentative Tract Map. The proposed modifications to the Specific Plan as well as the General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone, and Tentative Tract Map are described below. Refer to Section 2.0, *Project Description*, for a complete description of the proposed Project. The following approval is requested of the County of Riverside (collectively hereafter called “the Project”):

Specific Plan No. 152, Amendment No. 5 (SPA 5) proposes to amend Specific Plan No. 152 Amendment No. 3 (“SPA 3”). SPA 3 was approved and Mitigated Negative Declaration for Environmental Assessment No. 38981 was adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors on October 19, 2004. An application was subsequently filed for a fourth Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 4); however, the application was abandoned without approval. Thus, the currently proposed amendment to Specific Plan No. 152, amendment to SPA 3 is referred to herein as Specific Plan Amendment No. 5 (SPA 5).

As compared to the adopted SPA 3, SPA 5 would not affect Planning Areas 1-21 and proposes the following specific modifications to Planning Areas 22-26:

- Reconfigure the boundaries of Planning Areas 22 through 25, add Planning Area 26, and relocate Planning Area 24 from the east side of Street “A” to the west side of Street “A.”
- Increase the Specific Plan area by 2.3 acres to reflect more precise surveying measurements in Planning Areas 22 through 26 and incorporate 1.3 acres of right of way located at the corner of De Palma Road and Horsethief Canyon Road into Planning Area 22.
- Re-designate Planning Area 22 from “Townhomes” (High Density Residential (8-14 du/ac) to Medium High Density Residential (5.0-8.0 du/ac) and change the product type from attached Townhomes to single family, detached homes on minimum 3,619sf lots.
- Re-designate Planning Area 23 from “5,000 square foot lots” (Medium Density Residential (2.0-5.0 du/ac)) to Medium High Density Residential (5.0-8.0 du/ac).
- Re-designate Planning Area 24 from “Recreation Center” to “Open Space – Recreation” to be consistent with current nomenclature used in the Riverside County General Plan. Replace the

recreation center identified in Planning Area 24 with a private park and increase the recreation acreage within Planning Area 24 by 0.1 acres.

- Add a new Planning Area 25 consisting of 3.8 acres designated "Open Space-Recreation" to accommodate a linear open space buffer between the Conservation Open Space in Planning Area 26 and residential development in Planning Areas 22 and 23 as well as a maintenance road/trail.
- Re-number Planning Area 25 to Planning Area 26 and re-designate Planning Area 25 from "MSHCP Open Space" to "Open Space – Conservation Habitat" to be consistent with current nomenclature used in the Riverside County General Plan.
- Eliminate the previously identified gated entries on private roadways that access Planning Areas 22 through 25 from De Palma Road and Horsethief Canyon Road to ungated access to these Planning Areas.
- Relocate Street "A" to the east of Planning Area 24 and refine the proposed internal circulation system to accommodate the modifications to the land use plan.

Overall, with the inclusions of the modifications proposed under SPA 5, SPA 5 would reduce the maximum number of residential units throughout the Specific Plan area from 2,307 units to 2,210 units, increase the residential acreage within the Specific Plan area from 849.5 acres to 851.8 acres, and reduce the target density from 2.7 du/ac to 2.6 du/ac. Further, SPA 5 would make the following land use acreage modifications to the Specific Plan:

- Reduce residential land use acreage throughout the Specific Plan area from 748 acres to 746.8 acres.
- Increase "Open Space – Recreation" acreage throughout the Specific Plan area from 74.0 acres to 78.2 acres.

General Plan Amendment No. 1155 (GPA 1155) would modify and reconfigure the adopted land use designations of Planning Areas 22, 23, 24, and 25 within Specific Plan No. 152 and the EAP. GPA 1155 also would modify the land use designations within the Specific Plan from 15.5 acres of Very High Density Residential (VHDR), 23.8 acres of Medium Density Residential (MDR), 1.2 acres of Open Space-Recreation (OS-R), and 6.2 acres of Open Space-Conservation Habitat (OS-CH) to 34.8 acres of Medium High Density Residential (MHDR), 5.4 acres of OS-R, and 6.2 acres of OS-CH, to provide for the development of 229 single-family homes and a 1.6-acre park, and the preservation of 6.2 acres of MSHCP Open Space. Additionally, GPA 1155 would incorporate the 1.3 acres of vacated right of way into the boundaries of SP 152 and would re-designate the 1.3-acre area from "Commercial Retail (CR)" to "Specific Plan," which pursuant to SPA 5 would allow for development of this portion of the Project site with "Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)" land uses.

Change of Zone No. 7881 (CZ 7881) would amend the approved Specific Plan Zoning Ordinance for SP 152A3 (Ordinance No. 348.4291) to provide amended land use and development standards for the subject property and formalize planning area boundaries that reflect the refinements proposed as part of SPA 5.

Tentative Tract Map No. 37002 (TTM No. 37002) would subdivide the the Project site to accommodate development in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan Amendment. TTM No. 37002 would subdivide the a 49.0-acre Project site into 229 single-family residential lots on 37.4 acres; one (1) recreation site with a park on 1.6 acres; one (1) recreation site with service road/trail on 3.8 acres; and one (1) open space lot dedicated to MSHCP open space on 6.2 acres to implement HCRSP Planning Areas 22, 23 and 24 and added Planning Area 25, and renumbered Planning Area 26.

A detailed description of the various land uses that would result from the approval of TTM 37002 is provided in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, of this MND Addendum.

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

**C. Total Project Area:** 49.0 acres (area subject to SPA 5 and TTM37002)

<b>Residential Acres:</b> 37.4	<b>Lots:</b> 229	<b>Units:</b>	<b>Projected No. of Residents:</b> 765
<b>Commercial Acres:</b> N/A	<b>Lots:</b> N/A	<b>Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:</b> N/A	<b>Est. No. of Employees:</b> N/A
<b>Industrial Acres:</b> N/A	<b>Lots:</b> N/A	<b>Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:</b> N/A	<b>Est. No. of Employees:</b> N/A

**Other:** Open Space (Recreation): 5.4 acres; Open Space (Conservation Habitat): 6.2 acres

**D. Assessor’s Parcel No(s):** 391-090-006; -007; -016; -026; -044; -045; -046.

**E. Street References:** The parcels subject to the Specific Plan Amendment are located north of Broken Bit Circle Road, south of De Palma Road, east of Horsethief Canyon Creek, and west Horsethief Canyon Road.

**F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:** Section 17, Township 5S, and Range 5W, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian.

**G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings:** The areas proposed for changes as part of the Project consist of four irregularly shaped contiguous parcels in the Lake Elsinore area of unincorporated Riverside County, California. The property is vacant and undeveloped, and is characterized by generally rugged terrain incised by natural drainage features, including the Horsethief Canyon Wash located along the western boundary of the property. Refer to Subsection 2.2, *Project Setting and Surrounding Land Uses*, for a detailed description of the Project site’s existing environmental setting and surrounding land uses.

The area surrounding the parcels subject to the Specific Plan Amendment is characterized by Interstate 15 to the north; rural residential land uses and vacant land to the east, which is approved by the County of Riverside for development as a master-planned residential community (SP333 and TR 331210-1, known as “Renaissance Ranch”; residential land uses associated with the remaining portions of SP 152 to the south; and a residence and vacant land to the west.

### 3.2 APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

#### A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. **Land Use:** Pursuant to Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element Policy LU 1.10, with approval of SPA 5 and GPA 1155, the proposed land uses within the planning areas subject to SPA 5 would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use Map. The proposed Project is consistent with all other applicable land use policies of the Riverside County General Plan and the EAP.
2. **Circulation:** The proposed Project was reviewed by the Riverside County Transportation Department and was found to be in conformance the applicable circulation policies of the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element and the EAP, as well as County Ordinance No. 461 (Road Improvement Standards and Specifications).
3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** Approximately 12 percent of the Project site is planned to be conveyed to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) to contribute toward the formation of the MSHCP conservation area. The Project site does not contain any areas designated by the Riverside County General Plan the EAP as important farmland,

forest land, or mineral resource land. The proposed Project adheres to all applicable Multipurpose Open Space Element policies of the Riverside County General Plan and the EAP.

4. **Safety:** The Project site is located in Southern California, which is a seismically active area subject to ground shaking during a seismic event. The Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone or a County-designated Fault Hazard Zone. Construction as required by the California Building Standards Code (CBSC) would satisfactorily address structural stability related to seismic safety. The Project site is not located in a flood hazard area, per Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Map No. 06065C2006G (FEMA, 2008). The Project site is located in a high fire hazard area; however, the Project is designed to minimize hazards associated with wildfires. In addition, the Project is designed to accommodate the sufficient provision of emergency response services and was reviewed by the Riverside County Fire Department for compliance with all applicable fire protection requirements. The proposed Project adheres to all other applicable policies of the Riverside County General Plan Safety Element and the EAP.
5. **Noise:** The proposed Project adheres to all applicable policies within the Riverside County General Plan Noise Element.
6. **Housing:** The Riverside County General Plan Housing Element does not contain any policies applicable to the proposed Project, but rather identifies programs and actions to achieve the County's goals with respect to housing. The proposed Project relates to the County General Plan Housing Element through the Project's proposed residential land use of the property. The density of residential use proposed by the Project would not adversely impact the implementation of the County General Plan Housing Element's goals or policies.
7. **Air Quality:** The proposed Project is conditioned to control fugitive dust emissions during grading and construction activities and to reduce air pollutant emissions to the greatest feasible extent. The proposed Project is consistent with all other applicable Riverside County General Plan Air Quality Element policies.

**B. General Plan Area Plan(s):** Elsinore

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

**D. Land Use Designation(s):** Specific Plan No. 152, Amendment No. 3 (which identifies the following land use designations for the Project site: VHDR; MDR; OS-R; OS-CH; and CR).

**E. Overlay(s), if any:** None

**F. Policy Area(s), if any:** None

**G. Adjacent and Surrounding:**

1. **Area Plan(s):** Elsinore

2. **Foundation Component(s):** Community Development to the north; Community Development to the east; Community Development and Open Space to the south; Community Development to the west.

3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Light Industrial to the north; Commercial Retail and Medium Density Residential to the east; Medium Density Residential to the south; Medium Density Residential to the west.

- 4. **Overlay(s), if any:** None
- 5. **Policy Area(s), if any:** Glen Eden Policy Area to the east and west; Warm Springs Policy Area and Temescal Wash Policy Area to the north.

**H. Adopted Specific Plan Information**

- 1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** Specific Plan No. 152, Amendment No. 3 (Horsethief Canyon)
- 2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** The proposed Project would affect the northern portion of the Specific Plan area, including Planning Areas 22-25.

**I. Existing Zoning:** Specific Plan (SP) and Right of Way (R/W)

**J. Proposed Zoning, if any:** Specific Plan (SP)

**K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning:** Manufacturing-Serve Commercial (M-SC) to the north; Rural Residential (R-R) and Specific Plan (SP) to the east; Specific Plan (SP) to the south; Rural Residential (R-R) and Open Area Combining Zone Residential Developments (R-5) to the west.

**3.3 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below (☒) would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “New Significant Impact” or “More Severe Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

### 3.4 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 have been made by 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.

Prepared By:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_ For \_\_\_\_\_

**4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000-21178.1), this Initial Study has been prepared to analyze the 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 project. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the decision-makers, affected agencies, and the public of potential new or more severe significant environmental impacts that were not previously disclosed in MND No. 3981 associated with the implementation of the proposed Project.

**4.1 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE ASSESSMENT**

**4.1.1 Aesthetics**

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>1) Scenic Resources</b>				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Figure C-9 “Scenic Highways” (Riverside County, 2015a).

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No. 38981 noted that at the time, the Horsethief Canyon Ranch Specific Plan (HRCSP) site contained a fire facilities and rural residential uses and did not contain any scenic resources such as tress,



rock outcroppings, or other unique visual or aesthetic features. MND No. 38981 noted that at the time, the Horsethief Canyon Ranch Specific Plan (HRCSP) site contained fire facilities and rural residential uses and did not contain any scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, or other unique visual or aesthetic features. MND No. 38981 also determined that the proposed residential uses would not obstruct any prominent scenic vista or public view. MND No. 38981 determined that features on the property did not have scenic significance and that their removal would not comprise damage to scenic resources; thus, MND No. 38981 concluded that impacts to scenic resources would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 6)

Findings of Fact:

a) Consistent with the conditions that existed at the time MND No. 38981 was adopted, there are no officially-designated State scenic highways in the Project vicinity, nor are there any County-designated scenic highways. The nearest officially-designated State Scenic Highway is the portion of State Route 74 (SR-74) located east of the City of Hemet, which is approximately 30.5 miles east of the Project site. The Project site is located just south of Interstate 15 (I-15), which is a State Eligible Scenic Highway. (Caltrans, 2011) Due to distance, intervening topography, and development, buildings proposed by the Project would not be visible from any segments of SR-74; thus, the Project would not result in any impacts to State scenic highways. Although the buildings proposed by the Project would be visible from nearby segments of I-15, I-15 is not officially designated as a scenic highway corridor. Additionally, Riverside County reviewed the Project's design elements for conformance with the development standards and design guidelines associated with the HCRSP, and determined that all Project components are consistent with the HCRSP. As the HCRSP development standards and design guidelines were crafted to preclude aesthetically offensive conditions, the Project would not result in a significant adverse effect on views available from nearby segments of I-15. Accordingly, Project impacts to scenic highway corridors would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as previously analyzed in MND No. 38981.

b) and c) Impacts to scenic resources resulting from the buildout of SPA 3 were previously evaluated in MND No 38981, Section V.I., "Aesthetics," which found that impacts would be less than significant because the Project site does not contain any scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, or other unique visual or aesthetic features. Moreover, the MND determined that the proposed residential subdivision would not obstruct any prominent scenic vista or public view. Although the Project entails single-family residential uses in lieu of higher-density residential uses, the proposed SPA 5 Project would have a similar aesthetic character to approved SPA 3, when viewed from public viewpoints. Further, Development Standards and Design Guidelines (Architecture and Landscaping) set forth in SPA 5 would ensure that the Project site is developed in a manner that is visually attractive and would not adversely affect public views. Although SPA 5 would reconfigure the location of open space and recreational land uses within the Project site, these modifications would result in a similar amount of open space as was approved in SPA 3. Because the Project would be developed with a similar aesthetic character as approved SPA 3, implementation of the Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts to scenic resources than previously disclosed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>2) Mt. Palomar Observatory</b>				
a. Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: (RCIT, 2019), (Riverside County, 1988)(Regulating Light Pollution)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 noted that the HCRSP site is located within 45 miles of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, and therefore would be subject to Riverside County Ordinance No. 655. MND No. 38981 determined that adherence to the regulations set forth in Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 would allow future development within the HRCSP to avoid interfering with nighttime astrological observations at the Mt. Palomar Observatory, and that the proper shielding of lighting and the use of lighting types as identified in Ordinance No. 655 would ensure that the future development within the HRCSP would have a less-than-significant impact on activities at the Observatory. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 7)

Findings of Fact:

a) As detailed in the Riverside County GIS database, the Project is located in Zone B for the Mount Palomar Observatory and is located approximately 41.7 miles northwest of the Mount Palomar Observatory. As detailed in Riverside County Ordinance No. 655, “The application for any required County approval for work in Zones A and B involving nonexempt outdoor light fixtures shall include evidence that the proposed work will comply with this ordinance.” In addition, proposed SPA 5 incorporates design standards that minimize contributions to sky glow. Consistent with the finding of MND No. 38981, mandatory compliance with Ordinance No. 655 and implementation of the proposed design measures addressing outdoor lighting fixtures would ensure that the proposed Project would not contribute substantial amounts of light pollution (i.e., sky glow) which could interfere with nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory. The proposed Project would not result in any new or increased impacts associated with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>3) Other Lighting Issues</b>				
a. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Description; Riverside County General Plan EIR (Riverside County, 2015b)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 noted that development within the HRCSP would increase the amount of artificial nighttime lighting and incrementally contribute to a reduction of nighttime views in the area. However, MND No. 38981 determined that SPA 3 was a logical continuation of the HRCSP area and the introduction to new lighting sources created by SPA 3 would not create lighting impacts beyond those previously disclosed in the Riverside County General Plan EIR. As such, MND No. 38981 concluded that impacts due to light and glare would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 7)

Findings of Fact:

a) and b) As with the project evaluated in MND No. 38981, the development of the Project would increase the amount of light and glare, compared to existing conditions on the Project site. However, the proposed Project would reduce the number of dwelling units that would occur on the Project site, which would have a nominal reduction in the comparative amount of light and glare that may occur as compared to what was assumed by MND No. 38981.

Consistent with the findings of MND No. 38981, the Project would be required to comply with all applicable County of Riverside standards for lighting levels (i.e. the minimum standard required to ensure safe circulation and visibility). Exterior lighting for buildings would be of a low profile and intensity. The Project would be required to comply with Ordinance No. 915, which regulates outdoor lighting in Riverside County and states that “All outdoor luminaires in 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.” (Riverside County, 2012, p. 1) Additionally, the Project is also subject to the County of Riverside Public Road Standards, which implement the provisions of County Ordinance No. 461 and regulates (in part) lighting on public roadways (including roadways that would be constructed as part of the proposed Project). The Public Road Standards require that all street lights installed within the public right-of-way must comply with specific requirements, including that luminaries shall be low pressure sodium type, because the Project is located within a 30-mile radius of Mt. Palomar Observatory (Riverside County, 2007, p. 26). The Project would be required to comply with applicable street lighting standards of Ordinance No. 461. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed

Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

4.1.2 **Agriculture and Forest Resources**

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>4) Agriculture</b>				
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"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," Map My County – Riverside County (RCIT, 2019); Riverside County Important Farmland 2012 (Sheet 1 of 3) (CDC, 2017); Riverside County Williamson Act FY 2008/2009 (Sheet 1 of 3) (CDC, 1981), and Project Application Materials.

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 determined that the SPA 3 site was not located within an area mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Locally Important Farmland. Furthermore, MND No. 38981 noted the SPA 3 site was not designated for long-term agricultural use by the Riverside County General Plan, and was designated by the Elsinore Area Plan for development with residential and commercial retail uses. As such, MND No. 38981 concluded that no impacts to agricultural resources would occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 8)

Findings of Fact:

a) According to agricultural lands mapping available from the California Department of Conservation (CDC), the Project site is designated as "Other Land." Areas surrounding the Project site are designated

as “Farmland of Local Importance,” “Urban and Built-Up Land,” and “Other Land.” No portion of the Project site or immediately surrounding areas contains Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (“Farmland”). (CDC, 2017) SPA 5 includes the addition of 1.3 acres of land that is currently within the right-of-way for De Palma Road. This additional land is not designated for agricultural use. Accordingly, no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

b) As disclosed in MND No. 38981 in Section V.4., the Project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not under active agricultural production. These circumstances have not changed since MND No. 38981 was prepared in 2004. According to GIS mapping available from *Map My County – Riverside County*, there are no lands on the Project site that are located within an agricultural preserve, including the additional 1.3 acres of vacated right-of-way that would be added to the Specific Plan under SPA 5. The nearest lands within an agricultural preserve are located approximately 1.9 miles west of the Project site. (RCIT, 2019) Thus, the Project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural uses, or with land subject to Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve, and no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

c) As disclosed in MND No. 38981 in Section V.4., the Project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not under active agricultural production. These circumstances have not changed since MND No. 38981 was prepared in 2004. The Project site is currently zoned Specific Plan (SP) Zone and Right of Way (RW). According to GIS mapping available from *Map My County – Riverside County*, zoning designations surrounding the Project site include Rural Residential (R-R) to the east and west; Rural Residential (R-R), Open Area Combining Zone Residential Developments (R-5) to the west, SP Zone to the east and south, and Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC) to the north. No agriculturally zoned properties are located within 300 feet of the Project site; therefore, the Project would not cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property, and no impact would occur. Accordingly, no new or more severe impacts associated with this issue would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

d) Implementation of the proposed Project would replace the site’s previously developed (currently vacant) land with a residential community. As described in response to Item 5(a) above, the implementation of the Project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. Accordingly, development on the subject property would result in no impacts associated with farmland conversion. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>5) Forest</b>				
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 General Plan Figure OS-3 “Parks, Forests and Recreation Areas,” and Project Application Materials.

