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I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description: The project site is an approximately 27-acre area located east of the Interstate-15 (I-15) freeway, north of Indian Truck Trail and Corona Lake, and west of Temescal Canyon Road (Refer to Figure 1, Regional Map and Figure 2, Aerial Map, and Figure 3, USGS Topographic Map). The project site is located within the Elsinore Area Plan of the Riverside County General Plan. The proposed project is a commercial development that will include a gas station, restaurants, retail, office, and a supermarket. The overall project would be developed in two phases; Phase I would include development of approximately 12 acres of the southeast portion of the site and Phase II would include future development of the remaining approximately 15 acres of the northwest portion of the site. Development applications (Plot Plan and Conditional Use Permit) that cover Phase I as listed below are in process to be considered concurrently with the environmental document. Subsequent applications for Phase II would be submitted at a later time and will require subsequent environmental review.

Plot Plan No. 26290 covering Phase I of the planned development proposes the construction of 6 buildings totaling approximately 61,000 square feet for fast food, retail, office, and gas station use as outlined in Table 1 below. Buildings 1 and 2 are single story 3,400 square foot fast food restaurants with drive-thrus. Building 3 is a single-story 3,800 square foot gas station with 12 fueling stations, car wash, and a convenience store. Building 4 is a single story 4,500 square foot restaurant. Building 5 is a two-story 39,900 square foot retail and office building. Building 6 is a single story 6,000 square foot restaurant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Number</th>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>Square Footage (square feet)</th>
<th>Height (in feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fast Restaurant</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gas Station with Convenient Store</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Retail (1st floor) and Office (2nd floor)</td>
<td>39,900</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The combined maximum square footage in Phase I is 6,800 square feet for fast-food restaurant; 10,500 square feet for restaurant; 3,800 square feet for gas station/convenience store; and 39,900 square feet for retail and office. The final development may have adjustments that result in a reduction of square footage. However, the development will not exceed the total square footages outlined herein as these are used in the technical studies and analysis in this Environmental Assessment and subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Conditional Use Permit No. 3712 proposes to permit the sale of beer and wine for off-site consumption associated with the convenience store (Building 3) and gas station use proposed.

General Plan Amendment No. 1146 proposes to change the Land Use designation of the entire project site from Community Development: Light Industrial (CD: LI) to Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD:CR).

Change of Zone No. 7859 proposes to change the zoning of the entire project site from Manufacturing – Service Commercial (M-SC) to Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S).

Three access points to Phase I buildings will be located along Temescal Canyon Road. The first entrance into the Phase I development would be between Building 1 and Building 2. The next entrance would be located between Building 3 and Building 4. The most northerly entrance of Phase I is located north of Building 6 and constitutes the northwest extent of Phase I. The six buildings would be served by a total of approximately 389 parking spaces.

Phase II buildings will follow the same architectural design standards as Phase I buildings. Phase II of the planned development would include the construction of an anticipated total of 9 buildings totaling approximately 133,000 square feet for restaurant, bank, office, retail and supermarket uses as outlined in Table 2 below. Building 7 is single story 6,000 square foot restaurant. Buildings 8, 9, and 10 are two-story office buildings each with 14,000 square feet. Building 11 is a single-story 14,000 square foot pharmacy. Building 12 is a single story 21,000 square foot retail building. Building 13 is a single-story 3,500 square foot bank or restaurant building. Building 14 is a single story 3,500 square foot restaurant. Building 15 is a single story 43,000 square foot supermarket.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Number</th>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
<th>Height (in feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bank or Restaurant</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>133,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum square footage in Phase II is 13,000 square feet for restaurant; 42,000 square feet for office; 14,000 square feet for pharmacy; 21,000 square feet for retail; 3,500 square feet for bank; and 43,000 square feet for supermarket. The final development may have adjustments that result in a reduction of square footage. However, the final site plan and plot plan(s) will not exceed the total square footages outlined herein as these are used in the
technical studies and analysis in this Environmental Assessment and subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

One access point to Phase II buildings will be located along Temescal Canyon Road, near the northeast corner of the site and Building 15, the supermarket. The nine buildings will be served by a total of approximately 749 parking spaces.

Additionally, the project applicant proposes to obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans to do mass grading of Caltrans' right-of-way (ROW) on approximately 3.3 acres between the site’s southwest boundary and the I-15 northbound on-ramp. Mass grading for the entire proposed project site, including the Caltrans ROW of 3.3 acres, would occur during Phase I. A total of approximately 300,000 cubic yards (CY) of material will be cut and filled onsite. No material is anticipated to be exported or imported. Phase II would be mass graded at the same time Phase I is graded. However, construction of Phase II buildings would be sometime after initial mass grading of the entire site and construction of Phase I.

The project will include the construction of offsite water, sewer, and non-potable water pipeline extensions in Temescal Canyon Road to connect to existing lines north up to Terramor Drive. The project will include road improvements at Temescal Canyon Road and Indian Truck Trail intersection at a driveway to the project along Temescal Canyon Road. The project will include construction of on-site drainage facilities (storm drain pipelines, swales, and basins) to convey on-site and off-site (upstream) across the site to existing downstream facilities located in Temescal Canyon Road.

Approximately 8 existing Southern California Edison (SCE) power poles that are located along Temescal Canyon Road and the project site's frontage will need to be relocated. The power poles will generally remain in the same location within the existing SCE Right-of-Way. The relocation is an adjustment in elevation because the existing elevation (or ground level) where they are located and the proposed elevation after site grading and proposed improvements to the west side of Temescal Canyon Road are different. The elevation adjustments are anticipated to be completed by installing a new pole several feet away from the existing at the new elevation and then transferring the power lines from the previous pole to the new pole at the proper elevation.
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B. **Type of Project:** Site Specific ☑; Countywide ☐; Community ☐; Policy ☐.

C. **Total Project Area:** 27 acres
   - Residential Acres: 27
     - Lots: 270
     - Units: 
     - Projected No. of Residents:
   - Commercial Acres: 27
     - Lots: 27
     - Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: 194,000
     - Est. No. of Employees: 470
   - Industrial Acres:
     - Lots: 
     - Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: 
     - Est. No. of Employees:
   - Other:

D. **Assessor's Parcel No(s):** 290-130-003, 290-130-004, 290-130-005, 290-130-006, 290-130-052, 290-130-053, 290-130-054, 290-130-055

E. **Street References:** Temescal Canyon Road, Indian Truck Trail

F. **Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:**
   - Township 5 South, Range 6 West, Section 12.

G. **Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings:**
   The proposed project is located on a narrow strip of land between I-15 and Temescal Canyon Road in the County of Riverside (County). Areas to the west of I-15 consist of residential, commercial, and industrial land uses. Corona Lake and associated recreational land uses are located to the southeast. Areas to the east of the project site consist of vacant, undeveloped land extending up to Estelle Mountain. Immediately east of the project site and east of Temescal Canyon Road is a hill that separates the project site from the Temescal Canyon Wash. The wash flows around the eastern side of the hill in a northerly direction adjacent to Temescal Canyon Road.

   Surface elevations range from approximately 1,078 to 1,215 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) with areas of greater topographic relief located along the western boundary of the project site. Based on the USDA Soil Survey, the project site is underlain by the following soil units: Altamont Clay (15 to 25 Percent Slopes Eroded); Cortina Gravely Coarse Sandy Loam (2 to 8 Percent Slopes); Gorgonio Loamy Sand (0 to 8 Percent Slopes); Ramona Sandy Loam (0 to 5 Percent Slopes, Eroded); Ramona Sandy Loam (5 to 8 Percent Slopes, Severely Eroded); Ramona Sandy Loam (8 to 15 Percent Slopes, Eroded); and Terrace Escarpments.

   Nine (9) plant communities were observed within the boundaries of the project site during the habitat assessment: annual grassland; Riversidean sage scrub (RSS); southern cottonwood willow riparian forest; coast live oak riparian forest; mulefat scrub; wetland; eucalyptus woodland; disturbed; and developed. The project site consists of vacant land that varies in levels of disturbance. The southern two thirds of the project site primarily consist of annual grasslands that have historically been subject to grading activities and human disturbance with isolated patches of Riversidean Sage Scrub on terrace slopes.

   Historically, the majority of the northern half of the project site was used as a storage yard, based on historic aerial photographs. Currently, this area is no longer utilized as a storage area, but the vegetation has been heavily disturbed. Additionally, on top of the recessed area along the northern boundary is an area that has been graded and leveled with little to no vegetation. On the northwestern corner of the project site is an ephemeral drainage feature that extends from the western boundary of the project site via an earthen channel. This drainage feature then becomes riprap lined as it generally flows in a northern direction into Temescal Canyon Wash.
II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. **Land Use:** The project site is currently designated under the General Plan as Community Development: Light Industrial (CD: LI). The project includes a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation to Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD:CR).

2. **Circulation:** The proposed project will add overall trips to the area. A traffic study will be prepared for the project and reviewed by the Transportation Department to determine whether the proposed project meets required levels of service.