MND No. 38981 Findings:

Although MND No. 38981 did not address this subject, MND No. 38981 contained enough information about existing conditions and zoning of the SPA 3 site that with the exercise of reasonable diligence, information about SPA 3’s potential effect to forest resources was readily available to the public. MND No. 38981 did not evaluate impacts to forest resources. (Riverside County, 2004)

Findings of Fact:

a) through c) Although the Project is adjacent to a portion of the Cleveland National Forest, no portion of the Project site is zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Additionally, no lands surrounding the Project site are zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, the Project would have no potential to conflict with forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, nor would the Project result in the loss of forest land or cause other changes in the existing environment which would result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Thus, no impact would occur and no mitigation is required. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

4.1.3 Air Quality

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>6) Air Quality Impacts</b>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Expose sensitive receptors which are located within one (1) mile of the project site to project substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affected a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: (Riverside County, 2018); (Google Earth, 2019); (Giroux, 2015a)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 found that short-term impacts to air quality could result from construction activities associated with SPA 3 and long-term impacts to air quality could result from development of residential uses on-site associated with SPA 3. MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 project would be generally consistent with the growth anticipated by the Elsinore Area Plan. MND No. 38981 also noted that implementing projects would be subject to conditions from Riverside County to employ best management practices to reduce short- and long-term impacts to air quality to the greatest extent possible. Impacts were determined to be less than significant. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded impacts to air quality would be less than significant and impacts due to emissions of odors would not occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 9)

Findings of Fact:

As noted in 2.0, *Project Description*, the Project proposes development of 229 dwelling units. The Project’s Air Quality Report analyzes development of the Project site with 240 units. Thus, because the Project’s Air Quality Report analyzed development of 240 units, the Air Quality Report slightly overstates the amount of air quality emissions that would result from the Project. Thus, the discussion herein provides a conservative or “worst-case” analysis of the Project’s anticipated air quality emissions impacts.

a) Air quality impacts were evaluated in MND No. 38981 in Section V.5., which determined that no significant impacts associated with air quality would occur as a result of the construction and operation of SPA 3. The proposed Project associated with SPA 5 would include a similar amount of construction activities, and a reduction in the number of residential units that would be constructed at the Project site.

The applicable air quality management plan (AQMP) for the Project site is the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) 2012 AQMP. 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 Project's consistency with the 2012 AQMP is based on these criteria and is discussed below.

*Consistency Criterion No. 1: The proposed Project would 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.*

### Construction Impacts

The proposed Project would add an additional 1.3 acres of land to the Specific Plan area, which would result in a nominal increase in the amount of area that would subject to construction activities compared to the project analyzed in MND No. 38981. However, due to more stringent regulations that have been implemented following the approval of SPA 3 in 2004, it is expected that construction emissions would be at similar or reduced in comparison to the SPA 3 project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and the construction activities associated with the implementation of SPA 5 would 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. (Giroux, 2015a)

### Operational Impacts

The proposed Project would result in a nominal increase in the size of the Specific Plan area (1.3 acres) and overall reduction in the number of residential units that would occur in the buildout of the HCRSP. The reduction in the number of residential units would have a corresponding reduction in the amount of operational emissions of air pollutants, as the number of vehicular trips would be reduced. Because there would be a reduction in air quality emissions during Project operation as a result of SPA 5, the operation of the Project would 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. (Giroux, 2015a)

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

The proposed Project would result in the construction of fewer residential units compared to the land uses that were identified in SPA 3. As the assumptions in the AQMP is based on General Plan land uses for each jurisdiction within the South Coast Air Basin, the reduction of units associated with the proposed Project would ensure that the Project would not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP.

The proposed Project would not (1) 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 or (2) exceed the assumptions in the AQMP based on the years of Project build-out phase. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.



b) Air quality impacts were evaluated in MND No. 38981 in Section V.5., which determined that no significant cumulative impacts associated with air quality would occur as a result of the construction and operation of SPA 3. As evaluated in threshold a) above, the Project would result in fewer dwelling units than were assumed for the site by SPA 3 and MND No. 38981, which would result in a corresponding reduction in air quality emissions. Additionally, due to technological innovations and enhanced regulatory requirements adopted since 2004, operational emissions associated with the Project would be reduced in comparison to what was assumed for the Project by MND No. 38981. As such, because MND No. 38981 concluded that buildout of SPA 3 would not 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, and because the Project entails a reduction in the number of dwelling units (and associated air quality emissions) as compared to SPA 3, it can be concluded that Project-related air quality emissions would be reduced and that impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981. (Giroux, 2015a)

c) Residential areas adjacent to the Project site are considered to be sensitive to air pollution exposure because they may be occupied for extended periods, and residents may be outdoors when exposure is highest. MND No. 38981 identified that less-than-significant impacts to sensitive receptors would occur during the implementation of SPA 3. The proposed Project site is vacant with residential uses directly to the south, east and west. The proposed modifications to the HCRSP associated with SPA 5 would result in a reduction in the overall residential units within the Project site. No new uses would occur within the Project site that could result in a substantial point source for air quality emissions, and setbacks from the existing residential uses adjacent to the Project site would be similar to those identified in SPA 3. Therefore, impacts associated with the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial point source emissions would be similar to the project evaluated in MND No. 38981 and would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981. (Giroux, 2015a)

d) The residential, open space, and recreational land uses proposed in SPA 5 are similar to those that were evaluated in MND No. 38981 for SPA 3. Similar to SPA 3, the Project does not propose any land uses typically associated with emitting emissions that would lead to objectionable odors. Odor emissions associated with construction and operation of the Project would be similar to those previously evaluated in MND No. 38981, which concluded no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981. (Giroux, 2015a)

4.1.4 Biological Resources

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>7) Wildlife &amp; Vegetation</b>				
a. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?				
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 regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 Wildlife 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 State or federally protected wetlands (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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: (RCIT, 2019), WRCMSHCP and/or CVMSHCP, On-site Inspection; General Biological Assessment prepared by Terracor October 15, 2003 (Terracor, 2003); Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc. (GLA) Oak Tree Assessment (GLA, 2006).

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 determined that impacts associated with the MSHCP would be less than significant because the SPA 3 project was consistent with the MSHCP. In addition, MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 site was disturbed and contained no native vegetation at the time MND No. 38981 was prepared and SPA 3 was designed to protect Horsethief Canyon Creek. MND No. 38981 also noted that the SPA 3 site was within the Stephen's Kangaroo Rat Fee Area and that no endangered habitat was identified on the SPA 3 site. Furthermore, MND No. 38981 determined that potential habitat for burrowing owl may occur on-site and a focused survey would be required as a condition for implementing projects. The SPA 3 project was designed to protect Horsethief Canyon Creek, and the SPA 3 project included mitigation requiring completion of a wetland delineation to demonstrate that no wetlands would be disturbed with implementation of the SPA 3 project. Implementation of this mitigation was found reduce impacts to less than significant. MND No. 38981 noted that if disturbance to protected lands were to occur, a project redesign or take permits would be required. Additionally, MND No. 38981 determined that SPA 3 was located within a MSHCP Cell Area (Cell Group E, Cell Number 3647); however, MND No. 38981 found that the SPA 3 site was not designed for open space preservation under the MSHCP's Elsinore Area Plan. MND No. 38981 also noted that a portion of the SPA 3 site adjacent to Horsethief Canyon Creek would be retained as open space. Impacts to biological resources were determined to be potentially significant, but were found to be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 11)

Findings of Fact:

a.) The Biological Assessment Prepared for the Project site in 2003 indicated that the majority of the Project area contained highly disturbed upland sage scrub and alluvial sage scrub habitat. A majority of the Project site had been directly disturbed by humans over the previous several decades. (Terracor, 2003, p. 1) The conditions at the Project site remain largely unchanged since the preparation of MND No. 38981, and the boundaries of impacts and the development footprint are not any greater than what was evaluated in the previous MND, with the exception of the addition of 1.3 acres of right-of-way associated with De Palma Road. Moreover, although the proposed Project would refine the Planning Area boundaries and modify the residential densities within Planning Areas 22 and 23, the proposed Project includes the preservation of areas adjacent to Horsethief Canyon Creek through the OS-CH (Open Space – Conservation Habitat) designation for Planning Area 26. The preservation of the areas proposed along Horsethief Canyon Creek would be consistent with the planned land uses within the western portion of the approved project. As the existing site conditions are unchanged compared to the conditions that were analyzed in MND No. 38981, and because the development footprint would not be greater than what was evaluated in the previous MND, there would be no new or more severe impacts associated with MSHCP compliance.

b.-c.) As discussed above in question a), Project site has been directly disturbed by humans over the last several decades. (Terracor, 2003, p. 1) The conditions at the Project site remain largely unchanged since the preparation of MND No. 38981, and the boundaries of impacts and the development footprint are not any greater than what was evaluated in the previous MND, with the exception of the addition of 1.3 acres of right-of-way associated with De Palma Road. Moreover, although the proposed Project would refine the Planning Area boundaries and modify the residential densities within Planning Areas 22 and 23, the proposed Project includes the preservation of areas adjacent to Horsethief Canyon Creek through the OS-CH (Open Space – Conservation Habitat) designation for Planning Area 26. The preservation of the areas proposed along Horsethief Canyon Creek would be consistent with the planned land uses within the western portion of the approved project. Therefore, the Project's impacts associated with endangered, threatened, candidate, sensitive or special status species would be less than significant.

Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

d.) Similar to the approved project, the proposed Project would preserve the adjacent portion of Horsethief Canyon Creek. The Project's preservation of these areas through the designation of Planning Area 26 for conservation land uses would contribute to the assembly of Proposed Constrained Linkage 5. (GLA, 2005a, p. 5) Thus, the proposed Project would not conflict with wildlife movement. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

e.) The MSHCP defines riparian/riverine areas as "lands which contain habitat dominated by trees, shrubs, persistent emergent, or emergent mosses and lichens, which occur close to or which depend upon soil moisture from a nearby fresh water source, or areas with fresh water flow during all or a portion of the year." The 2005 DBESP prepared in conjunction with the approved project determined that approximately 0.24 acre of riparian vegetation including southern willow scrub, mule fat scrub, cottonwood woodland, walnut woodland, and sycamore woodland, occur within the Project site. All riparian vegetation within the Project site is located along Horsethief Canyon Creek, which occurs in limited areas and is interspersed throughout the drainage. Additionally, the Project was reviewed and approved on June 26, 2006 as part of the Habitat Assessment and Negotiation Strategy (HANS) process (HANS No. 238) (refer to *Technical Appendix B5*), which is used by the County to implement portions of the MSHCP by identifying and delineating conservation areas on specific properties. Furthermore, the Project was reviewed and approved as part of the Joint Project Review (JPR) process (JPR 06-06-07-01), which allows the County to monitor implementation of the MSHCP and subjects development applications within the Criteria Area to review in order to determine if they have the potential to affect the goals of the MSHCP. Similar to the approved project, the proposed Project would avoid development within the area around Horsethief Canyon Creek. As the development footprint in relation to Horsethief Canyon Creek would not change in comparison to the approved project, and because the Project has been reviewed and approved under the HANS and JPR processes, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts to riparian/riverine areas. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

f.) Based on a Preliminary Findings of Corps and CDFG Jurisdiction prepared in 2004 in conjunction with the approved project, Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) jurisdiction associated with the Project site totals approximately 0.59 acre of Waters of the United States, none of which consists of jurisdictional wetlands. (GLA, 2005a, p. 6) California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW, previously the California Department of Fish and Game) jurisdiction associated with the Project site is approximately 0.83 acre, of which approximately 0.24 acre consists of vegetated riparian habitat, and includes all areas within Corps jurisdiction. (GLA, 2005a, p. 6) However, similar to the approved project, the proposed Project would avoid development within the area around Horsethief Canyon Creek where the 0.83 acre of CDFW jurisdiction occurs. As the development footprint in relation to Horsethief Canyon Creek would not change in comparison to the approved project, the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts to wetlands.

g.) Subsequent to the adoption of MND No. 38981, an Oak Tree Assessment was prepared for the Project site in 2006. The County's Oak Tree Management Guidelines require an oak tree assessment for all properties that contain oak trees to determine project impacts to oak trees. The County's guidelines do not apply to individual oak trees, unless their trunks are larger than two inches in diameter at breast height (DBH) for a single trunk or the sum of the diameters of multiple trunks at breast height. (GLA, 2006, p. 1)

Several coast live-oak trees (*Quercus agrifolia*) were determined to occur on the Project site. (GLA, 2006, p. 2). A total of 17 coast live-oak trees were surveyed on the Project Site, including one dead tree. The Project would result in the removal of three coast live-oak trees and may encroach into the protected zone of a third oak tree (Tree # 16). The Project would be required to replace the removed oak trees as a condition of approval based on the County's Oak Tree Management Guidelines. As this impact was identified as potentially significant in the MND, the implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts to oak trees.

Project Requirements and MND No. 38981 Mitigation Compliance

MND No. 38981 identified several mitigation measures (applied to MND No. 38981 as Conditions of Approval) to address impacts to biological resources. These measures, which are listed below, would continue to apply to the proposed Project and would be enforced as part of the Project's conditions of approval.

**COA 15. PLANNING**

Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project: "PRIOR TO PROJECT APPROVAL, a biological study shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval. This condition shall be considered MET if the relevant study has been approved by the Planning Department. This condition may be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if the Planning Department determines that the required study is not necessary. The submittal of this study mandates that a CEQA determination of an Addendum to a previously adopted EIR be made, at a minimum."

**COA 30. PLANNING 25**

Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall obtain written notification to the County Planning Department that the appropriate California Department of Fish and Game notification pursuant to Sections 1601/1603 of the California Fish and Game Code has taken place, or obtain an "Agreement Regarding Proposed Stream or Lake Alteration" (Sections 1601/1603 permit) should any grading or construction be proposed within or along the banks of any natural watercourse or wetland, located either on-site or any required off-site improvement areas. Copies of any agreement shall be submitted with the notification.

**COA 30. PLANNING 26**

Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall obtain written notification to the County Planning Department that the alteration of any watercourse or wetland, located either on-site or on any required off-site improvement areas, complies with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permit Conditions, or obtain a permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act should any grading or construction be proposed within or along the banks of any natural watercourse or wetland. Copies of any agreement shall be submitted with notification."

In accordance with Condition of Approval COA 15. Planning, a Biological Technical Report was submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval. In accordance with the Project's Biological Technical Report, the following Project-specific mitigation measures would apply to the Project. These measures,

which are listed below, would continue to apply to the proposed Project and would be enforced as part of the Project's conditions of approval.

- MM-1 All disturbed and unvegetated areas of the site shall be watered daily to minimize the generation of fugitive dust which can affect adjacent habitats.
- MM-2 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department that all grading and construction personnel have received copies of all adopted mitigation measures to reduce impacts to biological resources. Additionally, verbal instruction shall be provided during monitoring by qualified personnel to all site workers to insure clear understanding that biological resources are to be protected on-site to the maximum extent feasible.
- MM-3 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department that qualified biologist or ecologist has been hired to conduct monitoring during grading activities. Monitoring shall be periodic, not constant, and shall be unannounced. Brief monitoring reports shall be submitted to Riverside County and kept on file. The monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt grading or construction activities if an unauthorized activity is underway or if currently-undetected sensitive resources are determined to be present.
- MM-4 The Project Applicant shall dedicate Horsethief Canyon Wash and adjoining southern coast live oak riparian forest areas to the County of Riverside and its habitat conservation agency to meet conservation goals set for the Elsinore Area Plan, Estelle Mountain/Indian Canyon Subunit, Cell Group E, Cell No. 3647.
- MM-5 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall submit the street lighting plan to the County Biologist for review in order to reduce unnecessary impacts to natural areas to the west.
- MM-6 Prior to issuance of a building permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department that the Project utilizes native trees and shrubs for slope plantings, front yard trees, and reverse frontage landscape plans. Tree species could include coast live oak and western sycamore, however, trees with invasive root systems should be avoided where feasible, such as alder or cottonwood. Native shrubs should be utilized where feasible, including toyon, Ceanothus, sugar bush, white sage, black sage, and other flora native to the area.
- MM-7 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project Applicant shall submit to the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD) a Best Management Water Quality Protection Plan consistent with the requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- MM-8 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department that impacts to coast live oak trees occurring within the area to be affected by the Project are mitigated by planting 19 coast live oak trees in the on-site Conservation Area within the potential mitigation areas. Refer to Exhibit 5, Mitigation Map, of the DBESP prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates (*Technical Appendix B2*).

- MM-9 Prior to issuance of a grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department that impacts to 0.79 acre of MSHCP riparian habitat are mitigated through restoration in the on-site Conversation Area. The on-site Conservation Area shall be enhanced and replanted with a dominance of California sagebrush, California buckwheat, yerba santa, tarragon, lemonade berry, and a hydroseed mixture associated with sage scrub communities, within the potential mitigation areas. Refer to Exhibit 5, *Mitigation Map*, of the DBESP prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates (*Technical Appendix B2*).
- MM-10 Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, the Riverside County Planning Department shall approve a three-year maintenance and monitoring program. General maintenance requirements will encompass weed eradication, inspection for trash, vandalism, disease and pest infestation that may threaten the long-term health of the riparian community. Trash will be removed, vandalism will be repaired and the maintenance contractor will employ appropriate pest control techniques as necessary. In addition, any signs of distress or mortality will be noted and rectified. The routine monitoring shall include evaluation of site hydrology, plant establishment and vigor, indications of faunal utilization, development of soils, indications of biochemical processes, and collection of site photographs. The Project biologist or restoration specialist will conduct the monitoring and report any problems to the Project proponents and the maintenance contractor.
- MM-11 Following the initial three years of mitigation monitoring, the Riverside County Planning Department shall verify that the entire on-site Conservation Area is protected in perpetuity through recordation of a deed restriction or a conservation easement in the name of a suitable land-management entity, or another similar mechanism to ensure that areas remain as open space in perpetuity.

4.1.5 Cultural Resources

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>8) Historic Resources</b>				
a. Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials; (RCIT, 2019); (JMA, 2015b); (JMA, 2019)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 site was completely disturbed and the likelihood of the presence of any historical resources is minimal. MND No. 38981 determined that due to the character of the surrounding land uses (primarily single-family and rural residential uses), it would be extremely unlikely that any significant historic resources would be located in the SPA 3 area. MND No. 38981 noted that no

previously recorded significant historical sites are located on or adjacent to the SPA 3 site. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that potential impacts to historic resources were not expected and that no impact would occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 12)

Findings of Fact:

a. The proposed Project would occur within the same limits of disturbance as the project evaluated in MND No. 38981, with the exception of the addition of 1.3 acres associated with the De Palma Road right-of-way. A records search for the Project site (including the 1.3-acre addition) was performed and an intensive survey of the Project site was conducted and summarized in the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment and Addendum to the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment (JMA, 2015b, p. 1; JMA, 2019). The search entailed the review of all previously recorded historic sites on or within a one-mile radius of the Project site. In addition, the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, California Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, and the California Directory of Properties were reviewed to identify historic properties. (JMA, 2015b, p. 14)

The records search conducted for the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment did not identify any historic resources within the Project boundaries. The various concrete slabs located on the Project site appear to be less than 50 years in age and likely served as foundation pads for large, pre-engineered metal storage buildings, sheds, and an office. Along the southern property margin there are several older slabs of poor construction that were used for either travel trailers or single-wide mobile homes. Consequently, no historic resources were identified within the Project site. (JMA, 2015b, p. 19; JMA, 2019) No impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

b. No listed National Register of Historic Places, California Historical Landmarks, or California Points of Historical Interest properties have been recorded on or within a one-mile radius of the Project area. The California Directory of Properties Office of Historic Preservation’s Directory of Properties also did not list any historic structures in this part of Corona/Temescal Canyon as having been previous evaluated for historical significance. (JMA, 2015b, p. 16; JMA, 2019) Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>9) Archaeological Resources</b>				
a. Alter or destroy an archeological 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 archeological resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
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"/>

Source: Project Application Materials; (JMA, 2015b); (JMA, 2019)

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 site was completely disturbed and the likelihood of the presence of any archeological resources was minimal. MND No. 38981 determined that due to the character of the surrounding land uses (primarily single-family and rural residential uses), it would be extremely unlikely that any significant archeological resources would be located in the SPA 3 area. MND No. 38981 noted that no previously recorded significant archeological sites are located on or adjacent to the SPA 3 site. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that potential impacts to archeological resources were not expected and that no impact would occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 12)

**Findings of Fact:**

a. and b.) The proposed Project would occur within the same limits of disturbance as the project evaluated in MND No. 38981, with the exception of the addition of 1.3 acres associated with the De Palma Road right-of-way. An intensive pedestrian survey of the study area was conducted on April 14, 2015, which is detailed in the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment. The intent of the survey was to identify all potentially significant cultural resources situated within the boundaries of the Project site. The results of the records search did not identify any archeological resources within the Project site.

The records search and field survey did not indicate the presence of any prehistoric or historic archaeological resources within the Project site. The study confirmed the findings made MND No. 38981 that due to the large amount of disturbance that has taken place throughout the study area associated with past use of the Project site, monitoring of future earth-disturbing activities connected with development of the property is not required. (JMA, 2015b, pp. 19-20; JMA, 2019). Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

c.) In the event that human remains are encountered during the course of any future development, California State Law (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Section 5079.98 of the Public Resources Code) states that no further earth disturbance shall occur at the location of the find until the Riverside County Coroner has been notified. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). (JMA, 2015b, p. 20; JMA, 2019) The modifications to the HCRSP that would occur with the implementation of SPA 5 would not increase the likeliness that human remains would be encountered, nor would it affect the potential for impacts if such remains were encountered during ground-disturbing activities. No impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

4.1.6 Energy

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>10) Energy Conservation</b>				
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with or obstruct a State or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 indicated that SPA 3 was not considered an energy intensive land use and that energy consumption levels would not be expected to exceed typical requirements for similar urban development. MND No. 38981 determined the SPA 3 project would not conflict with any adopted energy conservation plan. Furthermore, MND No. 38981 noted that the applicable service providers for energy had indicated an ability to serve the SPA 3 project without significantly affected the provision of energy resources. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that impacts due to wasteful consumption of energy resources would be less than significant and no impact would occur due to conflicts with an adopted energy conservation plan. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 35)

Findings of Fact:

a) and b) The Project would not conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans. The Project would be developed in conformance with all applicable energy conservation regulations including but not limited to Title 24 energy conservation standards. The Project would be constructed to achieve the building energy efficiency standards set forth in the California Code of Regulations Title 24 requirements in effect at the time of building permit issuance. Adherence to these efficiency standards would result in a “maximum feasible” reduction in unnecessary energy consumption. Additionally, the proposed Project would represent a decrease in the number of dwelling units within the Project site, which would have a corresponding reduction in the energy demand. Furthermore, it should be noted that current regulations for energy conservation are much stricter than the regulations adopted at the time MND No. 38981 was adopted in 2004. As a result, the Project would result in a decreased energy demand as compared to what was evaluated for the Project site in MND No. 38981. Thus, the Project’s impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during Project construction and operation would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

4.1.7 Geology and Soils

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>11) Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazards Zones</b>				
a. Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 “Earthquake Fault Study Zones,”; (RCIT, 2019);

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 disclosed that the SPA 3 site was not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone or a County Fault Hazard Zone. Furthermore, MND No. 38981 noted that no active faults had been mapped within the SPA 3 site. MND No. 38981 determined no impact would occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 13)

Findings of Fact:

a.) No new information has become available following adoption of MND No. 38981 indicating that the Project site may contain an earthquake fault and no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>12) Liquefaction Potential Zone</b>				
a. Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 “Generalized Liquefaction”; LGC Geotechnical Inc. *Summary of Infiltration Testing*, May 21, 2014 (LGC, 2014b); (RCIT, 2019); LGC Geotechnical Liquefaction Study, April 14, 2104 (LGC, 2014a)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 determined that the SPA 3 site was located in an area mapped as having moderate liquefaction potential. A site-specific Geotechnical Report was prepared for SPA 3, which found that the SPA 3 site did not contain any liquefaction hazards. MND No. 38981 concluded impacts would be considered less than significant with incorporation of the County’s standard Uniform Building Code (UBC) and County requirements for construction, as required in standard conditions of approval. MND No. 38981 concluded impacts would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 14)

Findings of Fact:

According to the County of Riverside GIS database, the Project site is located in area with low to moderate liquefaction potential. A Geotechnical Liquefaction Study for the site was performed by LGC Geotechnical in April 2014. The exploration program consisted of drilling and sampling two small-diameter exploratory borings to evaluate the general engineering characteristics of the onsite materials and depth to groundwater. The borings were excavated in the lower elevations of the site in anticipation of encountering the shallowest depth to groundwater. (LGC, 2014a, p. 1) The soil samples indicated that soils within the Project site are generally not considered susceptible to liquefaction due to their dense to very dense nature below the estimated historic-high groundwater level of 30 feet below existing grade. (LGC, 2014a) As detailed in the Geotechnical Liquefaction Study prepared for the Project, due to the relatively low potential for liquefaction the potential for lateral spreading is also considered very low. (LGC, 2014a, p. 4) Accordingly, the findings in the Geotechnical Liquefaction Study are consistent with the findings in MND No. 38981 with respect to liquefaction impacts. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>13) Ground-shaking Zone</b> a. Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 “Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map,” and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk); (LGC, 2014a); (LGC, 2020)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

Given SPA 3’s location in Southern California, and the common occurrence of earthquake faults in the region, the MND No. 38981 disclosed that the SPA 3 site may experience strong seismic ground shaking from a local or regional earthquake of large magnitude. MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 site was located within a zone of very high (30 - 40% g) ground-shaking risk, as designated by the General Plan. Since the SPA 3 site was not located within a State Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone or a County Fault Hazard Zone, the SPA 3 site was not required to investigate the potential for and setback from ground rupture hazards. MND No. 38981 indicated that SPA 3 would follow engineering and design parameters in accordance with the most recent edition of the UBC, as required in standard County conditions of

approval. Therefore, MND No. 38981 disclosed that ground-shaking events are expected to cause less than significant impacts to the project. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 14)

Findings of Fact:

The proposed Project would include the development of residential land uses that are similar to those that were evaluated in MND No. 38981. As with much of the Southern California region, the Project site is located in a seismically active area. As disclosed in MND No. 38981, the proposed homes would be subject to ground shaking during seismic events that could occur during the operation of the proposed Project. Therefore, the Project has the potential to expose people or structures to adverse effects associated with seismic events. However, similar to the homes that proposed within SPA 3, the design of the proposed homes would be required to comply with the California Building Code (CBC), which requires compliance with special structural design standards to attenuate hazards associated with credible seismic ground shaking events that are anticipated in the Project area. Mandatory compliance with the CBC would ensure that impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>14) Landslide Risk</b> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: On-site Inspection, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 “Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map”;

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 disclosed that the SPA 3 site consisted of Undocumented Fill, Alluvium, Colluvium, and Alluvial Fan Deposit soils. MND No. 38981 noted the SPA 3 site was flat, contained no measurable slopes and would not be subject to landslide risk. MND No. 38981 disclosed that no landslides were documented within or adjacent to the SPA 3 site. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded no impacts would occur associated with landslide risk. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 15)

Findings of Fact:

As disclosed in MND No. 38981, the Project site is not subject to landslides. The 1.3-acre of right-of-way that would be added to the Project site would be relatively flat and would not affect the potential for landslides to occur on the site. Thus, no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>15) Ground Subsidence</b> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 “Documented Subsidence Areas Map”

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 found that the SPA 3 site was mapped within a Susceptible Subsidence Zone. Seismic-induced differential settlements were expected to be within Riverside County acceptable limits. A Geotechnical Report was prepared for the SPA 3 site and no significant subsidence hazards were identified. MND No. 38981 acknowledged that future development within SPA 3 would be required to follow engineering and design parameters in accordance with the UBC, as required by standard County conditions of approval. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that the risk of subsidence hazards would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 15)

Findings of Fact:

The Project site falls within an area of Riverside County that is designated as being susceptible to subsidence. However, design of the proposed homes would be required to comply with the CBC, which requires compliance with special structural design standards to attenuate hazards associated with ground subsidence that could occur in the Project area. As with the project analyzed in MND No. 38981, compliance with mandatory CBC requirements would ensure that impacts associated with ground subsidence would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>16) Other Geologic Hazards</b> a. Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 determined that the SPA 3 project would not be subject to any other geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazards. MND No. 38981 concluded no impact would occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 16)

Findings of Fact:

Consistent with the conditions that existed at the time MND No. 38981 was certified, there are no volcanoes in the Project region. Additionally, the Project vicinity consists of relatively flat topography, and there are no hillsides in the area that could subject the Project site to mudflow hazards. With respect to seiches, the nearest body of water to the Project site is Corona Lake, which is a small reservoir located approximately 0.5-mile northwest of the Project site. The nearest large body of water to the Project site is Lake Elsinore, located approximately 5.5 miles southeast of the site. According to Riverside County Elsinore Area Plan (EAP), the Project site is not located within the inundation zone for Lake Elsinore or Corona Lake, indicating that the site is not subject to hazards associated with seiches (Riverside County, 2017, Figure 10). The areas surrounding the Project site are generally flat, with the area immediately south of the Project site developed with homes. There are no prominent topographic landforms within the Project vicinity that would subject the Project site to mudflows during a storm event. Although the Project site is located adjacent to the Horsethief Canyon Creek, the Project has been designed with open space and conservation areas along on the western boundary to the site adjacent to Horsethief Canyon Creek, which would avoid the potential for mudflow impacts to the proposed residential uses. Accordingly, the Project would not result in new or more severe impacts associated with these geologic hazards. Thus, no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>17) Slopes</b>				
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: Project Application Materials

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 indicated that the SPA 3 site was generally flat and did not contain any measurable slopes or distinct landform features. MND No. 38981 noted that no cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 were proposed and the Building and Safety Standard Grading Requirements, applied as County conditions of approval, require slopes higher than 10 feet tall to be landscaped to reduce impacts such as excess runoff and loss of topsoil and that no additional mitigation was required. In addition, MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 project did not contain any subsurface sewage disposal systems that would be affected as a result of grading activities. Therefore, MND No. 38981 determined grading proposed as part of the SPA 3 project would have a less than significant impact on existing topography and ground surface relief features and would have no impact to subsurface sewage disposal systems. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 16)

Findings of Fact:

a-c) Due to the relatively flat nature of the Project site there are no prominent slopes on the Project site. Development of the proposed Project would not dramatically change the topography or ground surface relief features. The Preliminary Grading Plan for the Project site (dated July 28, 2014) by Mayers & Associates Civil Engineering, Inc., indicates that a portion of the land sloping into the proposed on-site detention basin would have a slopes ranging from 2:1 to 4:1. However, these slopes would be designed for the detention basin use and would not result in physical environmental impacts to other uses on the Project site or to adjacent properties. No slopes greater than ten feet in height are proposed. No other steep slopes are proposed within the Project site. Impacts associated with cut or fill slopes would be less than significant.

The proposed Project would include new subsurface sewer pipes that would connect to existing facilities within adjacent roadways. Project grading would not affect existing sewer facilities, and proposed sewer facilities would be designed to accommodate the proposed grades. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>18) Soils</b>				
a. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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: Project Application Materials; On-site Inspection; (Riverside County, 2015a); (JMA, 2015a); (LGC, 2014b)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 noted that under existing conditions the SPA 3 site contained a temporary fire service facility and rural residential uses, was void of vegetation in many areas, and experienced substantial soil erosion. Furthermore, MND No. 38981 indicated expansive soils were not present on the SPA 3 site. MND No. 38981 determined that soil erosion would continue to occur during construction of the SPA 3 project. MND No. 38981 noted that implementation of the SPA 3 project would result in the introduction of impervious surfaces and landscaping to the site, which would dramatically reduce erosion and loss of topsoil. MND No. 38981 determined the SPA 3 project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit process and would be required to establish and implement specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) at the time of implementation to ensure that erosion would not occur during the construction phase. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that impacts would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 17)

Findings of Fact:

a) Potential soil erosion/loss of topsoil during the construction and operational phase of the Project is analyzed below.

Construction-Related Activities

As with the project evaluated in MND No. 38981, the proposed grading activities associated with the Project would temporarily expose underlying soils to water and air, which would increase erosion susceptibility while the soils are exposed. The property is generally flat, so erosion potential would not be substantial compared to sites with exposed soils on slopes. Regardless, exposed soils would be subject to erosion during rainfall events or high winds due to the removal of the remnants of structures, pavement, and/or stabilizing vegetation and exposure of these erodible materials to wind and water. Erosion by water would be greatest during the first rainy season after grading and before the Project's foundations are established and paving and landscaping occur. Erosion by wind would be highest during periods of high wind speeds when soils are exposed.

Pursuant to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board, the Project Applicant is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for construction activities. The NPDES permit is required for all projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area. Additionally, during grading and other construction activities involving soil exposure or the transport of earth materials, Chapter 15.12 (Uniform Building Code) of the Riverside County Municipal Code would apply, which establishes, in part, requirements for the control of dust and erosion during construction. As part of the requirements of Chapter 15.12, the Project Applicant would be required to prepare an erosion control plan that would address construction fencing, sand bags, and other erosion-control features that would be implemented during the construction phases to reduce the site's potential for soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Requirements for the reduction of particulate matter in the air also would apply, pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 403. Mandatory compliance to the Project's NPDES permit and these regulatory requirements would ensure that water and wind erosion impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

### Long-Term Operational Activities

Following construction, wind and water erosion on the Project site would be minimized, as the areas disturbed during construction would be landscaped or covered with impervious surfaces. Only nominal areas of exposed soil, if any, would occur in the Project's landscaped areas. The only potential for erosion effects to occur during Project operation would be indirect effects from storm water discharged from the property. All flows entering the on-site storm drainage system would be directed toward the water quality detention basin planned in the northern portion of the site via subsurface storm drain pipes. Following treatment of these flows within the water quality detention basin, flows would be conveyed to an existing storm drain located in Horsethief Canyon Road. On-site drainage would largely mimic existing conditions.

Based on the analysis presented in the Project's hydrology study (*Technical Appendix E1*), post-development runoff from the site would slightly increase during 100-year (24-hour duration) storm events (i.e., from 75.2 cubic feet per second [cfs] under existing conditions to 99.44 under post-development conditions) (Mayers & Associates, 2014b, p. 4). Although peak runoff from the site would increase under the proposed Project, the Project area was previously improved with storm water drainage infrastructure that was sized to accommodate future development within the area. Moreover, runoff from the Project site following development would be conveyed directly to existing drainage facilities downstream that have been designed to preclude or substantially avoid erosion hazards. As such, soil erosion and the loss of topsoil would not increase substantially as compared to existing conditions.

In addition, the Project Applicant is required to prepare and submit to the County for approval of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). The WQMP must identify and implement an effective combination of erosion control and sediment control measures (i.e., Best Management Practices) to reduce or eliminate discharge to surface water from storm water and non-storm water discharges. Adherence to the requirements noted in the Project's required WQMP (refer to *Technical Appendix E2*) would further ensure that potential erosion and sedimentation effects would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

b) Expansive soils testing and remediation are required by current County of Riverside grading and building codes prior to development. These mandatory soils testing requirements as well as compliance with CBC requirements would further ensure that the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts associated with expansive soils. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

c) No septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems are located on the site or proposed as part of the Project; accordingly, no impact due to soils incapable of supporting such systems have the potential to occur. Because no septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems are proposed as part of the Project, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

### Project Requirements and MND No. 38981 Mitigation Compliance

MND No. 38981 identified a mitigation measure (applied to MND No. 38981 as a Condition of Approval) to address impacts to geological resources. This measure, which is listed below, would continue to apply to the proposed Project and would be enforced as part of the Project's conditions of approval.

**COA 10. FLOOD RI.I**

1. Development of the site will require armored bank protection along Horsethief Canyon Wash, which the District would maintain. This bank protection shall be designed and constructed to District standards. Exhibit ‘B’ from the Hydraulic report by AEI-CASC (dated June 14, 2004) depicts a Hydraulic Encroachment limit line. Exhibit ‘B’ also shows a Conservation Encroachment limit line. The slope protection shall be designed to respect both limits and such that any conservation easement/habitat area would not constrain the District from performing maintenance on the structural improvements. Note: Joint use of the trail proposed along the top of the slope would require indemnification of the Flood Control District by and appropriate public entity.

2. The County’s Municipal Stormwater Permit will require that individual development proposals on the site develop and implement a Water Quality Management Plan to mitigate any potential negative impacts to Water quality.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>19) Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on- or off-site.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 “Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map,” Ord. No. 460, Article XV & Ord. No. 484  
MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 site was mapped within a Moderate Wind Erodibility Zone. MND No. 38981 explained that under existing conditions, the SPA 3 site was disturbed, void of vegetation in many areas, and experienced substantial soil erosion, including erosion caused by wind. MND No. 38981 concluded that during construction, soil erosion from wind would continue to occur; however long-term development of the SPA 3 site would dramatically reduce wind erosion and the loss of top soil. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded impacts would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 18)

Findings of Fact:

Proposed grading activities would expose underlying soils at the Project site, which would increase erosion susceptibility during grading and construction activities. Exposed soils would be subject to erosion due to the removal of stabilizing vegetation and exposure of these erodible materials to wind. Erosion by wind would be highest during periods of high wind speeds.

The Project site is considered to have a “moderate” susceptibility to wind erosion (Riverside County, 2015a, Figure S-8). During grading and other construction activities involving soil exposure or the transport of earth materials, significant short-term impacts associated with wind erosion would be

precluded with mandatory compliance with the Project’s SWPPP and Riverside County Ordinance No. 484.2, which establishes requirements for the control of blowing sand. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403, which addresses the reduction of airborne particulate matter. With mandatory compliance to regulatory requirements, wind erosion impacts would be less than significant during construction and mitigation is not required.

Following construction, wind erosion on the Project site would be negligible, as the disturbed areas would be landscaped (and in many cases irrigated) or covered with impervious surfaces. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not significantly increase the risk of long-term wind erosion on- or off-site, and impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

**4.1.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>20) Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

Although MND No. 38981 did not address this subject, MND No. 38981 contained enough information about projected air quality emissions associated with SPA 3 that with the exercise of reasonable diligence, information about SPA 3’s potential effect due to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions was readily available to the public. MND No. 38981 did not evaluate impacts due to GHG emissions.

**Findings of Fact:**

As noted in 2.0, the Project proposes development of 229 dwelling units. The Project’s Trip Generation Review, which is relied upon for analysis of greenhouse gas emissions impacts, analyzes development of the Project site with 240 units. Thus, because the Project’s Trip Generation Review analyzed development of 240 units, the Trip Generation Review slightly overstates the number of trips (and related greenhouse gas emissions) that would result from the Project. Thus, the discussion herein provides a conservative or “worst-case” analysis of the Project’s anticipated greenhouse gas emissions impacts.

a) and b) A discussion and analysis of the Project’s potential impacts associated with GHG emissions is presented below.

## Background

Global Climate Change (GCC) is defined as the change in average meteorological conditions on the earth with respect to temperature, precipitation, and storms. Scientific evidence suggests that GCC is the result of increased concentrations of greenhouse gases in the earth's atmosphere, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and fluorinated gases. Many scientists believe that this increased rate of climate change is the result of greenhouse gases resulting from human activity and industrialization over the past 200 years.

GCC refers to the change in average meteorological conditions on the earth with respect to temperature, wind patterns, precipitation and storms. Global temperatures are regulated by naturally occurring atmospheric gases such as water vapor, CO<sub>2</sub> (carbon dioxide), N<sub>2</sub>O (nitrous oxide), CH<sub>4</sub> (methane), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride. These particular gases are important due to their residence time (duration they stay) in the atmosphere, which ranges from 10 years to more than 100 years. These gases allow solar radiation into the earth's atmosphere, but prevent radioactive heat from escaping, thus warming the earth's atmosphere. GCC can occur naturally as it has in the past with the previous ice ages.

An individual project like the proposed Project cannot generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to affect a discernible change in global climate. However, the proposed Project may participate in the potential for GCC by its incremental contribution of greenhouse gases combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of greenhouse gases, which when taken together constitute potential influences on GCC.

## Applicable GHG Regulations

Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 was issued by Governor Schwarzenegger in 2005 and documents GHG emission reduction goals, creates the Climate Action Team, and directs the Secretary of CalEPA to coordinate efforts with meeting the GHG reduction targets with the heads of other state agencies. EO S-3-05 goals for GHG emissions reductions include: reducing GHG emissions to 2000 levels by the year 2010; reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020; and reducing GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. (CCC, n.d.)

In response to EO S-3-05, in September 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the California Climate Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 requires California to reduce its GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, which represents a reduction of approximately 15 percent below emissions expected under a "business as usual" scenario. Pursuant to AB 32, the CARB must adopt regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emission reductions. The full implementation of AB 32 will help mitigate risks associated with climate change, while improving energy efficiency, expanding the use of renewable energy resources, cleaner transportation, and reducing waste. (CARB, 2014)

## Comparison of Project GHG Impacts to MND No. 38981

Although MND No. 38981 did not evaluate GHG impacts per se, MND No. 38981 contained sufficient information about projected air quality emissions associated with SPA 3 that with the exercise of reasonable diligence, information about SPA 3's potential effect due to GHG emissions was readily available to the public. In comparison to the land uses and other assumptions utilized in MND No. 38981, the proposed Project would result in a substantial reduction in GHG emissions. Due to advancements in technology and more stringent regulations since 2004, the Project's GHG emissions associated with construction sources, mobile sources, area sources, and energy sources would be substantially less than what would have been disclosed by MND No. 38981 for the Project site. Moreover, the proposed Project

would result in an overall reduction in the number of residential units in the HCRSP. The reduction in the number of residential units would have a corresponding reduction in the amount of traffic (as discussed in Subsection 4.1.18, *Transportation*, Threshold a), MND No. 38981 assumed the Project site would generate approximately 467 more daily trip-ends than would be generated by the Project). Because a majority of the Project’s GHG emissions would be associated with mobile sources, and because the Project would result in a reduction in vehicular traffic as compared to what was evaluated by MND No. 38981, it can therefore be assumed that GHG emissions that would occur as a result of the Project would be reduced in comparison to what would have been disclosed by MND No. 38981. Therefore, the Project would not result in any new or more severe impacts due to GHG emissions as compared to what would have been disclosed as part of MND No. 38981.