3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** The proposed project is located within the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). It is located in the Criteria Area; however, the site is not required for conservation. A MSHCP Compliance Report will be prepared for the project and reviewed by the County's Environmental Programs Department (EPD) as well as the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) to determine if all of the requirements of the MSHCP have been met.

4. **Safety:** The proposed project is not located in a flood zone. The proposed project is in an area designated as having very low potential for liquefaction and susceptible to subsidence. The project is within a very high fire area. The project site is located near a mapped fault located to the east of the project site generally on the east side of Temescal Canyon Road from the project site (Figure 5, Earthquake Faults). According to the site specific geotechnical report prepared for this project, this mapped fault is a possible fault trace located within approximately 200 feet of the eastern portion of the property. Soil within the southeastern tip of the site does appear to have surficial grading which has occurred previously and therefore no surface expression of this potential fault exists on the site.

5. **Noise:** The proposed project will permanently increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. However, current noise levels are relatively high on the project vicinity and immediate area due to proximity to Interstate-15.

6. **Housing:** N/A

7. **Air Quality:** The proposed project will generate vehicle trips primarily that will impact regional and local air quality.

8. **Healthy Communities:** As outlined in the Healthy Communities Element of the General Plan, healthy land use patterns can be achieved by encouraging infill, focusing development in mixed use districts and along major transit corridors, avoiding leap frog development, constructing a diverse mix of uses throughout the County and encouraging land use patterns that promote walking, bicycling and transit use. The proposed project includes development of commercial, retail, and office uses along a major transit corridor, the I-15 freeway, within an area with existing residential development.

B. **General Plan Area Plan(s):** Lake Elsinore Area Plan
C. Foundation Component(s): Community Development

D. Existing Land Use Designation(s): Light Industrial

E. Proposed Land Use Designation(s): Commercial Retail

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

G. Policy Area(s), if any: N/A

H. Adjacent and Surrounding

1. Area Plan(s): Temescal Canyon Area Plan, Lake Elsinore Area Plan

2. Foundation Component(s): Community Development to the north and east and further to the west, Rural to the east, Open Space to the north and west

3. Land Use Designation(s): Light Industrial to the east, Mixed Use Area to the east, Rural Mountainous to the east, Conservation to the north and west

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

5. Policy Area(s), if any: N/A

I. Adopted Specific Plan Information

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

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

J. Existing Zoning: Manufacturing – Service Commercial (M-SC)

K. Proposed Zoning, if any: Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S)

L. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Manufacturing Service – Commercial (M-SC) to the north, Specific Plan (SP 327) to the east and north, Mixed Use Area (MUA) to the east, Specific Plan (SP 256) to the west
III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials  ☐ Recreation
☐ Agriculture & Forest Resources  ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality  ☐ Transportation/Traffic
☒ Air Quality  ☑ Land Use/Planning  ☐ Utilities/Service Systems
☒ Biological Resources  ☐ Mineral Resources  ☐ Other:
☒ Cultural Resources  ☑ Noise  ☐ Other:
☐ Geology/Soils  ☐ Population/Housing  ☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance
☒ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Public Services

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

| ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. |
| ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. |
☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. |

| ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED because (a) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible. |
| ☐ I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An ADDENDUM to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies. |
| ☐ I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised. |
| ☐ I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the |
project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any the following: (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration; (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration; (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or, (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

___________________________  _______________________
Signature                                                   Date
Russell Brady, Contract Planner                             For Charissa Leach, P.E. Assistant TLMA
Printed Name                                               Director
V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

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

AESTHETICS

Would the project:

1. Scenic Resources
   a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located? □ □ ☒ □ □
   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? □ □ ☒ □ □

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Policy C 19.1; Riverside County General Plan Figure C-9, "Scenic Highways"; Caltrans Scenic Highway Guidelines

Findings of Fact:

a) According to Riverside County General Plan Figure C-9 "Scenic Highways" the proposed project site is located adjacent of the I-15 freeway which is designated as a State Eligible Scenic Highway. The project site would be highly visible from this corridor. The County’s General Plan also references Policy C 19.1, which calls to “preserve scenic routes that have exceptional or unique visual features in accordance with Caltrans’ Scenic Highways Plan.”