**4.1.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>21) Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter (1/4) 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials; (Google Earth, 2019)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 noted that the predominant land use proposed for the SPA 3 project was residential development, which is a use with little potential for storage of toxic substances with the exception of household chemicals. However, MND No. 38981 explained that common household chemicals are of such a low concentration and volume that they would pose no significant impacts to human health and safety. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that impacts due to the creation of a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant, and impacts due to other hazards and hazardous materials would not occur. (Riverside County, 2004, pp. 18-19)

Findings of Fact:

a) and b) Similar to the approved project evaluated in MND No. 38981, heavy equipment would be used during construction of the Project, which would be fueled and maintained by substances such as oil, diesel fuel, gasoline, hydraulic fluid, and other liquid materials that would be considered hazardous if improperly stored or handled. In addition, materials such as paints, roofing materials, solvents, and other substances typically used in building construction would be located on the Project site during construction. Improper use, storage, or transportation of hazardous materials could result in accidental releases or spills, potentially posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment. This is a standard risk on all construction sites, and there would be no greater risk for improper handling, transportation, or spills associated with the Project than would occur on any other similar construction site, and such impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

Due to the residential nature of the proposed land use, residents would not store any acutely hazardous materials within the residential areas. Household goods would be used within the proposed residences and throughout the common areas of the Project site that contain toxic substances, such as cleaning supplies, construction materials, and pesticides. These household goods are typically low in concentration and limit in amount; therefore, there is no significant risk to humans or the environment from the use of such household goods. Residents are required to dispose of household hazardous waste including pesticides, batteries, old paint, solvents, used oil, antifreeze, and other chemicals at a Household Hazardous Waste Collection Facility. Accordingly, impacts during long-term operation of the Project would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

c) The Project site is not identified in any adopted emergency evacuation plans as containing any emergency evacuation routes or facilities. Due to the nature and location of the Project site, the Project would not interfere with implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. The reduction in the total number of units on the Project site in comparison to the approved SPA 3 project would have a corresponding reduction in the impact to any emergency evacuation plans. Additionally, the proposed Project would be required to meet County of Riverside standards for sightlines and access for emergency vehicles. No impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

d) The Project site is not located within a quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school to the Project site is Luiseno School (a Kindergarten through 8<sup>th</sup> grade school) located at 13500

Mountain Road in Corona, approximately 0.6 mile southeast of the Project site (Google Earth, 2019). Additionally, due to the residential nature of the proposed Project, it would not result in the emissions or release of acutely hazardous materials. Thus, no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

e) Based on a review of the California Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) Cortese List Data Resources (which lists the facilities/sites identified as meeting the “Cortese List” requirements), the Project site is not identified as being contaminated, thereby indicating that the site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. (CalEPA, 2019) Therefore, the Project has no potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to presence of an existing hazardous materials site identified on a list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Thus, no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>22) Airports</b>				
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 (2) 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"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 “Airport Locations,” (RCIT, 2019); (Google Earth, 2019); (RCALUC, 2010, page 3-37)

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No. 38981 determined that the SPA 3 site was not located within an airport influence area and there was no potential for airport-related impacts to occur. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded no impact would occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 19)



Findings of Fact:

a) The nearest airport to the Project site is Skylark Field Airport in the City of Lake Elsinore, located approximately 10 miles to the southeast of the Project site. The Project is not located within a geographic area that is covered by any Airport Master Plans (as described in thresholds c) and d) below), thus the Project would not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan. No impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

b) The nearest airport to the Project site is Skylark Field Airport in the City of Lake Elsinore, located approximately 10 miles to the southeast of the Project site. The Project would not require the review of an Airport Land Use commission due to the Project’s distance from any nearby airports/heliports and because the homes proposed on site would not be of a height that would interfere with aircraft operations. No impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

c) and d) The nearest airport to the Project site is Skylark Field Airport in the City of Lake Elsinore, located approximately 10 miles to the southeast of the Project site. The nearest private airstrip to the Project site is the McConville Airstrip located approximately 5.50 miles south of the Project site. There are not heliports in the vicinity of the Project site. (Google Earth, 2019) The Project site is not located within an airport land use plan nor is the Project located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Although the Perris Valley Airport is the closest airport to the Project site, as a privately-owned facility, no master plan has been prepared for this airport. The Project site does not lie within the airport influence area of the Perris Valley Airport. (RCALUC, 2010, page 3-37) Additionally, the Project site is not located within an airport influence area (RCIT, 2019). Thus, with regards to airports, airstrips and heliports, the Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

**4.1.10 Hydrology and Water Quality**

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>23) Water Quality Impacts</b>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Create or contribute runoff water which 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk the release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Map No. 06065C2006G; (FEMA, 2008); (Riverside County, 2014); (Mayers & Associates, 2014a); (Mayers & Associates, 2014b) Figure 4.9.2 (Dam Failure Inundation Zones) County of Riverside General Plan EIR (RCIT, 2019); (Riverside County, 2015b)

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 site was not located within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone and was not subject to inundation resulting from dam failure. MND No. 38981 determined that the SPA 3 project would result in grading operations that could result in short-term erosion and sedimentation impacts. Furthermore, MND No. 38981 determined the SPA 3 project would permanently alter the composition of surface runoff by grading site surfaces and constructing impervious surfaces. MND No. 38981 identified mitigation imposed by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, which would reduce impacts related to flooding to less than significant. Furthermore, MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 project would be required to comply with the NPDES requirements, which would reduce water quality and sedimentation impacts to a level below significance. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that with implementation of the required mitigation (refer to COA 10. FLOOD RI.I, below), impacts to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 20)

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project would have the potential to violate water quality standards and waste discharge requirements during Project construction and/or operation. Each is discussed below.

Construction-Related Water Quality Impacts

Construction of the proposed Project would involve the demolition of the existing building remnants on site (such as building pads) and ground disturbance/grading, resulting in the generation of potential water quality pollutants such as silt, debris, chemicals, and other solvents with the potential to adversely affect water quality. As such, short-term water quality impacts have the potential to occur during construction of the Project in the absence of any protective or avoidance measures.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Santa Ana RWQCB and the County of Riverside, the Project would be required to obtain a NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit for construction activities. The NPDES permit is required for all projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with the Santa Ana RWQCB's Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program. Compliance with the NPDES permit and the Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program involves the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP for construction-related activities. The SWPPP would specify the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that the Project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern (including sediment) are prevented, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property. Mandatory compliance with the SWPPP would ensure that the Project does not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction activities. Therefore, no new or more severe impacts to water quality would occur during Project construction.

Operational Water Quality Impacts

Storm water pollutants that could be generated by the proposed Project include bacterial indicators; nutrients; pesticides; sediments; trash and debris; and oil and grease (Mayers & Associates, 2014a, p. 20).

The water quality/infiltration basin is designed for the Project site to accept storm runoff from the majority of the Project site and then outlet to Horsethief Canyon Creek. A portion of the proposed storm runoff would discharge to an existing California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS) storm drain system located northeast of the Project site. The proposed basin would store water quality flows in the lower five feet of the basin. Above this depth, the basin would mitigate the developed 2-year 24 hour below that of the existing 2-year 24-hour flows. The westerly portion of the Project site (approximately 10 acres) will not be disturbed and continue to drain westerly in its natural drainage pattern. (Mayers & Associates, 2014a, p. 17) As detailed in the Hydrology and Hydraulic Analysis for the Project, the developed peak flow rates would be below that of the existing flow rates. (Mayers & Associates, 2014b, p. 1)

Although the impervious surface area that would be generated by the proposed Project would be similar to the amount of impervious surface area that would have occurred under the approved project (SPA 3), the proposed Project would increase the amount of impervious surface area compared to existing conditions and would also increase the amount of storm water runoff discharged from the Project site. As detailed in the Hydrology and Hydraulic Analysis for the Project and as described below, the developed peak flow rates for runoff would be below that of the existing runoff rates.

The proposed water quality/infiltration basin has been designed to store the water flows in the lower 5 feet of the basin. Above this depth the basin will mitigate the developed 2-year 24-hour flow below that of the existing 3-year 24-hour flows. (Mayers & Associates, 2014b, p. 2) The rational hydrology 10- and 100-year site analysis determined that the 100-year unmitigated peak flow rate would be 75.2 cubic feet per second (cfs) for the approximately 36.9-acre tributary area "A" that outlets into Horsethief Canyon Creek. The proposed storm drain would be designed to convey the 100-year peak discharge from the Project site. (Mayers & Associates, 2014b, p. 4) The impermeable surfaces proposed by the Project would decrease the amount of storm water runoff infiltration on-site as compared to existing conditions thereby increasing the volume of storm water runoff (and pollutants) discharged into downstream receiving waters. However, this would not represent a substantial increase in storm water quantity and would not result in a substantial increase in the potential for polluted storm water, as described below.

The Project's Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (*Technical Appendix E2*) identifies the inclusion of the following low impact development (LID) retention BMPs: water quality/infiltration basin (Mayers & Associates, 2014a, p. 17). The Project design also includes the following treatment control BMP: infiltration basin, which will mitigate bacterial indicators, nutrients, pesticides, sediments, trash/debris, and oil/grease. (Mayers & Associates, 2014b, p. 22) In addition the Project includes the following source control BMPs: all catch basins would be marked with the works "Only Rain Down the Storm Drain" or similar; existing native trees, shrubs and ground cover will be preserved to the maximum extent possible; landscaping would be designed to minimize irrigation and runoff and would promote infiltration when possible; the Homeowner's Association (HOA) would be responsible for the maintenance of the basin on a monthly basis; the HOA is responsible for educating the home owners regarding pools, spas, ponds and fountains as well as private driveways and hardscape areas; streets will be vacuum swept on a monthly basis and prior to the rainy season; and the HOA would be responsible to contract with an outside company for weekly trash pickup. (Mayers & Associates, 2014a, pages 25-26) The infiltration basin would minimize, prevent, and/or otherwise appropriately treat storm water runoff flows before they are discharged from the site. Mandatory compliance with the WQMP would ensure that the Project does not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during long-term operation. Additionally, the Project would be required to comply with provisions set forth in the Riverside County Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP) to control stormwater runoff so as to prevent any deterioration of water quality that would impair subsequent or competing beneficial uses of the water. The DAMP is used by the Permittees in their development of the Local Implementation Plans (LIPs), individual ordinances, plans, policies, and procedures to manage urban runoff (Riverside County, 2014, page 2-1). Accordingly, impacts to water quality associated with post-development activities would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

b) As detailed in the Preliminary WQMP for the Project site, the soils on site are Type "A" and provide favorable infiltration throughout the site. The LID design for the site would be a water quality/infiltration basin. Additionally, there would be approximately 11 acres of open space/recreation and open space/conservation habitat along the westerly boundary of the Project site which would not be disturbed and as such would provide additional infiltration areas on the Project site. (Mayers & Associates, 2014a, p. 9) Impervious surfaces were minimized in the Project design via a reduction in the width of sidewalks from 6 feet to 5 feet in Planning Areas 22 and 23.

No groundwater wells are located on the Project site or proposed as part of the Project. Water for the Project would be provided by the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD) because the Project site falls within the boundaries of this water district (RCIT, 2019). The proposed Project would result in a reduction of the number of residential units planned for the Project site, which would have a corresponding reduction in the demand for potable water. This reduction in demand will decrease the

amount of groundwater supplies that would be required for the HCRSP. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

c) The Project includes “Open Space – Conservation Habitat” (OS-CH) land uses in Planning Area 26 which is intended to avoid alteration of the adjacent Horsethief Canyon Creek. As described in detail in Threshold a) above, the Project has been designed to not increase the amount of runoff from the Project site as compared to existing conditions and, as such, the Project would not result in the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

d) The proposed Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Runoff from the developed portion of the Project site would drain northerly to the proposed infiltration basin through a storm drain system and then outlet into Horsethief Canyon Creek. The basin was designed to store the water quality flows in the lower 5 feet of the basin. Above this depth the basin was designed to detain the developed-condition 2-year 24-hour flow below that of the existing 3-year 24-hour flows. (Mayers & Associates, 2014b, p. 2) The 10- and 100-year site analysis determined that the 100-year unmitigated peak flow rate would be 75.2 cfs for the portion of the site that outlets into Horsethief Canyon Creek. Accordingly, the Project would have a less than significant impact in this regard and would not result in new or more severe impacts compared to the project evaluated in MND No. 38981.

e) The proposed Project would result in a similar amount of developed area within the Project site in comparison to the previously approved project (SPA 3). The Project entails “Open Space – Conservation Habitat” (OS-CH) land uses in Planning Area 26 and as such the Project would avoid alteration of the adjacent Horsethief Canyon Creek. As detailed in the response to Threshold a) above, with the implementation of the proposed stormwater drain facilities and infiltration basin, the amount of post-development runoff from the Project site would be less than what current runoff rates. The proposed storm drain facilities have been designed to convey the 100-year peak discharge from the Project site and as such, the Project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

f) As detailed in Threshold a) above, runoff from the developed portion of the Project site would drain northerly to the proposed infiltration basin through a storm drain system and then outlet into Horsethief Canyon Creek. The basin has been designed to store the stormwater flows in the lower 5 feet of the basin. Above this depth the basin would accommodate the developed 2-year 24-hour flow below that of the existing 3-year 24-hour flows. (Mayers & Associates, 2014b, p. 2) The proposed storm drain would be designed to convey the 100-year peak discharge from the Project site. (Mayers & Associates, 2014b, p. 4) Thus, the Project would not 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. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

g) The Project proposes “Open Space – Conservation Habitat” (OS-CH) land uses in Planning Area 26 and as such the Project would avoid alteration of the adjacent Horsethief Canyon Creek. As described in detail in Threshold a) above, the Project’s drainage improvements have been designed to not increase the amount of runoff from the Project site, compared to existing conditions and as such, the Project would not impede or redirect flood flows. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of

the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

h) The nearest body of water to the Project site is Corona Lake, which is a small reservoir located approximately 0.5-mile northwest of the Project site. The nearest large body of water to the Project site is Lake Elsinore, located approximately 5.5 miles southeast of the site. According to Riverside County EAP, the Project site is not located within the inundation zone for Lake Elsinore or Corona Lake, indicating that the site is not subject to hazards associated with seiches (Riverside County, 2017, Figure 10). The Project site is located approximately 25 miles from the Pacific Ocean; thus, the Project would not be subject to hazards associated with tsunamis. As disclosed in MND No. 38981, the Project site is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area. As detailed on FEMA website, the Project site is located in Flood Zone X (unshaded), which is an area determined to be outside of the 0.2% annual chance floodplain (i.e. 500-year flood zone). Zone X (unshaded) is an area of minimal flood hazard (FEMA, 2008). Thus, the Project would not result in the release of pollutants due to Project inundation in a flood, tsunami, or seiche hazard zone. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

i) As discussed above under Threshold a), the Project would fully comply with the Santa Ana RWQCB's Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program. Compliance with the Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program involves the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP for construction-related activities. The SWPPP would specify the BMPs that the Project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern (including sediment) are prevented, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property. Mandatory compliance with the SWPPP would ensure that the Project does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan. As discussed above under Threshold b), the Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge; thus, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

Project Requirements and MND No. 38981 Mitigation Compliance

MND No. 38981 identified a mitigation measure (applied to MND No. 38981 as a Condition of Approval) to address impacts to hydrology and water quality. This measure, which is listed below, would continue to apply to the proposed Project and would be enforced as part of the Project's conditions of approval.

**COA 10. FLOOD RI.1**

1. Development of the site will require armored bank protection along Horsethief Canyon Wash, which the District would maintain. This bank protection shall be designed and constructed to District standards. Exhibit 'B' from the Hydraulic report by AEI-CASC (dated June 14, 2004) depicts a Hydraulic Encroachment limit line. Exhibit 'B' also shows a Conservation Encroachment limit line. The slope protection shall be designed to respect both limits and such that any conservation easement/habitat area would not constrain the District from performing maintenance on the structural improvements. Note: Joint use of the trail proposed along the top of the slope would require indemnification of the Flood Control District by and appropriate public entity.

2. The County’s Municipal Stormwater Permit will require that individual development proposals on the site develop and implement a Water Quality Management Plan to mitigate any potential negative impacts to Water quality.

4.1.11 Land Use and Planning

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>24) Land Use</b>				
a. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. 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"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan, (RCIT, 2019), Project Application Materials

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 was located within the Elsinore Area Plan and was designated for Medium Density Residential (2-5 du/ac), Very High Density Residential (14-20 du/ac), and Commercial-Retail uses. The SPA 3 project included a General Plan Amendment which proposed changes in the land use designations. MND No. 38981 noted that with approval of the proposed General Plan Amendment development of the SPA 3 site would be consistent with the Elsinore Area Plan and was a logical continuation of development within the HCRSP and would not result in land uses consistency impacts beyond those previously described in the Riverside County General Plan EIR. Furthermore, MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an existing community. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that impacts to land use due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation would be less than significant and impacts due to the division of an established community would not occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 23)

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project would not result in a substantial alteration of the land uses that were approved through SPA 3 and evaluated in MND No. 38981. The approved project provided for the development of the Project site with residential development, open space, and recreational uses. The Project Applicant proposes a General Plan Amendment as well as a Specific Plan and Zoning Code Amendment. The proposed General Plan Amendment would amend the Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element and EAP Land Use Plan land use designations as they pertain to the 1.3-acre parcel from “CR” to “Specific Plan,” which pursuant to SP 152 would allow for development of the site with residential uses having a density range of 5.0 to 8.0 du/ac. Overall, with the inclusions of the modifications proposed under SPA 5 would reduce the maximum number of residential units throughout the entire HCRSP area (Planning

Areas 1 through 26) from 2,307 units to 2,210 units, increase the residential acreage within the Specific Plan area from 849.5 acres to 851.8 acres, and reduce the overall Specific Plan target density from 2.7 du/ac to 2.6 du/ac. Additionally, SPA 5 would increase the amount of “Open Space-Recreation” acreage throughout the Specific Plan from 74 acres to 78.2 acres, and would maintain the amount of MSHCP Open Space at 6.2 acres. With approval of the Project’s GPA and SPA, the Project would not conflict with the land use designations and policies of the General Plan or the HCRSP. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

b) The proposed Project does not include any changes to the previously approved project that would result in a physical division of a community. The Project involves refinements to Planning Areas 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26 of the larger HCRSP development and would provide for sidewalks and bike lanes that would enable public access throughout the site. As such, the Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community and no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

Project Requirements and MND No. 38981 Mitigation Compliance

MND No. 38981 identified a mitigation measure to address impacts to land use and planning. It should be noted that the mitigation measure has since been implemented and does not apply to the Project.

**MND MM-I** The applicant shall process a General Plan Amendment (GPA No. 658) and obtain approval and adoption from the Riverside County Board of Supervisors.

4.1.12 Mineral Resources

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>25) Mineral Resources</b>				
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. Potentially 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: General Plan EIR Figure 4.12.1, *Mineral Resource Areas*; California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures; Project Application Materials



MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 determined that the SPA 3 site was mapped as Mineral Resources Zone 3 (MRZ-3) and was not located within an area of known mineral resources. According to the California Department of Conservation California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, lands designated as MRZ-3 are defined as areas of undetermined mineral resource significance (CDC, 1981). Furthermore, the SPA 3 project was consistent with the Elsinore Area Plan and was not located within an area designated by the Elsinore Area Plan for mineral extraction uses. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded no impact to mineral resources would occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 24)

Findings of Fact:

a through c) Based on available information, the Project site has never been the location of mineral resource extraction activity. No mines are located on the property. According to General Plan Figure 4.12.1, *Mineral Resources Areas*, the Project site remains designated within MRZ-3 pursuant to the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA). According to the California Department of Conservation California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, lands designated as MRZ-3 are defined as areas of undetermined mineral resource significance (CDC, 2000, p. 3). Furthermore, the Project site is not identified as an important mineral resource recovery site by the General Plan or by HCRSP. Accordingly, no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

4.1.13 Noise

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project result in:</i>				
<b>26) Airport Noise</b>				
a. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two (2) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations,"; (Google Earth, 2019); (RCALUC, 2010)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 determined that the SPA 3 site was not located within an airport influence area and there was no potential for airport-related noise impacts to occur. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded no impact would occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 25)

Findings of Fact:

a) and b) The nearest airport to the Project site is Skylark Field Airport in the City of Lake Elsinore, located approximately 10 miles to the southeast of the Project site. The nearest private airstrip to the Project site is the McConville Airstrip located approximately 5.50 miles south of the Project site. March Air Force Base is located approximately 13.40 miles northeast of the Project site. (Google Earth, 2019) According to Riverside County GIS, the Project site is not located within an Airport Influence Area for any airport. Due to the Project’s distance from airports and private air fields, the Project site does not fall within an airport land use plan nor is the Project located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>27) Noise Effect by the Project</b>				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Table N-1 (“Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure”); Project Application Materials.

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 determined that the SPA 3 project had the potential to expose existing area residents to temporary and permanent increases in ambient noise levels, expose persons noise levels in excess of the Riverside County General Plan noise ordinance, and expose persons to groundborne vibration during the construction phase of the SPA 3 project. MND No. 38981 concluded that with implementation of mitigation, which required implementing projects to construct a masonry wall along Horsethief Canyon Road, limitations on construction hours, and County review and approval of an acoustical report, impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that with

implementation of mitigation, impacts to noise would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, pp. 25-27)

Findings of Fact:

As noted in 2.0, the Project proposes development of 229 dwelling units. The Project's Noise Impact Analysis analyzes development of the Project site with 240 units. Thus, because the Project's Noise Impact Analysis analyzed development of 240 units, the Trip Generation Review slightly overstates the amount of noise that would result from the Project. Thus, the discussion herein provides a conservative or "worst-case" analysis of the Project's anticipated noise impacts.

a) The proposed Project would have the potential to generate substantial temporary or permanent increases in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Each is discussed below.

Construction-Related Impacts

Similar to the previously approved SPA 3 project, the construction activities associated with the development of the proposed Project would create short-term noise increases near the Project site. The proposed Project does not include any new components that would subject area residents to noise levels that would be substantially different than those contemplated in MND No. 38981. Due to the temporary nature of construction-related activities, these impacts would be limited to the duration of the construction in any one location. Consistent with the conclusions in MND No. 38981, the Project would be required to adhere to the County's conditions of approval related to limits in the hours of construction, which are required through the implementation of COA 30. PLANNING 36. With implementation of mitigation, impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

Long-Term Operation Impacts

Operation of the proposed Project would result in noise impacts due to traffic generated by the Project, and noise due to the Project's proximity to the I-15 freeway, which is located immediately north of the Project site. The Project would generate traffic that would increase area-wide noise levels throughout the Project area. However, as discussed in Subsection 4.1.18, the proposed Project generate 467 fewer daily transportation trip-ends than the SPA 3 project, which would have a corresponding decrease in the amount of traffic noise that would be generated by the Project. Thus, noise impacts due to Project-related traffic would be less than was disclosed by MND No. 38981, which found that traffic-related noise off site would be less than significant. Accordingly, Project-related traffic noise would be less than significant.

Consistent with the findings in MND No. 38981, future residents on the Project site would be subject to potentially significant noise levels from off-site traffic from the I-15 freeway. Implementation of Mitigation Measures identified in MND No. 38981, which would still be required for the proposed Project, would reduce traffic-related noise impacts on site to less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

b) Consistent with the conclusions reached in MND No. 38981, operational characteristics associated with the Project's proposed residential use would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or noise and impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, and also consistent with the findings of MND No. 38981, while some groundborne noise and vibration may result from construction activities, such noise

would be temporary and infrequent and would not result in the exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or noise. Notwithstanding, a noise and vibration analysis was included in the Project’s Noise Impact Analysis (*Technical Appendix F*), the results of which are presented below for construction activities.

Construction activities generate ground-borne vibration when heavy equipment travels over unpaved surfaces or when it is engaged in soil movement. The effects of ground-borne vibration include discernable movement of building floors, rattling of windows, shaking of items on shelves or hanging on walls, and rumbling sounds. Vibration is most commonly expressed in terms of the root mean square (RMS) velocity of a vibrating object when considering vibration annoyance potential. RMS velocities are expressed in units of vibration decibels. The range of vibration decibels (VdB) is as follows (Giroux, 2015, p. 10):

- 65 VdB - threshold of human perception
- 72 VdB - annoyance due to frequent events
- 80 VdB - annoyance due to infrequent events
- 100 VdB- minor cosmetic damage

To determine potential impacts of the project’s construction activities, estimates of vibration levels induced by the construction equipment at various distances are presented in Table 4-1, *Project Construction Vibration Levels*.

Table 4-1 Project Construction Vibration Levels

Equipment	Approximate Vibration Levels (VdB)*				
	25 feet	50 feet	75 feet	100 feet	1000 feet
Large Bulldozer	87	81	77	75	55
Loaded Truck	86	80	76	74	54
Jackhammer	79	73	69	67	47
Small Bulldozer	58	52	48	46	26

\*(FTA Transit Noise & Vibration Assessment, Chapter 12, Construction, May, 2006)  
(Giroux, 2015, Table 3)

The on-site construction equipment that will create the maximum potential vibration is a large bulldozer or loaded truck. The stated vibration source level in the FTA Handbook for such equipment is 81 VdB at 50 feet from the source. The nearest residential structures to the project site are at least 75 feet from the nearest building pad and heavy equipment activity. The majority of project equipment would operate at much greater separation distances. Vibration levels from heavy equipment could be as high as 77 VdB at the closest existing residences which, although could be perceptible, is well below any damage thresholds. Therefore, the Project-related vibration impacts are considered less than significant during the construction activities at the Project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981. (Giroux, 2015, p. 10)

Project Requirements and MND No. 38981 Mitigation Compliance

MND No. 38981 identified a mitigation measure (applied to MND No. 38981 as a Condition of Approval) to address impacts due to noise. These measures, which are listed below, would continue to apply to the proposed Project and would be enforced as part of the Project’s conditions of approval. It should be noted that COA 30. PLANNING 36 been updated to reflect information contained in the Project-specific Noise Study and updated construction times per Riverside County Ordinance No. 874.

**COA 30. PLANNING 36**

Prior to project approval, compliance with the conditions of approval contained in Department of Health's Report dated June 15, 2004 (attached), based on Noise Impact analysis prepared by Giroux & Associates, July 9, 2003. These conditions call for:

1. A ~~thirteen~~ten-foot-high noise barrier along De Palma Road/Interstate 15 frontage.
2. A six-foot masonry wall along Horsethief Canyon Road.
3. Construction activities shall be limited to the house of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM Monday through Saturday during the months of October through May, and between 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM during the months of June through September.
4. Public health shall review and approve an acoustical report addressing indoor noise impacts prior to an implementing project approval.
5. Applicant shall pay all applicable Review Fees to the Department of Public Health.

Additionally, out of an abundance of caution, new Mitigation Measures MM-12 through MM-16 have been identified, which include standard noise attenuation measures in order to further reduce the potential for construction noise. Although construction-noise related impacts of the Project would be less than significant and would be no greater than disclosed by MND No. 38981, these mitigation measures are identified to reduce to the maximum feasible extent noise levels during construction.

- MM-12 Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the County of Riverside Building Director (or his designee) shall ensure that grading and/or building plans include a note that requires all construction equipment to minimize noise from construction activities by maintaining equipment mufflers in proper operating order and operating all equipment in the quietest manner feasible.)
- MM-13 Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the County of Riverside Building Director (or his designee) shall ensure that grading and/or building plans include a note that requires that to the extent feasible, the noisiest operations shall be scheduled to occur simultaneously in the construction program to avoid prolonged periods of annoyance.
- MM-14 Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the County of Riverside Building Director (or his designee) shall ensure that grading and/or building plans include a note that requires that the construction contractor locates equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site.
- MM-15 Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the County of Riverside Building Director (or his designee) shall ensure that grading and/or building plans include a note that requires that no music or electronically reinforced speech from construction workers shall be audible at noise-sensitive properties adjacent to the Project site.
- MM-16 Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the County of Riverside Building Director (or his designee) shall ensure that grading and/or building plans include a note that requires that all project workers exposed to noise levels above 80 dBA shall be provided with personal protective equipment for hearing protection (i.e., earplugs and/or earmuffs). The County of

Riverside Planning Director (or his designee) shall also ensure that areas where noise levels are routinely expected to exceed 80 dBA are clearly posted with signs requiring that hearing protection be worn.

Additionally, out of an abundance of caution, Mitigation Measure MM-17 has been identified, which includes a standard noise attenuation measures in order to further reduce the potential for noise impacts during Project operation. It should be noted that traffic-related noise affecting the Project is outside the purview of CEQA; nonetheless, the following mitigation measure is identified to ensure future Project residents are allowed a “windows closed” condition to reduce interior noise levels.

MM-17 Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits, the County of Riverside Building and Safety Department shall ensure that all De Palma/I-15 perimeter homes shall have central air conditioning as a standard feature to allow for window closure during warmer weather while maintaining interior comfort. Supplemental ventilation shall be required for any habitable rooms facing De Palma Road. Assuming a 3-person household, 45 cfm (5x15 cfm/person) of fresh make-up should be supplied to such rooms. The make-up air intake should be on the side of the house away from the adjacent arterial roadway.

4.1.14 Paleontological Resources

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>28) Paleontological Resources</b> a. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 “Paleontological Sensitivity”; Pre-Construction Paleontological Assessment (JMA, 2015a); (RCIT, 2019).

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 indicated that the SPA 3 site was designated by the Riverside County General Plan as having a paleontological sensitivity of “High A” which is defined as having the potential to yield fossils at or below four feet of depth. MND No. 38981 noted the area surrounding the SPA 3 site was previously developed and did not yield significant paleontological resources. MND No. 38981 noted that no previously recorded significant paleontological sites existed on the SPA 3 site. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that no impact to paleontological resources would occur.

Findings of Fact:

The proposed Project would occur within the same limits of disturbance as the project evaluated in MND No. 38981, with the exception of the addition of 1.3 acres associated with the De Palma Road right-of-way. Similar to the findings in MND No. 38981, the County of Riverside GIS system indicates that the Project site has a paleontological sensitivity of “High Sensitivity (High A)”, which is currently defined as

being “[b]ased on geologic formations or mappable rock units that are rocks that contain fossilized body elements, and trace fossils such as tracks, nests, and eggs. These fossils occur on or below the surface.” The current designation of the Project site as being within an area of Riverside County with a high paleontological resources sensitivity is consistent with the findings in MND No. 38981.

In April 2015, a Pre-Construction Paleontological Assessment was prepared to document the findings of the paleontological site investigation conducted for the Project site and included a literature search, records search at the San Bernardino County Museum, and field reconnaissance (JMA, 2015a, p. ii). No paleontological resources were identified on the Project site. (JMA, 2015a, p. 6). The entire Project site is underlain by Older Alluvial deposits which are known to contain highly significant fossil localities in other parts of Southern California area. However, no recorded fossil localities are known from the Project site and the field study failed to identify any exposed fossils.

The proposed Project includes similar development characteristics as those that were identified in SPA 3 (and evaluated in MND No. 38981), with no new components that would result in substantial excavations beyond those that were previously considered in MND No. 38981. Thus, no impact would occur. Therefore, due to the previous disturbance of the Project site, no new or more severe impacts associated with paleontological resources would occur. However, because the Project site is located in an area with a high sensitivity for paleontological resources, out of an abundance of caution Condition of Approval COA 15. PLANNING has been identified that would require monitoring during ground disturbing activities.

#### Project Requirements and MND No. 38981 Mitigation Compliance

As recommended by the Project’s Pre-Construction Paleontological Assessment, because the Project would require grading and ground-disturbing activities, the following condition of approval has been imposed on the Project to ensure the Project implements monitoring during grading and ground-disturbing activities for paleontological resources that could be uncovered with development of the Project.

#### **COA 060. PLANNING**

Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project 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). 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.
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 (e.g. Project Geologist), 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 Project 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.



4.1.15 Population and Housing

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>29) Housing</b>				
a. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or 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. Induce substantial unplanned 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"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, (RCIT, 2019), Riverside County General Plan Housing Element; (JMA, 2015a); (Riverside County, 2015b)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 project was located within the Elsinore Area Plan and was generally consistent with the land use designations applied to the SPA 3 site by the Elsinore Area Plan. MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 project would develop the SPA 3 site with residential uses and would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, or create a demand for additional affordable housing. MND No. 38981 determined that SPA 3 would not generate substantial unplanned population growth beyond what was envisioned to occur by the Elsinore Area Plan. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded impacts due to displacing substantial numbers of existing people or housing and creating a demand for additional affordable housing would be less than significant and that impacts due to substantial unplanned population growth would not occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 27)

Findings of Fact:

a) through c) The Project site is currently undeveloped with no remaining structures from past residential use at the site and thus, the Project would not displace existing housing nor would it displace any people (JMA, 2015a, p. 1). The Project would provide new housing opportunities to the region and would not generate any demand for new affordable housing within the County. Additionally, the Project does not propose land uses that would generate employment (i.e., schools, commercial buildings, etc.) that would result in an increased demand for affordable housing. Thus, the Project would not result in an incremental demand for additional housing, including housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income. The HRCSP currently allows development of up to 2,307 residential units within the Specific Plan area. The Project would result in a reduction in the number of residential units by 96

homes as part of SPA 5. This reduction in residential units would have a corresponding reduction in the number of residents that would be generated by the proposed Project. As implementation of the Project would result in a reduction in the planned population for the Project site, the Project would not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections and impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, although the Project proposes residential uses, the Project would result in less population growth than planned and does not involve any components, such as major sewer facility upgrades, that could indirectly result in substantial population growth. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

**4.1.16 Public Services**

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<b>30) Fire Services</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for <u>fire protection</u> services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element; Riverside County General Plan EIR; (Google Earth, 2019); Riverside County Fire Department website (RCFD, 2019)

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 site would result in an increase in population and residential structures and would result in increased need for fire emergency services/facilities. MND No. 38981 determined SPA 3’s need for additional fire protection services would not create impacts beyond what was evaluated for the site by the Riverside County General Plan EIR and that all implementing developments would be conditioned as part of standard County conditions of approval to pay Development Impact Fees (DIF) to the County to offset the need for additional services. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded impacts to fire protection services would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 28)

**Findings of Fact:**

As detailed in Figure S-11, Wildfire Susceptibility, of the County of Riverside General Plan, the Project site is located in a “low” wildfire hazard zone. The Project site would be served by the nearest fire station (#64), located at 25310 Campbell Ranch Road in Corona, approximately 1.6 miles northwest of the Project site (RCFD, 2019). Development of the proposed homes would result in a decrease in population in comparison to the population that would have been generated by the approved project. The reduction in the anticipated population for the Project site would have a corresponding reduction in the demand for fire services. Furthermore, the proposed Project would be conditioned by the County to provide a

minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities, including compliance with State and local fire codes, a fire hydrant system, paved access, and secondary access routes. Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County’s Development Impact Fee (DIF) Ordinance (Riverside County Ordinance 659), which requires a fee payment to assist the County in providing for fire protection services. Payment of the DIF fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional public services, including fire protection services, which may be applied to fire facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand for fire protection services that would be created by the Project. As such, impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<b>31) Sheriff Services</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for <u>sheriff</u> services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan EIR (Riverside County, 2015b); (Riverside County, 2006); Riverside County Sheriff’s Department website (RCSD, 2019); (Google Earth, 2019)

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 site would result in an increase in population and residential structures and would result in increased need for sheriff services/facilities. MND No. 38981 determined SPA 3’s need for additional sheriff protection services would not create impacts beyond what was evaluated for the site by the Riverside County General Plan EIR and that all implementing developments would be conditioned as part of standard County conditions of approval to pay DIF to the County to offset the need for additional services. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded impacts to sheriff services would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 29)

**Findings of Fact:** Law enforcement services to the Project site would primarily be provided by the Riverside County Sheriff Department’s Lake Elsinore Station, located at 333 Limited Avenue in Lake Elsinore, approximately 7.5 miles northwest of the Project site (Google Earth, 2019). Development of the proposed homes would result in a decrease in population in comparison to the population that would have been generated by the approved project. The reduction in the anticipated population for the Project site would have a corresponding reduction in the demand for sheriff services. Additionally, the proposed Project’s demand on sheriff protection services would not be significant on a direct basis because the Project would not create the need to construct a new Sheriff station or physically alter an existing station. The Project Applicant also would be required to comply with the provisions of the County’s DIF Ordinance (Ordinance 659), which requires a fee payment to assist the County in providing for public

services, including police protection services. Payment of the DIF fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional police protection services, which may be applied to sheriff facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand that would be created by the Project. As such, Project impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<b>32) Schools</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for <u>school</u> services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: School District correspondence, (RCIT, 2019); (LEUSD, 2019)

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No. 38981 noted that development of the SPA 3 site would result in an increase in the student population, which would increase the need for school services and facilities. MND No. 38981 determined SPA 3’s need for additional school facilities would not create impacts beyond what was evaluated for the site by the Riverside County General Plan EIR. MND No. 38981 identified mitigation requiring that school fees be paid in accordance with Senate Bill 50 or that the Applicant enter into a mitigation agreement with the school district prior to issuance of building permits. With implementation of the mitigation required by MND No. 38981, MND No. 38981 concluded that impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 29)

**Findings of Fact:**

Under existing conditions, the Project site is undeveloped and does not generate any demand for school services. The Project would result in the construction of 229 homes on the site, which would generate an increased demand for school services. However, the proposed Project would reduce the number of homes that would be developed on the Project site in comparison to the previously-approved project. This reduction in the number of residential units would have a corresponding reduction in the number of students that would be generated by the development of the proposed Project. Based on the student generation rates assumed in the General Plan EIR, the Project’s 229 single family homes would generate approximately 85 new elementary school students (229 x 0.369), 46 middle school students (229 x 0.201), and 57 high school students (229 x 0.246), based on the following student generation factors: 0.369 for elementary school; 0.201 for middle school; and 0.246 for high school (Riverside County, 2015b, Table 4.15.E).

The Project is located in the boundaries of the Lake Elsinore Unified School District (LEUSD). Children from the proposed Project would attend the Luiseño K-8 School, located at 13500 Mountain Road in Corona, for elementary and middle school and Temescal Canyon High School located at 28755 El Toro Road in Lake Elsinore. (LEUSD, 2019) The most recent information from the California Department of Education shows that the 2017-2018 school year enrollment at Luiseño School is 961 students and 2,239 students Temescal Canyon High School. (CADOE, 2018) The students who would be added to these schools from the Project are estimated to be 132 students, an approximate 13.7 percent increase in student enrollment at Luiseno School, and 57 students, an approximate 2.5 percent increase in student enrollment at Temescal Canyon High School.

As disclosed in MND No. 38981, the Project Applicant would be required to contribute school fees in accordance with Public Education Code Section 17072.10-18. The provision of school fees would assist the LEUSD in meeting the Project’s incremental demand for school services. Although it is possible that the LEUSD may ultimately need to construct new school facilities in the region to serve the growing population within their service boundaries, such facility planning is conducted by the LEUSD and is not the responsibility of the Project. Furthermore, the Project would be required to contribute fees to the LEUSD in accordance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Senate Bill 50). Pursuant to Senate Bill 50, payment of school impact fees constitutes complete mitigation for Project-related impacts to school services, where projects are subject to compliance with CEQA. Therefore, mandatory payment of school impact fees would reduce the Project’s impacts to school facilities to a level below significant, and no additional mitigation would be required. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

Project Requirements and MND No. 38981 Mitigation Compliance

MND No. 38981 identified a mitigation measure to address impacts to schools. This measure, which is listed below, would continue to apply to the proposed Project and would be enforced as part of the Project’s conditions of approval.

**MND MM-2** Prior to the issuance of each residential building permit(s), school fees shall be paid in accordance with the requirements of the State of California (Senate Bill 50) or the applicant shall enter into a mitigation agreement with the ~~Corona-Norco~~ Lake Elsinore Unified School District.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<b>33) Libraries</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for <u>library</u> services?				

Source: Riverside County General Plan; (Google Earth, 2019); (Riverside County, 2006)

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 site would result in an increase in population and would result in increased need for library services and facilities. MND No. 38981 determined SPA 3’s need for additional library services and facilities would not create impacts beyond what was evaluated for the site by the Riverside County General Plan EIR and that all implementing developments would be conditioned as part of standard County conditions of approval to pay DIF to the County to offset the need for additional services. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded impacts to library services would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 30)

**Findings of Fact:**

The proposed Project would be served by the Riverside County Public Library system. The nearest libraries to the Project site are the Lakeside Library, located approximately 5.5 miles southwest of the Project site at 32593 Riverside Drive in Lake Elsinore and the Lake Elsinore Library, located approximately 7 miles southeast of the Project site at 600 W. Graham Avenue (Google Earth, 2019). Development of the Project would result in an increase in population which could increase the demand on public library services and facilities. The Project would result in less than significant impacts to library services because the Project would be conditioned by the County of Riverside to pay DIFs to offset the need for additional library facilities and services. Since DIFs from the County of Riverside are required per Riverside County Ordinance No. 659.13 (Riverside County, 2006), no mitigation is required for the Project regarding library services. Payment of required DIF to the County of Riverside would ensure that potential impacts to library services would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<b>34) Health Services</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for <u>health</u> services?				

Source: Riverside County General Plan; (Google Earth, 2019)

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 site would result in an increase in population and would result in increased need for medical services and facilities. MND No. 38981 determined SPA 3’s need for additional medical services and facilities would not create impacts beyond what was evaluated for the site by the Riverside County General Plan EIR. Furthermore, MND No. 38981 noted that Riverside County conducts periodic medical needs assessments and funds the construction and/or expansion of medical facilities according to the level of medical demands. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded impacts to medical services would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 30)

**Findings of Fact:**

The residents of the proposed Project could be served by several different health care facilities in the vicinity of the Project site. The nearest healthcare facility is the Corona Regional Medical Center, located at 800 S. Main Street in Corona, approximately 12 miles northwest of the Project site. Additionally, the Inland Valley Medical Center, located at 36485 Inland Valley Drive in Wildomar is located approximately 15 miles southwest of the Project site. Development of the proposed Project would result in a decrease in population compared to the approved project, reducing the assumed need for medical services and facilities. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

**4.1.17 Recreation**

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<b>35) Parks and Recreation</b> a. 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"/>

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
b. Increase 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. Be located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with as Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: (RCIT, 2019), Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications); Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees); General Plan EIR Section 4.14 “Parks and Recreation.”