Views from the I-15 freeway in the project area include generally undeveloped hillsides of the Lake Mathews Estelle Mountains to the northeast and east and the hillsides of the Santa Ana Mountains to the west and northwest. The I-15 freeway generally follows Temescal Creek through the canyon between these mountains. Temescal Creek meanders through the canyon on the east side of the freeway and is generally located at a lower elevation than the freeway. Northwest of the project site, on the west side of I-15, there is an existing housing development that is at a higher elevation than the freeway. This development includes landscaped slopes and rooftops that are visible from the freeway. North and south of the project site, on both sides of the freeway, there is existing development of compatible uses such as existing residential, commercial, and industrial uses that already impact this scenic corridor.

The project site’s graded elevation will be lower than the I-15 freeway north and southbound lanes. The project and will not substantially obstruct views of the surrounding hillsides or of Temescal Creek. The project will be required to follow the County’s Design Standards and Guidelines for architecture. The two-story office buildings are the tallest proposed buildings and will not exceed 50 feet in height, which would not significantly obstruct views of the hillsides east of the project site from the I-15 freeway. The project will not conflict with the County’s General Plan Policy C 19.1. Therefore, the proposed project impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.
b) The proposed project site would not substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. The proposed project would include some minor vegetation removal, but no substantial scenic resources exist on the site that would be removed. Additionally, no prominent scenic vista or view that is open to the public is adjacent to the proposed project site nor would the proposed project obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public. As mentioned above, the project would be required to follow the County’s Design Standards and Guidelines for architecture and would not create an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. Therefore, the proposed project impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

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

Sources: GIS Database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution)

Findings of Fact:
   a) The proposed project is approximately 43.4 miles away from Mt. Palomar Observatory. The proposed project location falls within Zone B’s 45-mile radius. The project will include new lighting and all outdoor building and parking lot lights, street lights, will be shielded and light directed downward, in accordance with County Zoning Code Section 19.590.070 (Light and Glare) and Chapter 19.556 (Lighting). The proposed project would be compliant with Ordinance No. 655, which restricts the permitted use of certain light fixtures emitting undesirable light rays into the night sky which have detrimental effects on astronomical observation and research. With compliance with these existing requirements and Riverside County Ordinance No. 655, the proposed project would not interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

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

   b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

Sources: Riverside County Cod of Ordinances, Chapter 8.80

Findings of Fact:
   a) The proposed project’s specific lighting location, fixtures, and intensity would be designed and reviewed during the design review process and building permit process. The proposed project is required to adhere to provisions identified in County Ordinance Code Chapter 8.80, which outlines minimum requirements for outdoor lighting to protect the health, property, and well-being of residents in unincorporated areas of the county. Impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

   b) The proposed project is not located directly next to any residential properties. The nearest existing residential community is located west of the I-15 freeway opposite of the proposed project. Therefore, there would not be
exposure to existing homeowners of unacceptable light levels. On the northeast side of Temescal Canyon Road off Hermano Road, the Terramor Project is currently being developed with residential properties that would sit at a higher elevation relative to the project site. The lighting from the proposed project may increase the amount of light and glare for future residents, however, the impacts would be less than significant because the Estelle Mountains and the hillside would act as a barrier to significant light pollution. Also, the proposed project would be required to adhere to all relevant provisions in the County Ordinance Code Chapter 8.80, which outlines minimum requirements for outdoor lighting to protect the health, property, and well-being of residents in unincorporated areas of the county. Therefore, impacts to residential properties would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is necessary.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is necessary.

### AGRICULTURAL & FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Agriculture</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing agricultural use, or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625, “Right-to-Farm”)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Riverside County General Plan figure OS-2, “Agricultural Resources,” GIS database, and Project application materials.

**Findings of Fact:**

a) According to Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 “Agricultural Resources” the proposed project site does not contain Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Unique Farmland. Therefore, the project will not impact Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

b) As mentioned above, the proposed project is not zoned for agricultural uses and is not within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve or Williamson Act contract. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

c) Land surrounding the proposed project is not agriculturally zoned property. No impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

d) As the proposed project and its surrounding areas are not mapped as Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland) the project will not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, no impact would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. This topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.
| Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary. |
| Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary. |

| 5. Forest |
| a) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 122220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? |
| b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |

**Sources:** Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-3, “Parks, Forests and Recreation Areas,” and Project application materials.

**Findings of Fact:**

a-c) According to Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-3 “Parks, Forests, and Recreation Areas” the proposed project site is not located within an area identified as a forest or timberland. The site does not contain forest vegetation or trees or timberland trees. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is necessary.