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 site proposed 1.5 acres of park uses. MND No. 38981 also noted that County Service Area (CSA) 152-B collected Quimby fees for parks within the Elsinore area. MND No. 38981 determined the SPA 3 project would be conditioned to meet the parkland requirements as established in the Quimby Act and County enabling ordinances such as Ordinance No. 460. Implementation of the required mitigation would reduce impacts to recreation facilities to below a level of significance. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded with implementation of mitigation, impacts would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 31)

**Findings of Fact:**

a) According to the population generation rate of 3.34 persons per household, as provided by Appendix E-1 of the Riverside County General Plan, the HRCSP as modified by the Project would generate a future population of up to 7,382 people within the HRCSP area (2,210 dwelling units x 3.34 persons per household = 7,382 future residents). Riverside County Ordinance No. 460 requires 3.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Because the HRCSP as modified by the Project would generate approximately 7,382 residents, the Project would generate a demand for approximately 22.2 acres of parkland for the HRCSP community (7,382 residents x 3.0 acres of parkland / 1,000 residents = 22.2 acres of parkland). The Project would accommodate 5.4 acres of recreational uses on-site, increasing the overall recreation area in the HRCSP from 74 acres to 78.2 acres. Accordingly, the Project would comply with the parkland requirements of Ordinance No. 460. Furthermore, the Project would result in 96 fewer dwelling units than was assumed for the site as part of MND No. 38981; thus, the Project would result in decreased demand for park and recreation facilities as compared to what was evaluated and disclosed as part of MND No. 38981. Thus, adequate park facilities have been planned in the local area to serve future residents of the proposed Project, and no additional parkland would be needed beyond what has already been planned. (Riverside County, 2015a, Appendix E-1)

The Project entails development of 5.4 acres of on-site parkland, the construction of which would have the potential to result in physical impacts. These physical impacts are evaluated throughout this MND Addendum under the appropriate environmental issue areas (e.g., biological resources, cultural resources,



construction-related air quality impacts, etc.). Development of park facilities on the Project site were evaluated as part of MND No. 38981. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in increased impacts due to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond what was already evaluated and disclosed by MND No. 38981 and throughout this MND Addendum. Accordingly, impacts associated with the construction of new or expanded park and recreation facilities would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

b) As discussed in Threshold a), implementation of the Project would result in a total of 78.2 acres of active and passive parkland within the HRCSP. It is anticipated that the 78.2 acres of parkland would more than adequate to meet the recreation demands of the Specific Plan, which requires the provision of only 22.2 acres of parkland based on the development of up to 2,210 dwelling units within the entire HRCSP area. Thus, the Project would comply with the parkland requirements of Ordinance No. 460. Due to the adequate on-site parkland provided in the HRCSP area, any increase in use of existing off-site recreational facilities would be off-site by other County residents utilizing recreational facilities within the HRCSP area. Therefore, impacts associated with the increased use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

c) MND No. 38981 disclosed a potentially significant impact related to the payment of Quimby Fees, and provided a mitigation measure that required the payment of Quimby Fees. The Project site is located in Community Service Area (CSA 152-B), which is the CSA for the Elsinore area. The Project does not propose any reduction in park dedication and would slightly increase the park in Planning Area 24 from 1.2 to 1.6 acres and add 3.8 acres of land designated as Open Space-Recreation in Planning Area 24. The Project also would be required to pay any applicable fees from CSA 152-B. Park land requirements for the Project would be governed by Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, which allows for the dedication of park land in lieu or the payment of park land fees (i.e., Quimby Fees). As described above under the discussion of Thresholds a. and b., the Project would exceed the requirement to provide 22.2 acres of recreational use in the HRCSP, pursuant to County Ordinance No. 460. Accordingly, the Project would accommodate adequate areas of active recreational uses on-site, and in-lieu fees (Quimby fees) would not be required. In addition, the Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space District administers the acquisition, improvement, operation, and maintenance of Regional Trails. The Project Applicant proposes to provide a community trail along the south side of La Palm Road and along the west side of Horsethief Ranch Road. Thus, with the incorporation of the proposed park and trails and the payment of any applicable fees from CSA 152-B, impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

#### Project Requirements and MND No. 38981 Mitigation Compliance

MND No. 38981 identified mitigation measures (applied to MND No. 38981 as Conditions of Approval) to address impacts to recreation. These measures, which are listed below, would continue to apply to the proposed Project and would be enforced as part of the Project's conditions of approval. It should be noted that minor revisions have been made to COA 30. PARKS I to reflect Planning Area renumbering proposed as part of SPA 5.

**COA 30. PLANNING 16**

Prior to map recordation of any subdivision; or other residential development application, all portions of this implementing project no currently within the boundaries of the County Service Area 152-B, shall be annexed into the County Service Area/District that has been designated by the Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Section 10.35(G) of Ordinance No. 460, to receive park dedications and fees. Documentation of said annexation shall be provided to the Planning Department.

This condition shall be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if the County Service Area No. 152-B is unwilling or unable to annex the property in question.”

**COA 30. PARKS I**

Prior to any project approval, the applicant shall submit a trails plan for review and approval to the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District. This trail shall be a dual use with the flood control access road if possible. The trail shall be located east of the open space area (Planning Area 2526), within Planning Area 25 and west of Planning Areas 22, 23, and 24. The trails will continue along Del Palma Road to the property line.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<b>36) Recreational Trails</b>				
a. Include the construction or expansion of a trail system?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan Figure C-7 “Bikeways and Trail Plan”

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 noted a Regional Trail was designated along Horsethief Canyon Creek, along the SPA 3 sites western boundary. MND No. 38981 determined impacts due to the construction or expansion of a trails would be potentially significant. MND No. 38981 included implementation of mitigation that conditioned the SPA 3 project to incorporate regional trail improvements with the improvement plans for the planned Horsethief Canyon Creek flood control service road, which MND No. 38981 found would reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that impacts due to construction of regional trails would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 31)

Findings of Fact: As shown in the HRCSP Roadways Circulation Plan, a Maintenance Road/Trail is designated along Horsethief Canyon Creek within Planning Area 25, in the western portion of the Project site. The Maintenance Road/Trail would extend from De Palma Road to the Project’s southwestern boundary. In addition, the HRCSP Roadway Circulation Plan designates a Community Trail along the south side of De Palma Road and the west side of Horsethief Canyon Road along the Project’s northern and eastern boundaries. Construction of the trail system as part of the Project would have the potential to result in physical impacts. These physical impacts are evaluated throughout this MND Addendum under the appropriate environmental issue areas (e.g., biological resources, cultural resources, construction-

related air quality impacts, etc.). Development of trail facilities on the Project site were evaluated as part of MND No. 38981. There are no components of the proposed Project that would result in increased impacts due to the construction or expansion of trail facilities beyond what was already evaluated and disclosed by MND No. 38981 and throughout this MND Addendum. Therefore, impacts associated with the construction of a new or expanded trail system would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

Project Requirements and MND No. 38981 Mitigation Compliance

Condition of Approval COA 30.PARKS I would apply to the proposed Project. No additional mitigation measures or conditions of approval would be required.

**4.1.18 Transportation**

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>37) Transportation</b>				
a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan; Horsethief Canyon Updated Trip Generation Review (RK Engineering, 2014); Horsethief Canyon Ranch (TTM No. 37002) Technical Memo (Urban Crossroads, 2020); Riverside County General Plan EIR; (Google Earth, 2019)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 evaluated impacts to transportation and noted that SPA 3 included frontage improvements to Del Palma Road and Horsethief Canyon Road. MND No. 38981 determined impacts to transportation would be potentially significant with implementation of SPA 3. MND No. 38981 identified mitigation requiring transportation improvements that would reduce impacts to intersections and roadway segments to below a level of significance. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded impacts to transportation would be less than significant following implementation of mitigation. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 33)

Findings of Fact:

As noted in 2.0, the Project proposes development of 229 dwelling units. The Project's Technical Memorandum analyzes development of 229 dwelling units, consistent with the Project Description. However, the Project's Trip Generation Review, analyzes development of the Project site with 240 units. Thus, because the Project's Trip Generation Review analyzed development of 240 units, the Trip Generation Review slightly overstates the number of trips that would result from the Project. Thus, the discussion related to the Trip Generation Review provides a conservative or "worst-case" analysis of the Project's anticipated transportation impacts.

a) and b) A Trip Generation Review and Technical Memorandum were prepared for the proposed Project. The Trip Generation Review compares the trip generation of the proposed Project with the trip generation for approved SPA 3. The approved trip generation for the 2004 Project assumed the development of 210 townhomes, 112 single family residential units, and a recreation center. The approved project was estimated to generate 2,752 trip-ends per day with 225 AM peak hour trips and 257 PM peak hour trips. In contrast, the proposed Project includes 229 units (analyzed at 240 units in the Trip Generation Review), which would generate 2,285 trip-ends per day with 180 AM peak hour trips and 240 PM peak hour trips. Accordingly, the development of the proposed Project would generate 467 fewer daily trip-ends than the development of the previously approved project (including 45 fewer AM peak hour trips and 37 fewer PM peak hour trips). The reduction in trips would have a corresponding reduction in impacts to levels of service for Project area roadway segments and intersections.

The Technical Memorandum provides an evaluation of the Project's traffic contribution to key intersections in the immediate vicinity of Project site. Specifically, Riverside County requested a focused analysis for Existing (2020), Existing plus Project (E+P), and Existing plus Ambient Growth plus Project (EAP) (2026) at the intersections of Glen Eden Road/Future Mountain Road at De Palma Road and Horsethief Canyon Road at De Palma Road. As shown in Table 2 of the Technical Memorandum, both intersections currently operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS) during the peak hours and are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS for both E+P and EAP (2026) traffic conditions. (Urban Crossroads, 2020)

The proposed Project would not 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. The approved project would have generated more vehicle trips than the proposed Project. The proposed Project would result in 467 fewer daily trips than the approved project and would generate 2,285 trip-ends per day (180 AM peak hour trips and 240 PM peak hour trips). Thus, the proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program because the Project would result in less than significant impacts to intersections and roadway segments due to the reduced trip generation of the

Project and implementation of the mitigation measures identified in MND No. 38981. Impacts would be less than significant.

Additionally, MND No. 38981 anticipated that additional improvements to study area intersections would be required, and imposed COA 30. Trans. I requiring that site-specific traffic studies be required for all subsequent implementing projects and that specific project impacts and needed roadway improvements be identified for the site-specific development. In accordance with COA 30. Trans. I, the Project's Technical Memo identifies fair-share payments to ensure that the focused area intersections continue to operate at an acceptable LOS. In order to ensure that the fair-share percentages recommended by the Project's Technical Memo are implemented, new Mitigation Measures MM-18 and MM-19 have been identified. Implementation of the recommended mitigation would fund the construction of improvements to the local roadway system necessary to provide adequate LOS, which would offset the Project's contribution of traffic to local roadways and intersections. As such, the Project's impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

c) The proposed Project would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. The Project entails access off Horsethief Canyon Road for "Street B" and access off of De Palma Road, via "Street A." All streets would be designed to meet County of Riverside sight distance standards and the proposed homes on site are an extension of the existing Horsethief residential development to the south. Thus, the Project would not create hazards and is compatible with existing development in the Project vicinity. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

d) As detailed in the Updated Trip Generation Review for the Project, the proposed Project would result in 467 fewer daily trips compared to the approved project. Thus, although the Project would result in an increase in trips compared to existing conditions, the Project would not result in the need for new or altered maintenance of roads because the proposed residential land uses would not impact the roads to such a degree that new/altered maintenance of roads would need to occur. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

e) Construction of the Project would not require the complete closure of any public or private streets or roadways during construction. Accordingly, temporary construction activities would not cause a significant effect upon circulation. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

f) Construction of the Project would not require the complete closure of any public or private streets or roadways during construction. Accordingly, temporary construction activities would not impede use of roads for emergencies or access for emergency response vehicles because emergency vehicles would be able to access the Project site during construction should a lane be closed. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

Project Requirements and MND No. 38981 Mitigation Compliance

MND No. 38981 identified mitigation measures (applied to MND No. 38981 as Conditions of Approval) to address impacts to transportation. These measures, which are listed below, would continue to apply to the proposed Project and would be enforced as part of the Project's conditions of approval.

**COA 30. TRANS. 1**

Site-specific traffic studies will be required for all subsequent implementing projects within Specific Plan No. 152 as approved by the Transportation Department. These subsequent traffic studies shall identify specific project impacts and needed roadway improvements to be constructed prior to each development phase.

**COA 30. TRANS. 2**

The Specific Plan proponent and all subsequent implementing projects within the Specific Plan shall be responsible for design and construction of traffic signals at the following intersections or as approved by the Transportation Department:

- Northerly Project Access (PA 22/25)/De Palma Road
- Horsethief Canyon Road/Easterly Project Access (PA 23)  
with no credit given for Traffic Signal Mitigation Fees.
- Horsethief Canyon Road/De Palma Road
- Indian Truck Trail/I-15 SB Ramps
- Indian Truck Trail/I-15 NO Ramps  
with fee credit eligibility.

The project proponent shall contact the Transportation Department and enter into an agreement for signal mitigation fee credit or reimbursement prior to the start of construction of the signals. All work shall be preapproved by and shall comply with the requirements of the Transportation Department and the public contracts code in order to be eligible for fee credit or reimbursement.

In accordance with Condition of Approval COA 30. Trans. 1, site-specific traffic information was submitted to the Transportation Department for review and approval. In accordance with the Project's Technical Memorandum, the following Project-specific mitigation measures would apply to the Project. Thus, the new mitigation measures merely implement COA 30. Trans. 1 from MND No. 38981 at the Project level.

MM-18 Prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit for the Project, the Project Applicant shall make a fair share monetary contribution to the County of Riverside at the Glen Eden Road and Future Mountain Road at De Palma Road intersection. The Project's fair share for intersection improvements is 11.7%.

MM-19 Prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit for the Project, the Project Applicant shall make a fair share monetary contribution to the County of Riverside at the Horsethief Canyon Road at De Palma Road intersection. The Project's fair share for intersection improvements is 15.7%.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<b>38) Bike Trails</b> a. Include the construction or expansion of a bike system or bike lanes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan; Figure C-5 “Bikeways and Trail Plan”

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No. 38981 noted that the Riverside County General Plan designated a Class I Bike Trail along De Palma Road, along the northern boundary of the SPA 3 site. MND No. 38981 determined that future implementing developments would be conditioned to provide a bike trail along De Palma Road. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded no impact to bike trails would occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 33)

**Findings of Fact:**

The 2003 Riverside County General Plan Bikeways and Trail Plan identified a Class I Bicycle Trail along De Palma Road, located immediately north of the Project site. Following adoption of MND No. 38981, the Riverside County General Plan and EAP were updated. The EAP was updated most recently in 2017 with an updated Trails and Bikeway System exhibit, included in the EAP as Figure 8. According to Figure 8 of the EAP, there are no bike lanes planned in the vicinity of the Project site (Riverside County, 2017, Figure 8). Revisions associated with SPA 5 include revising HRCSP roadway cross-sections to remove the Class I Bike Trail along Del Palma Road in accordance with the revised EAP. The Project would not involve the construction of expansion of a bike system or bike lanes. Thus, consistent with the findings of MND No. 38981, the Project’s impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

4.1.19 Tribal Cultural Resources

	New Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
<i>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, or cultural landscape that is geographically defines 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:</i>				
<b>39) Tribal Cultural Resources</b>				
a. 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials; (JMA, 2015b); (JMA, 2019)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) was signed into law in 2014 and added the above-listed threshold to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Thus, at the time MND No. 38981 was adopted in 2004, AB 52 was not in place and MND No. 38981 did not evaluate this threshold. Notwithstanding, MND No. 38981 included an extensive analysis of potential impacts to cultural resources. As previously indicated herein in Subsection 4.1.5, no archaeological sites were identified within the SPA 3 boundaries. Additionally, MND No. 38981 found that it would be extremely unlikely for prehistoric resources to be identified in the SPA 3 area. MND No. 38981 concluded that no impact to cultural resources would occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 12)

In compliance with Senate Bill 18 (SB18), on February 11, 2015, Riverside County sent a request for a Sacred Lands File search and a consultation list from the Native American Heritage Commission (“NAHC”) of tribes whose historical extent includes the project area. The NAHC responded on March, 2, 2015 with the results of the SLF search. The results of the SLF search indicated that no sacred sites were documented within the immediate area. Riverside County Scoping Letters were sent to 22 tribes to inform them of the project and to inquire as to known Tribal Cultural Resources in the area. To the date of Archaeological Associates Cultural Resources assessment, the Pala Tribal Historic Preservation Office indicated that the project is outside the boundaries of their traditional boundaries. Both the Soboba Band of Lucieno Indians and the Pechanga Band of Lusieno Mission Indians provided a



request to comment. The County concluded consultation with Pechanga April 11, 2017, and Soboba on March 15, 2016.

Findings of Fact:

a.-b.) The proposed Project would occur within the same limits of disturbance as the project evaluated in MND No. 38981, with the exception of the addition of 1.3 acres associated with the De Palma Road right-of-way. A records search for the Project site (including the 1.3-acre addition) was performed and an intensive pedestrian survey of the study area was conducted on April 14, 2015, which is detailed in the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment (refer to *Technical Appendix C2*) and Addendum to the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment (refer to *Technical Appendix C3*). The intent of the survey was to identify all potentially significant cultural resources situated within the boundaries of the Project site. The results of the records search did not identify any archeological resources within the Project site. Furthermore, the Project site has been subject to previous ground disturbance and development associated with a temporary fire service facility and related structures and infrastructure. Thus, it is unlikely that any tribal cultural resources occur within the Project site and monitoring of future earth-disturbing activities associated with the Project would not be required. (JMA, 2015b, pp. 19-20; JMA, 2019). As such, and consistent with the finding of MND No. 38981, the Project’s impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

**4.1.20 Utilities and Service Systems**

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>40) Water</b>				
a. Require or result in relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage systems or expansion of existing facilities, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD, 2017);

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 noted that the Lee Lake Water District administered the provision of domestic water in the Elsinore area and that adequate water service was available to the site. MND No. 38981 noted that new water lines would be extended within the SPA 3 area; however, the construction would not result

in significant impacts. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded impacts to water utilities would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 33)

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project proposes water, sewer, and stormwater drainage infrastructure on-site that would connect to existing facilities in accordance with the HRCSP. The installation of water, sewer lines, and stormwater drainage systems on-site as proposed by the Project would result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of infrastructure alignments. Impacts associated with the provision of water, wastewater, and stormwater drainage service to the Project site have been evaluated throughout this MND Addendum, which concludes that impacts would be less than significant or would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures or standard regulatory requirements. There are no components of the proposed Project's water connections that would result in environmental effects not already addressed herein. Thus, impacts due to the construction of connections to existing water, wastewater, and stormwater drainage lines in the surrounding area would be less than significant. MND No. 38981 assumed the HCRSP would be developed with up to 2,307 residential dwelling units. The Project proposed to reduce the total number of dwelling units by 96 units, resulting in a total of 2,210 residential dwelling units in the HCRSP area. Thus, the Project would result in a substantial decrease in the number of dwelling units on-site and associated demand for water, wastewater treatment, and stormwater drainage systems as compared to what was evaluated and disclosed by MND No. 38981.

Moreover, since MND No. 38981 was certified in 2005, there have been a number of regulations and requirements implemented to reduce water demands associated with new developments. Specifically, Riverside County Ordinance No. 859 establishes provisions for water management practices and water waste prevention and creates a structure for planning, designing, installing, maintaining and managing water-efficient landscapes in new rehabilitated projects. Adopted to implement the requirements of the 2006 California Water Conservation in Landscaping Act and California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 2.7, Ordinance No. 859 generally requires new development landscaping to not exceed a maximum water demand of 70% (or lower as may be required by state legislation). Additionally, future development on site would be subject to compliance with the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code (GBSC), which imposes a series of regulations to reduce water consumption both within buildings and in landscaping areas outside of buildings. Mandatory compliance with applicable regulations adopted since 2005 would ensure that the Project's water consumption would be less than was evaluated in MND No. 38981.

Furthermore, the Project site is now located within the service area of the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD). The EVMWD has prepared an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) dated June 2016, which provides an updated and detailed account of current and projected EVMWD water supplies and demands under a variety of climactic conditions, and demonstrates that the EVMWD would be able to meet its long-term commitments to supply potable water to existing and planned developments. The supply and demand projections in the UWMP are based on buildout of the Riverside County General Plan and the general plans of cities within EVMWD's service area. As noted previously, the Project site is designated by the General Plan, EAP, and HCRSP for residential land uses. The proposed Project is fully consistent with the site's underlying General Plan and HRCSP land use designations, and would result in less residential units than was assumed by MND No. 38981. Thus, the Project is fully within the assumptions made by the UWMP, which concluded that EVMWD would have adequate supplies to meet existing and projected demands from existing and planned resources during normal, dry, and multiple dry-year conditions.

Consistent with the finding of MND No. 38981, wastewater generated by the proposed Project would be treated at the Horsethief Canyon Wastewater Reclamation Facility (HCWRF). According to information available from the EVMWD, the HCWRF has a current capacity of 0.5 million gallons per day (gpd). The ultimate planned capacity at the HCWRF is 0.7 million gpd (EVMWD, 2016). According the Riverside County General Plan EIR, single-family residential uses generate approximately 230 gpd/household of wastewater. Thus, at buildout the Project would generate approximately 52,670 gpd (229 households x 230 gpd/household = 52,670 gpd). The Project’s daily generation of wastewater represents 10% of the available daily capacity at the HCWRF. The proposed reduction in the number of dwelling units within the HRCSP as proposed by SPA 5 would have a corresponding reduction in the wastewater generation compared to the approved SPA 3 project. Thus, the proposed Project’s wastewater treatment demands would not exceed the daily capacity of the Horsethief Canyon WRF and as such, the Project would not result in the need for construction of a new wastewater treatment facility.

Based on the foregoing analysis and consistent with the findings of MND No. 38981, the Project would not require or result in the construction of new water, wastewater treatment facilities or stormwater drainage systems or the expansion of existing facilities, whereby the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects, and impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

b) As detailed in Section 4.1.15, *Population and Housing*, the proposed Project would result in a reduction in the planned population within the Project site in comparison to SPA 3. The Project site is within the boundaries of the EVMWD. The EVMWD has the following sources of drinking water: Canyon Lake (10 percent), groundwater (20 percent), imported water from the Colorado River and Northern California (70 percent). (EVMWD, 2017) Per the Urban Water Management Plan for the EVMWD, the District forecasts the future population that it will need to serve. The UWMP anticipates that by 2035 the District would need to serve a population of 185,102 persons, an increase of 48,969 persons compared to the 2015 forecast of 136,133 persons (EVMWD, 2016, Table 2-2). Thus, the decreased population for the Project site would represent a decrease in the population assumptions in the District’s UWMP. Therefore, the Project’s water needs have been accounted for in the UWMP’s future population projections and the EVMWD’s need to provide water to future users has already been accounted for in the UWMP. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact due to water supplies for the proposed Project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>41) Sewer</b> a. Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
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"/>

Source: Waterboards Website (Waterboards, 1996); Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District Urban Water Management Plan (EVMWD, 2016)

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No. 38981 noted that the SPA 3 site would be serviced by the Lee Lake Water District and that local sewer capacity was adequate for the SPA 3 project. MND No. 38981 noted that new water lines would be extended within the SPA 3 area; however, the construction would not result in significant impacts. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded impacts to water utilities would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 34)

**Findings of Fact:**

a) The Project site is within the boundaries of the EVMWD. To estimate the Project's wastewater generation, information from the County's General Plan was utilized for the EVMWD, which is a rate of 250 gallons/household/day for wastewater generation. The proposed reduction in the number of dwelling units within the Specific Plan would have a corresponding reduction in the wastewater generation compared to the approved project. The Horsethief Canyon Wastewater Reclamation Facility was constructed to service the approximately 900-acre housing and commercial development referred to as Horsethief Canyon Ranch. The proposed Project is a part of the larger Horsethief Canyon Ranch Project and as such, would be served by the Horsethief Canyon Wastewater Reclamation Facility. (Waterboards, 1996) As detailed in the Urban Water Management Plan for the EVMWD the existing capacity of the Horsethief WRF is 0.5 million gallons per day (mgd). The year 2030 capacity is estimated to be 0.7 mgd. (EVMWD, 2016) Thus, the proposed Project would contribute a nominal amount of the Horsethief Canyon WRF's daily capacity and as such, the Project would not result in the need for construction of a new wastewater treatment facility. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

b) As described in Threshold a) above, the proposed Project would reduce the amount of wastewater generated in comparison to the approved Project. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
<b>42) Solid Waste</b>				
a. Generate solid waste in excess of State or Local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction 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"/>

Source: (RCDWR, 2019); (Google Earth, 2019); (Riverside County, 2015b); (CalRecycle, 2018); (Riverside County, 2018)

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 noted that International Rubbish Service was the franchise waste hauler for the SPA 3 area. MND No. 38981 determined the construction and long-term development of the SPA 3 would increase the amount of solid waste generated in the area. MND No. 38981 concluded that the landfill capacity required by SPA 3 would not create service impacts beyond those previously disclosed in the Riverside County General Plan EIR. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that impacts due to solid waste would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, pp. 34-35)

Findings of Fact:

a) The Riverside County Department of Waste Resources is responsible for the efficient and effective landfilling of non-hazardous county waste. The Department of Waste Resources operates six landfills, has a contract agreement for waste disposal with an additional private landfill, and administers several transfer station leases. The closest landfill to the Project site is the El Sobrante Landfill located at 10910 Dawson Canyon Road in Corona, approximately 4.5 miles northwest of the Project site. (RCDWR, 2019) The landfill has a maximum permitted throughput of 16,054 tons/day, and a cease operation date of January 1, 2051. As of April 2018, the remaining capacity of the landfill was 143,977,170 tons. This landfill accepts mixed municipal waste as well as construction/demolition waste. (CalRecycle, 2018)

Based on the solid waste generation rate (of 0.41 tons/unit/year) presented in County of Riverside General Plan EIR Table 4.15.C, *Generation of Solid Waste at General Plan Buildout*, for residential uses, the 229 single family homes proposed on the site would result in the long-term generation of approximately 0.26 tons of solid waste per day (equivalent to approximately 520 pounds per day) of solid waste (Riverside County, 2015b). This amount of solid waste would result in an increase in the amount of solid waste conveyed to the El Sobrante Landfill that would be met by the landfill’s capacity. However, due to the reduction in the number of dwelling units that would be constructed by the Project in comparison to what was assumed by MND No. 38981, there would be a corresponding reduction in the amount of solid waste generated

at the Project site. As such, the Project’s impacts due to solid waste would be less than was disclosed by MND No. 38981 and impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

b) Public Resources Code Section 40000 et seq. requires that local jurisdictions divert at least 50 percent of all solid waste generated. The Project would be subject to the County’s solid waste collection and disposal requirements pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 8.132, which sets forth the requirements for trash disposal and collection. Accordingly, the Project would be fully compliant with all applicable Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, resulting in a less-than-significant impact. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<b>43) Utilities</b>				
<i>Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; whereby the construction or relocation could cause significant environmental effects?</i>				
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. Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials;

MND No. 38981 Findings:

MND No. 38981 determined that the residential and recreational uses proposed by SPA 3 would use electricity and natural gas as the dominant sources of energy. Furthermore, MND No. 38981 determined that the SPA 3 project would not be regarded as an energy intensive land use and that energy consumption levels would not be expected to exceed typical requirements for similar urban development. MND No. 38981 noted utility service providers had indicated an ability to serve the SPA 3 project without significantly impacting the provision of energy resources and that construction of additional facilities would not cause significant impacts. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded impacts to utilities would be less than significant. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 35)

Findings of Fact:

a), b), and c) The proposed Project would require electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications services. Given the Project’s location adjacent to existing development/homes, utility and infrastructure services would be available to the Project site. Thus, aside from local connections to existing electric, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities, the Project would not result in or require the construction or expansion of utilities that could have a significant impact on the environment. Impacts associated with local connections to these utilities is inherent to the Project’s construction phase and have been evaluated throughout this MND Addendum, which concludes that such impacts would be less than significant or would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures from MND No. 38981 or standard regulatory requirements. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

d) Any street lighting developed in conjunction with the proposed Project would be required to comply with all lighting and development standards of the County of Riverside, including but not limited to Ordinance Nos. 915, 461, and 655 as described in thresholds 2a) and 3a) and b). The construction of new street lights would not result in significant environmental effects, as they are required to maintain safe lighting levels for residents and visitors to the Project site. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

e) No public facilities are proposed with the Project; thus, no impact would occur. There are no components of the proposed Project that would require a substantial increase in roadway maintenance responsibilities for Riverside County, and any such increase in the need for maintenance would not inhibit the County’s ability to fund other environmental programs within the County. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

f) No governmental facilities are proposed with the Project, and there are no other government facilities that would be impacted by the proposed Project; thus, no impact would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.

4.1.21 Wildfire

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>If located in or near a State Responsibility Area (“SRA”), lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zone, or other hazardous fire areas that may be designated by the Fire Chief, would the project:</i>				
<b>44) Wildfire Impacts</b>				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-II “Wildfire Susceptibility,” (RCIT, 2019)

**MND No. 38981 Findings:**

MND No 38981 determined that the Riverside County General Plan designated the SPA 3 site as being located within a “low” hazardous fire area. Therefore, MND No. 38981 concluded that no impact due to wildfire would occur. (Riverside County, 2004, p. 20)

**Findings of Fact:**

a) through e) As detailed in Figure S-II, *Wildfire Susceptibility*, of the County of Riverside General Plan, the Project site is still designated as being within a “low” wildfire zone. Furthermore, the Project is not located in or near a State Responsibility Area. In addition, the Project would be developed in accordance with Riverside County Fire Department standards regarding fire hydrant locations and brush clearance requirements for the proposed homes on site. Consistent with the findings in MND No. 38981, no impacts due to wildfire would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously-identified significant impact as analyzed in MND No. 38981.



4.1.22 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Does the project:</i>				
45) 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, substantially 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

As indicated in MND Addendum Subsection 4.1.4, *Biological Resources*, Subsection 4.1.5, *Cultural Resources*, Subsection and throughout the analysis in this MND Addendum, assuming incorporation of the mitigation measures specified in MND No. 38981 (as modified/supplemented herein), implementation of the Project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habit of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as previously analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Does the project:</i>				
46) Have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects and probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the Project have been evaluated throughout this MND Addendum, which demonstrates that such impacts would not occur, would be less than significant, or would be reduced to a level below significant with implementation of the mitigation measures specified by MND No. 38981 (as modified/ supplemented herein) and/or standard regulatory requirements. Additionally, this MND Addendum concludes that the Project as proposed would not result in any new or more severe cumulative effects beyond what was already evaluated and disclosed by MND No. 38981. All applicable mitigation measures identified as part of MND No. 38981 and that were imposed to address cumulatively-considerable effects would continue to apply to the proposed Project as revised, except as modified or supplemented by this Addendum to MND No. 38981. The analysis throughout this MND Addendum demonstrates that all Project impacts would be less than significant, or would be reduced in comparison to the analysis and conclusions of MND No. 38981. Additionally, the analysis herein demonstrates that physical impacts associated with the Project (e.g., biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, etc.) would not substantially change or increase compared to the analysis presented in MND No. 38981. Accordingly, because the Project would have similar or reduced cumulative impacts to the environment as compared to what was evaluated and disclosed in MND No. 38981, the Project would not result in any new or increased impacts to the environment beyond what was evaluated, disclosed, and mitigated for by MND No. 38981. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as previously analyzed in MND No. 38981.

	<i>New Significant Impact</i>	<i>More Severe Impact</i>	<i>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</i>
<i>Does the project:</i>				
<b>47)</b> Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Staff review, project application

Findings of Fact:

The Project’s potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings has been evaluated throughout this Initial Study (e.g., Air Quality, Geology/Soils, Noise, etc.). Where potentially significant impacts are identified, mitigation measures from MND No. 38981 have been imposed, as modified or supplemented by this MND Addendum to MND No. 38981, to reduce these adverse effects to a level below significance. There are no components of the proposed Project that could result in substantial adverse effects on human beings that are not already evaluated and disclosed throughout this MND Addendum and/or by MND No. 38981. Accordingly, no additional impacts would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as previously analyzed in MND No. 38981.

## 4.2 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 I (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

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

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

## 5.0 REFERENCES

The following documents were referred to as information sources during the preparation of this document.

<b>Cited As</b>	<b>Source</b>
CADOE, 2015	California Department of Education, 2018. <i>DataQuest</i> . 2018. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <a href="http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/">http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/</a>
CARB, 2014	California Air Resources Board, 2014. <i>Assembly Bill 32 Overview (website)</i> . August 5, 2014. Accessed December 12, 2018. Available online: <a href="https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/ab32/ab32.htm">https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/ab32/ab32.htm</a>
CalEPA, 2019	California Environmental Protection Agency, 2019. <i>Cortese List Data Resources</i> . 2019. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <a href="https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?cmd=search&amp;reporttype=CORTESE&amp;site_type=CSITES,OPEN,FUDS,CLOSE&amp;status=ACT,BKLG,COM&amp;reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST">https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?cmd=search&amp;reporttype=CORTESE&amp;site_type=CSITES,OPEN,FUDS,CLOSE&amp;status=ACT,BKLG,COM&amp;reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST</a>
Caltrans, 2011	Caltrans, 2011. <i>California Scenic Highway Mapping System (website)</i> . September 7, 2011. Accessed November 6, 2018. Available online: <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/</a>
CalRecycle, 2018	CalRecycle, 2018. <i>SWIS Facility Detail: El Sobrante Landfill (33-AA-0217)</i> . April 1, 2018. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <a href="https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/33-AA-0217/Detail/">https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/33-AA-0217/Detail/</a>
CCC, n.d.	California Climate Change, n.d. <i>California Climate Change Executive Orders (website)</i> . Accessed December 12, 2018. Available online: <a href="http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/state/executive_orders.html">http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/state/executive_orders.html</a>
CDC, 1981	California Department of Conservation, 1981. <i>Mineral Land Classification Map 1981</i> . Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <a href="ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_143/PartIII/Plate_3-28.pdf">ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_143/PartIII/Plate_3-28.pdf</a>
CDC, 2017	California Department of Conservation, 2017. <i>Riverside County Important Farmland 2016</i> . 2017. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <a href="ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrop/FMMP/pdf/2016/riv16_w.pdf">ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrop/FMMP/pdf/2016/riv16_w.pdf</a>
EVMWD, 2016	Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District, 2016. <i>Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District 2015 Urban Water Management Plan</i> . June 2016. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <a href="http://www.evmwd.com/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=31890">http://www.evmwd.com/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=31890</a>
EVMWD, 2017	Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District, 2017. <i>Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District Agency Profile</i> . July 2017. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <a href="http://www.evmwd.com/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=32625">http://www.evmwd.com/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=32625</a>

FEMA, 2008 Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2008. *Flood Insurance Rate Map Map No. 06065C2006G*. August 28, 2008. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home>

Giroux, 2015a Giroux and Associates, 2015a. *Air Quality Impact Analysis*. April 6, 2015. MND Addendum Technical Appendix A.

Giroux, 2015b Giroux and Associates, 2015b. *Noise Impact Analysis*. April 6, 2015. MND Addendum Technical Appendix F.

GLA, 2004 Glenn Lukos Associates, 2004. *Preliminary Findings of Corps and CDFG jurisdiction (August 4)*.

GLA, 2005a Glenn Lukos Associates, 2005a. *Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) Analysis Report*. MND Addendum Technical Appendix B2.

GLA, 2005b Glenn Lukos Associates, 2005b. *Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Consistency Analysis*. MND Addendum Technical Appendix B3.

GLA, 2006 Glenn Lukos Associates, 2006. *Oak Tree Assessment*. MND Addendum Technical Appendix B4.

Google Earth, 2019 Google Earth, 2019. *Google Earth Viewer (application)*. January 21, 2019. Accessed January 21, 2019. Available online: <https://www.google.com/earth/download/gep/agree.html>

JMA, 2015a JMA, 2015a. *Pre-Construction Palaeontological Assessment*. April, 2015. MND Addendum Technical Appendix C1.

JMA, 2015b JMA, 2015b. *Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment*. October 15, 2015. MND Addendum Technical Appendix C2.

JMA, 2019 JMA, 2019. *Addendum to Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment*. June 6, 2019. MND Addendum Technical Appendix C3.

LEUSD, 2019 Lake Elsinore Unified School District, 2019. *Lake Elsinore Unified School District Boundary Interactive Map*. 2019. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <http://apps.schoolsiterlocator.com/index.html?districtCode=11361>

LGC, 2014a LGC Geotechnical Inc., 2014a. *LGC Geotechnical, Inc. Geotechnical Liquefaction Study, Proposed Residential Development of the Property Located Southwest of the Intersection of Horse Thief Canyon Road and De Palma Road, Corona Area of Riverside County, CA, PN. 14029-01*. April 14, 2014. MND Addendum Technical Appendix D1.

LGC, 2014b LGC Geotechnical Inc., 2014b. *LGC Geotechnical Inc. Summary of Infiltration Testing, Property Located Southwest of the Intersection of Horse Thief Canyon Road and De Palma Road, Corona Area of Riverside County, California*. May 21, 2014. MND Addendum Technical Appendix D2.

LGC, 2020 LGC Geotechnical Inc., 2020. *Updated Geotechnical Report, Proposed Residential Development of Tetnaitve Tract No. 37002, Riverside County, California*. April 13, 2020. MND Addendum Technical Appendix D3.

Mayers & Associates, 2014a Mayers & Associates, 2014a. *Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan July 1*. MND Addendum Technical Appendix E2.

Mayers & Associates, 2014b Mayers & Associates, 2014b). *Hydrology and Hydraulics Analysis July 10*. MND Addendum Technical Appendix E1.

Riverside County, 1988 Riverside County, 1988. *Ordinance No. 655*. July 7, 1988. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <http://www.rivcocob.org/ords/600/655.htm>

Riverside County, 2006 Riverside County, 2006. *Ordinance No. 659*. November 12, 2006. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <http://www.rivcocob.org/ords/600/659.7.pdf>

Riverside County, 2007 Riverside County, 2007. *Ordinance No. 461 Road Improvement Standards and Specifications*. December 20, 2007. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: [http://rctlma.org/Portals/7/documents/ord461/ord461\\_package.pdf](http://rctlma.org/Portals/7/documents/ord461/ord461_package.pdf)

Riverside County, 2012 Riverside County, 2012. *Ordinance No. 915*. January 19, 2012. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <http://www.rivcocob.org/ords/900/915.pdf>

Riverside County, 2014 Riverside County, 2014. *Riverside County Drainage Area Management Plan*. January 29, 2014. Accessed July 14, 2015. Available online: [http://rcflood.org/downloads/NPDES/Documents/SA\\_SM\\_DAMP/SAR\\_DAMP2014.pdf](http://rcflood.org/downloads/NPDES/Documents/SA_SM_DAMP/SAR_DAMP2014.pdf)

Riverside County, 2015a Riverside County, 2015a. *County of Riverside General Plan*. 2015. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <https://planning.rctlma.org/ZoningInformation/GeneralPlan.aspx>

Riverside County, 2015b Riverside County, 2015b. *County of Riverside Environmental Impact Report No. 521*. Feburary 2015. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <http://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/content/eir/volumeI.html>

Riverside County, 2017 Riverside County, 2017. *Elsinore Areas Plan*. April 11, 2017. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: [https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general\\_Plan\\_2017/areaplans/ELAP\\_041117.pdf?ver=2017-10-06-094258-763](https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general_Plan_2017/areaplans/ELAP_041117.pdf?ver=2017-10-06-094258-763)

RCALUC, 2010 Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, 2010. *Draft Perris Valley ALUCP October 2010*. Accessed July 06, 2015. Available online: [http://www.rcaluc.org/plan\\_perris\\_valley2010.asp](http://www.rcaluc.org/plan_perris_valley2010.asp)

RCDWR, 2019 Riverside County Department of Waste Resources, 2019. *Riverside County Department of Waste Resources website*. 2019. Accessed January 20, 2019. Available online: <http://www.rcwaste.org/>

RK Engineering, 2014      RK Engineering, 2014. *Horsethief Canyon Updated Trip Generation Review, Riverside County July 23*. July 22, 2014. MND Addendum Technical Appendix G1.

Terracor, 2003      Terracor, 2003. *General Biological Assessment for a 48 Acre Propoerty on Horsethief Canyon and De Palma Roads*. October 15, 2003. MND Addendum Technical Appendix B1.

Urban Crossroads, 2020      Urban Crossroads, Inc., 2020. *Horsethief Canyon Ranch (TTM No. 37002) Technical Memo*. March 9, 2020. MND Addendum Technical Appendix G2.

Waterboards, 1996      Waterboards, 1996. Accessed July 29, 2015. Available online: [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/board\\_decisions/adopted\\_orders/orders/1996/96\\_063\\_horsethief\\_canyon\\_stp.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/board_decisions/adopted_orders/orders/1996/96_063_horsethief_canyon_stp.pdf)

6.0 MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND No. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
4.1.1: Aesthetics	Due to the project's design, and through compliance with standard regulatory requirements, the proposed project's potential impacts will be below the level of significance.	Because the Project would be fully consistent with the HCRSP, impacts to aesthetics would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	<b>RR:</b> The Project shall be designed to comply with Riverside County Ordinance Nos. 655 and 915.	Less than significant.
4.1.2: Agriculture and Forest Resources	MND No. 38981 determined that no direct or indirect impacts would occur to agriculture and forest resources.	The Project would not result in any direct or indirect impacts to agriculture and forest resources.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	Not applicable.	No Impact
4.1.3: Air Quality	Impacts to air quality were determined by MND No. 38981 to be less than significant.	Because the Project would result in fewer residential dwelling units than was anticipated for the site by MND No. 38981, impacts would be less than what was assumed by MND No. 38981 and would remain less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	<b>RR:</b> The Project shall comply with SCAQMD Rules 403 and 402 during construction.  <b>RR:</b> The Project shall be designed to comply with SCAQMD Rule 445.	Less than significant.
4.1.4: Biological Resources	MND No. 38981 determined that impacts to sensitive biological resources would be potentially significant.	Consistent with the finding of MND No. 38981, the Project has the potential to impact sensitive biological resources.	<b>COA 15. PLANNING</b> Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the SPECIFIC PLAN (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.), the following condition shall be placed on the implementing project: "PRIOR TO PROJECT APPROVAL, a biological study shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval. This condition shall be considered MET if the relevant study has been approved by the Planning Department. This condition may be considered as NOT	Prior to the approval of any implementing project within the Specific Plan (i.e.: tract map, parcel map, use permit, plot plan, etc.),	Planning Department	Applicable	<b>MM-1</b> All disturbed and unvegetated areas of the site shall be watered daily to minimize the generation of fugitive dust which can affect adjacent habitats.  <b>MM-2</b> Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department that all grading and construction personnel have received copies of all adopted mitigation measures to reduce impacts to biological resources. Additionally, verbal instruction shall be provided during monitoring by qualified personnel to all site workers to insure clear understanding that biological resources are to be protected on-site to the maximum extent feasible.  <b>MM-3</b> Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department that qualified biologist or ecologist has been hired to conduct monitoring during grading activities. Monitoring shall be periodic, not constant, and shall	Less than significant.



IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND NO. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE- SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
			<p>APPLICABLE if the Planning Department determines that the required study is not necessary. The submittal of this study mandates that a CEQA determination of an Addendum to a previously adopted EIR be made, at a minimum."</p>				<p>be unannounced. Brief monitoring reports shall be submitted to Riverside County and kept on file. The monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt grading or construction activities if an unauthorized activity is underway or if currently-undetected sensitive resources are determined to be present.</p> <p><b>MM-4</b> The Project Applicant shall dedicate Horsethief Canyon Wash and adjoining southern coast live oak riparian forest areas to the County of Riverside and its habitat conservation agency to meet conservation goals set for the Elsinore Area Plan, Estelle Mountain/Indian Canyon Subunit, Cell Group E, Cell No. 3647.</p> <p><b>MM-5</b> Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall submit the street lighting plan to the County Biologist for review in order to reduce unnecessary impacts to natural areas to the west.</p> <p><b>MM-6</b> Prior to issuance of a building permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department that the Project utilizes native trees and shrubs for slope plantings, front yard trees, and reverse frontage landscape plans. Tree species could include coast live oak and western sycamore, however, trees with invasive root systems should be avoided where feasible, such as alder or cottonwood. Native shrubs should be utilized where feasible, including toyon, Ceanothus, sugar bush, white sage, black sage, and other flora native to the area.</p> <p><b>MM-7</b> Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project Applicant shall submit to the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD) a Best Management Water Quality Protection Plan consistent with the requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p> <p><b>MM-8</b> Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department that impacts to coast live oak trees occurring within the area to be affected by the Project are mitigated by planting 19 coast live oak trees in the on-site Conservation</p>	

IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND NO. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE- SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND NO. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
							<p>Area within the potential mitigation areas. Refer to Exhibit 5, Mitigation Map, of the DBESP prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates (Technical Appendix B2).</p> <p><b>MM-9</b> Prior to issuance of a grading permits, the Project Applicant shall provide evidence to the Riverside County Planning Department that impacts to 0.79 acres of MSHCP riparian habitat are mitigated through restoration in the on-site Conversation Area. The on-site Conservation Area shall be enhanced and replanted with a dominance of California sagebrush, California buckwheat, yerba santa, tarragon, lemonade berry, and a hydroseed mixture associated with sage scrub communities, within the potential mitigation areas. Refer to Exhibit 5, Mitigation Map, of the DBESP prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates (Technical Appendix B2).</p> <p><b>MM-10</b> Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, the Riverside County Planning Department shall approve a three-year maintenance and monitoring program. General maintenance requirements will encompass weed eradication, inspection for trash, vandalism, disease and pest infestation that may threaten the long-term health of the riparian community. Trash will be removed, vandalism will be repaired and the maintenance contractor will employ appropriate pest control techniques as necessary. In addition, any signs of distress or mortality will be noted and rectified. The routine monitoring shall include evaluation of site hydrology, plant establishment and vigor, indications of faunal utilization, development of soils, indications of biochemical processes, and collection of site photographs. The Project biologist or restoration specialist will conduct the monitoring and report any problems to the Project proponents and the maintenance contractor.</p> <p><b>MM-11</b> Following the initial three years of mitigation monitoring, the Riverside County Planning Department shall verify that the entire on-site Conservation Area is protected in perpetuity through recordation of a deed restriction or a conservation easement in the name of a suitable land-management entity, or another similar mechanism to ensure that areas remain as open space in perpetuity.</p>	

IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND No. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
			<p><b>COA 30. PLANNING 25</b> Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall obtain written notification to the County Planning Department that the appropriate California Department of Fish and Game notification pursuant to Sections 1601/1603 of the California Fish and Game Code has taken place, or obtain an "Agreement Regarding Proposed Stream or Lake Alteration" (Sections 1601/1603 permit) should any grading or construction be proposed within or along the banks of any natural watercourse or wetland, located either on-site or any required off-site improvement areas. Copies of any agreement shall be submitted with the notification.</p>	Prior to grading permit.	Planning Department	Applicable	None; COA 30. PLANNING 25 shall apply	Less than significant
			<p><b>COA 30. PLANNING 26</b> Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall obtain written notification to the County Planning Department that the alteration of any watercourse or wetland, located either on-site or on any required off-site improvement areas, complies with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permit Conditions, or obtain a permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act should any grading or construction be proposed</p>	Prior to grading permit.	Planning Department	Applicable	None; COA 30. PLANNING 26 shall apply.	Less than significant

IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND No. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
			within or along the banks of any natural watercourse or wetland. Copies of any agreement shall be submitted with notification.”					
4.1.5: Cultural Resources	MND No. 38981 determined that no direct or indirect impacts would occur to cultural resources.	The Project would not result in any direct or indirect impacts to cultural resources.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	Not applicable.	No Impact
4.1.6: Energy	Impacts to energy were determined by MND No. 38981 to be less than significant.	Because the Project would not conflict with any energy plans and would not involve an energy intensive land use, impacts would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	Not applicable.	Less than significant.
4.1.7: Geology and Soils	Impacts due to soil erosion would be potentially significant prior to mitigation. With the exception of soil erosion, impacts to geology and soils would be less than significant.	With mandatory compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of Best Management Practices from the Project’s Water Quality Management Plan, impacts would be less than significant.	<b>COA 10. FLOOD R.I. 1.</b> Development of the site will require armored bank protection along Horsethief Canyon Wash, which the District would maintain. This bank protection shall be designed and constructed to District standards. Exhibit ‘B’ from the Hydraulic report by AEI-CASC (dated June 14, 2004) depicts a Hydraulic Encroachment limit line. Exhibit ‘B’ also shows a Conservation Encroachment limit line. The slope protection shall be designed to respect both limits and such that any conservation easement/habitat area would not constrain the District from performing maintenance on the structural improvements. Note: Joint use of the trail proposed along the top of the slope would require	Prior to the issuance of grading permits.	Department of Building and Safety	Applicable.	<p><b>RR:</b> The Project shall be required to comply with the provisions of the Project’s NPDES permit, and the Project’s SWPPP for construction activities.</p> <p><b>RR:</b> The Project shall be designed to comply with Riverside County Municipal Code Chapter 15.12.</p> <p><b>RR:</b> The Project shall be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 during construction.</p>	Less than significant.

IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND No. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
			<p>indemnification of the Flood Control District by and appropriate public entity.</p> <p>2. The County's Municipal Stormwater Permit will require that individual development proposals on the site develop and implement a Water Quality Management Plan to mitigate any potential negative impacts to Water quality.</p>					
4.1.8: Greenhouse Gas Emissions	The issue of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions was not evaluated in MND No. 38981.	Because the Project would result in fewer residential dwelling units than was anticipated for the site by MND No. 38981, impacts would be less than what was assumed by MND No. 38981 and would remain less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	Not applicable.	Less than significant.
4.1.9: Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Impacts to hazards and hazardous materials were determined by MND No. 38981 to be less than significant.	The Project would not result in significant impacts due to the transportation, use, or storage of hazardous materials, and the Project site is not identified as having any Recognized Environmental Concerns (RECs). Additionally, the Project site does not serve as an evacuation route and is not located within or adjacent to a high fire hazard zone.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	Not applicable.	Less than significant.
4.1.10: Hydrology and Water Quality	Impacts to hydrology and water quality related to erosion would be potentially significant prior to mitigation. With the exception of erosion, impacts to hydrology and water quality	With mandatory compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of Best Management Practices from the Project's Water Quality Management Plan, impacts would be less than significant.	<b>COA 10. FLOOD R.I. I.</b> Development of the site will require armored bank protection along Horsethief Canyon Wash, which the District would maintain. This bank protection shall be designed and constructed to District standards.	Prior to the issuance of grading permits.	Department of Building and Safety	Applicable.	<p><b>RR:</b> The Project shall be required to comply with the provisions of the Project's NPDES permit, and the Project's SWPPP for construction activities.</p> <p><b>RR:</b> The Project shall be designed to comply with Riverside County Municipal Code Chapter 15.12.</p> <p><b>RR:</b> The Project shall be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 during construction.</p>	Less than significant.

IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND No. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	would be less than significant.		<p>Exhibit 'B' from the Hydraulic report by AEI-CASC (dated June 14, 2004) depicts a Hydraulic Encroachment limit line. Exhibit 'B' also shows a Conservation Encroachment limit line. The slope protection shall be designed to respect both limits and such that any conservation easement/habitat area would not constrain the District from performing maintenance on the structural improvements. Note: Joint use of the trail proposed along the top of the slope would require indemnification of the Flood Control District by and appropriate public entity.</p> <p>2. The County's Municipal Stormwater Permit will require that individual development proposals on the site develop and implement a Water Quality Management Plan to mitigate any potential negative impacts to Water quality.</p>					
4.1.11: Land Use and Planning	Impacts to land use and planning were determined by MND No. 38981 to be less than significant.	The Project would not result in a substantial alteration of the land uses that were approved through SPA 3 and evaluated in MND No. 38981; thus, impacts would be less than significant.	<b>MND MM-I</b> The applicant shall process a General Plan Amendment (GPA No. 658) and obtain approval and adoption from the Riverside County Board of Supervisors	Prior to Project Approval	Riverside County Board of Supervisors	Not applicable.	GPA No. 658 was approved and adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in 2005.	Less than significant.
4.1.12: Mineral Resources	MND No. 38981 determined that no direct or indirect impacts would occur to mineral resources.	The Project would not result in any direct or indirect impacts to mineral resources.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	Not applicable.	No Impact

IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND No. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
4.1.13: Noise	the SPA 3 project had the potential to expose existing area residents to temporary and permanent increases in ambient noise levels, expose persons noise levels in excess of the Riverside County General Plan noise ordinance, and expose persons to groundborne vibration during the construction phase of the SPA 3 project.	<p>Construction activities associated with the development of the proposed Project would create short-term noise increases near the Project site and would be potentially significant.</p> <p>Future residents on the Project site would be subject to potentially significant noise levels from off-site traffic from the I-15 freeway.</p>	<p><b>COA 30. PLANNING 36</b> Prior to project approval, compliance with the conditions of approval contained in Department of Health's Report dated June 15, 2004 (attached), based on Noise Impact analysis prepared by Giroux &amp; Associates, July 9, 2003. These conditions call for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A <del>thirteen</del> <u>ten</u>-foot-high noise barrier along De Palma Road/Interstate 15 frontage.</li> <li>2. A six-foot masonry wall along Horsethief Canyon Road.</li> <li>3. Construction activities shall be limited to the house of 7:00 AM to <del>7</del> <u>6</u>:00 PM Monday through Saturday <u>during the months of October through May, and between 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM during the months of June through September.</u></li> <li>4. Public health shall review and approve an acoustical report addressing indoor noise impacts prior to an implementing project approval.</li> <li>5. Applicant shall pay all applicable Review Fees to the Department of Public Health.</li> </ol>	Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.	Building and Safety Department.	Applicable	<p><b>MM-12</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the County of Riverside Building Director (or his designee) shall ensure that grading and/or building plans include a note that requires all construction equipment to minimize noise from construction activities by maintaining equipment mufflers in proper operating order and operating all equipment in the quietest manner feasible.)</p> <p><b>MM-13</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the County of Riverside Building Director (or his designee) shall ensure that grading and/or building plans include a note that requires that to the extent feasible, the noisiest operations shall be scheduled to occur simultaneously in the construction program to avoid prolonged periods of annoyance.</p> <p><b>MM-14</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the County of Riverside Building Director (or his designee) shall ensure that grading and/or building plans include a note that requires that the construction contractor locates equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site.</p> <p><b>MM-15</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the County of Riverside Building Director (or his designee) shall ensure that grading and/or building plans include a note that requires that no music or electronically reinforced speech from construction workers shall be audible at noise-sensitive properties adjacent to the Project site.</p> <p><b>MM-16</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the County of Riverside Building Director (or his designee) shall ensure that grading and/or building plans include a note that requires that all project workers exposed to noise levels above 80 dBA shall be provided with personal protective equipment for hearing protection (i.e., earplugs and/or earmuffs). The County of Riverside Planning Director (or his designee) shall also ensure that areas where noise levels are routinely expected to exceed 80 dBA are clearly posted with signs requiring that hearing protection be worn.</p>	Less than significant.



IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND No. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
							<p><b>MM-17</b> Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits, the County of Riverside Building and Safety Department shall ensure that all De Palma/I-15 perimeter homes shall have central air conditioning as a standard feature to allow for window closure during warmer weather while maintaining interior comfort. Supplemental ventilation shall be required for any habitable rooms facing De Palma Road. Assuming a 3-person household, 45 cfm (5x15 cfm/person) of fresh make-up should be supplied to such rooms. The make-up air intake should be on the side of the house away from the adjacent arterial roadway.</p>	
4.1.14: Paleontological Resources	MND No. 38981 determined that no direct or indirect impacts would occur to paleontological resources. However, out of an abundance of caution, a Condition of Approval was applied to the Project.	The proposed Project includes similar development characteristics as those that were identified in SPA 3 (and evaluated in MND No. 38981). Thus, no impact would occur. However, because the Project site is located in an area with a high sensitivity for paleontological resources, out of an abundance of caution a Condition of Approval was applied to the Project.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	<p><b>COA 060. PLANNING</b> Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project 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). 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Description of the proposed site and planned grading operations.</li> <li>2. Description of the level of monitoring required for all earth-moving activities in the Project area.</li> <li>3. Identification and qualifications of the qualified paleontological monitor to be employed for grading operations monitoring.</li> <li>4. Identification of personnel with authority and responsibility to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for recovery of large specimens.</li> <li>5. Direction for any fossil discoveries to be immediately reported to the property owner who</li> </ol>	No Impact



IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND No. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE- SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
							<p>in turn will immediately notify the County Geologist of the discovery.</p> <p>6. Means and methods to be employed by the paleontological monitor to quickly salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays.</p> <p>7. Sampling of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates.</p> <p>8. Procedures and protocol for collecting and processing of samples and specimens.</p> <p>9. Fossil identification and curation procedures to be employed.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>11. All pertinent exhibits, maps and references.</p> <p>12. Procedures for reporting of findings.</p> <p>13. Identification and acknowledgement of the developer for the content of the PRIMP as well as acceptance of financial responsibility for monitoring, reporting and curation fees. The property owner and/or applicant on whose land the paleontological fossils are discovered shall provide appropriate funding for monitoring, reporting, delivery and curating the fossils at the institution where the fossils will be placed, and will provide confirmation to the County that such funding has been paid to the institution.</p> <p>All reports shall be signed by the Project paleontologist and all other professionals responsible for the report's content (e.g. Project Geologist), 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 Project 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.</p>	

IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND No. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
4.1.15: Population and Housing	Impacts to population and housing were determined by MND No. 38981 to be less than significant.	Because the Project would not displace people or housing and would not generate demand for additional affordable housing the in the County impacts would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	Not applicable.	Less than significant.
4.1.16: Public Services	Impacts to public services were determined by MND No. 38981 to be less than significant, with the exception of schools, which were found to be potentially significant.	Because the Project would result in fewer residential dwelling units than was anticipated for the site by MND No. 38981, impacts would be less than what was assumed by MND No. 38981 and would remain less than significant, except for impacts related to school facilities.	<b>MND MM-2</b> Prior to the issuance of each residential building permit(s), school fees shall be paid in accordance with the requirements of the State of California (Senate Bill 50) or the applicant shall enter into a mitigation agreement with the <del>Corona-Norco</del> <u>Lake Elsinore</u> Unified School District.	Prior to the issuance of each residential building permit(s)	Riverside County Building and Safety Department	Applicable.	None; MND MM-2 shall apply.	Less than significant.
4.1.17: Recreation	MND No. 38981 determined that the addition of residential uses to the Project site would increase parkland demand and impacts would be potentially significant.	Similar to the findings of MND No. 38981, the addition of residential uses to the Project site would increase parkland demand and impacts would be potentially significant.	<b>COA 30. PLANNING 16</b> Prior to map recordation of any subdivision; or other residential development application, all portions of this implementing project no currently within the boundaries of the County Service Area 152-B, shall be annexed into the County Service Area/District that has been designated by the Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Section 10.35(G) of Ordinance No. 460, to receive park dedications and fees. Documentation of said annexation shall be provided to the Planning Department.  This condition shall be considered as NOT APPLICABLE if the County Service Area No. 152-B is	Prior to map recordation or other residential development application	Planning Department	Applicable	None; COA 30. PLANNING 16 shall apply.	Less than significant.

IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND No. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
			<p>unwilling or unable to annex the property in question.”</p> <p><b>COA 30. PARKS I</b> Prior to any project approval, the applicant shall submit a trails plan for review and approval to the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District. This trail shall be a dual use with the flood control access road if possible. The trail shall be located east of the open space area (Planning Area 2526), within Planning Area 25 and west of Planning Areas 22, 23, and 24. The trails will continue along Del Palma Road to the property line.</p>	Prior to project approval	Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District.	Applicable	None; COA 30. PARKS I shall apply.	Less than significant
4.1.18: Transportation	Impacts to transportation were determined to be potentially significant with implementation of SPA 3.	Because the Project would result in fewer residential dwelling units than was anticipated for the site by MND No. 38981, impacts would be less than what was assumed by MND No. 38981 and would remain potentially significant prior to implementation of mitigation.	<p><b>COA 30. TRANS. I</b> Site-specific traffic studies will be required for all subsequent implementing projects within Specific Plan No. 152 as approved by the Transportation Department. These subsequent traffic studies shall identify specific project impacts and needed roadway improvements to be constructed prior to each development phase.</p>	Prior to subsequent development approval	Transportation Department	Applicable	<p>None; COA 30; TRANS. I will apply. Additional site-specific mitigation measures were identified by the Project’s Technical Memorandum and are listed as separate mitigation measures below.</p> <p>MM-18 Prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit for the Project, the Project Applicant shall make a fair share monetary contribution to the County of Riverside at the Glen Eden Road and Future Mountain Road at De Palma Road intersection. The Project’s fair share for intersection improvements is 11.7%.</p> <p>MM-19 Prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit for the Project, the Project Applicant shall make a fair share monetary contribution to the County of Riverside at the Horsethief Canyon Road at De Palma Road intersection. The Project’s fair share for intersection improvements is 15.7%.</p>	Less than significant.

IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND NO. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
			<p><b>COA 30. TRANS. 2</b>                      The Specific Plan proponent and all subsequent implementing projects within the Specific Plan shall be responsible for design and construction of traffic signals at the following intersections or as approved by the Transportation Department:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Northerly Project Access (PA 22/25)/De Palma Road</li> <li>-Horsethief Canyon Road/Easterly Project Access (PA 23)</li> </ul> <p>with no credit given for Traffic Signal Mitigation Fees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Horsethief Canyon Road/De Palma Road</li> <li>-Indian Truck Trail/I-15 SB Ramps</li> <li>-Indian Truck Trail/I-15 NO Ramps</li> </ul> <p>with fee credit eligibility.</p> <p>The project proponent shall contact the Transportation Department and enter into an agreement for signal mitigation fee credit or reimbursement prior to the start of construction of the signals. All work shall be preapproved by and shall comply with the requirements of the Transportation Department and the public contracts code in order to be eligible for fee credit or reimbursement.</p>	<p>Road improvement plans for each implementing development project to be submitted prior to the issuance of that project's grading permits.</p>	<p>Transportation Department</p>	<p>Applicable</p>	<p>None; COA 30. TRANS. 2 shall apply.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

IMPACT CATEGORY	MND No. 38981 IMPACT (PER MND No. 38981)	SPA 5 FINDING	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA)	MND No. 38981 MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION TIMING	RESPONSIBLE PARTY FOR MITIGATION	APPLICABILITY OF MND No. 38981 MITIGATION TO SPA 5	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COA), REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR), AND SITE-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES (MM) APPLICABLE TO SPA 5	MND No. 38981 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
4.1.19: Tribal Cultural Resources	MND No. 38981 did not specifically evaluate impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources, although impacts to Cultural Resources as disclosed by MND No. 38981 are addressed above.	The Project would not result in any direct or indirect impacts to tribal cultural resources.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	Not applicable.	No Impact
4.1.20: Utilities and Service Systems	Impacts to utilities and service systems were determined by MND No. 38981 to be less than significant.	Because the Project would result in fewer residential dwelling units than was anticipated for the site by MND No. 38981, impacts would be less than what was assumed by MND No. 38981 and would remain less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	Not applicable.	Less than significant.
4.1.21: Wildfire	Impacts to wildfire were determined by MND No. 38981 to be less than significant.	The Project is located in an area of "Low" Wildfire hazard; thus, impacts would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	--	Not applicable.	Less than significant.