**Monitoring:** No mitigation is necessary.

---

**AIR QUALITY**

Would the Project:

| 6. Air Quality Impacts |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within one mile of the project site to substantial point source emissions? |
**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Would the Project:

### 7. Wildlife & Vegetation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional or state conservation plan?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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 Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of Fact:

a-f) The proposed project has the potential to impact air quality. This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.
Findings of Fact:
a-g) The proposed project will impact riparian habitat and streambeds. This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

CULTURAL RESOURCES
Would the Project:

8. Historic Resources
   a) Alter or destroy an historic site? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
   b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Sources: Phase I Cultural Resources Report (BCR 2014)

Findings of Fact:
a, b) According to the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment Report prepared in May of 2014, only one cultural resource was found within the proposed project site (Appendix A). A historic period railroad grade was located on the project site. The resource was recorded using California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms. The field survey and research indicated that the previously recorded historic-period railroad grade lacks integrity and as such does not appear to be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources. No further investigations are recommended. The Caltrans ROW that will be graded as part of this project is not expected to contain historical resources based on the records search conducted and since the area was already been disturbed by grading activities when the on-ramp to the I-15 was constructed. Therefore, no significant impacts related to historical resources would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

9. Archaeological Resources
   a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
   b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
   c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
   d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Sources: Project application materials, Cultural Resources Report (BCR 2014, Appendix A)

Findings of Fact:
a, b) The Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment Report (Appendix A) included a records search that revealed 30 cultural resources studies have taken place resulting in the recording of 11 archaeological sites and no built environment resources within one mile of the proposed development site. A record search along with a field study was conducted on the proposed project site to determine the presence of an archaeological resource and none were found. However, if during construction any archaeological resource becomes exposed through ground disturbing activity on the site, construction activities shall be stopped until a qualified archaeologist determines the significance of the find. Mitigation and treatment measures may be necessary if the resource is found to be a
significant archaeological discovery. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

c) A field visit evaluation and research on the proposed project site did not reveal any human remains, known cemeteries, or tribal burial grounds. However, if during construction activities human remains are discovered, the State of Health Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and deposition pursuant to the Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. 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). With permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The discovery of human remains is not expected at the project site. However, if there is a discovery the Coroner will be notified immediately and the State of Health Safety Code Section 7050.5 and the Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 will be followed. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

d) A record search of the NAHC Sacred Lands Inventory failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional places at the project site. The proposed project is not expected to adversely affect a sacred land. Potential impacts are less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the Draft EIR.

Mitigation:

CUL-1:

A qualified archaeological Inspector(s) would be retained to monitor construction-related activities that involve excavation below a depth of one foot such that inadvertent finds can be avoided by heavy equipment. If the Inspector encounters a cultural or paleontological resource site during implementation of this mitigation measure, the Inspector(s) shall if possible move the heavy equipment used during maintenance to a point at least 50 feet away from the new discovery and then inform the County of the event. Isolated artifacts lying outside established site boundaries of a known historic property need not be mitigated for, but such finds should be recorded and isolate forms by the Inspector(s). The project applicant must also notify the County if there is an inadvertent discovery made (without the Inspector(s) present) of buried unknown resources, human remains or sacred Native American objects during maintenance activities because there may be additional responsibilities under 36 CFR Part 800.

Monitoring: During mass grading activities.

10. Paleontological Resources

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

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8, “Paleontological Sensitivity”

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located in an area mapped as high paleontological sensitivity. Portions of the site have been previously disturbed by grading activities and roadway (Temescal Canyon Road) and highway (I-15) construction. The proposed project is not anticipated to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature. However, there is a potential for grading activities to cut into undisturbed soils and unearth paleontological resources. Potential impacts are reduced to less than significant with implementation of the County’s standard condition of approval (outlined below) and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

County Condition of Approval:

If a paleontological resource is encountered onsite during construction activities, all site earthmoving shall be ceased in the area and may be diverted to other areas of the site. The owner of the property shall be immediately
notified of the discovery who shall in turn immediately notify the County Geologist. The applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist approved by the County of Riverside. The paleontologist shall determine the significance of encountered fossil remains.

If any fossils encountered are determined to be significant by the paleontologist, any recovered fossil remains shall be prepared to the point of identification and identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible by knowledgeable paleontologists. The remains shall then be curated and catalogued, and associated specimen data and corresponding geologic site data will be archived at the museum repository by a laboratory technician. The remains shall be accessioned into the museum repository fossil collection, where they will be permanently stored, maintained, and available for future study by qualified scientific investigators. Per the County of Riverside “SABER Policy”, paleontological fossils found in the County should be directed to the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet. The property owner and/or applicant shall provide appropriate funding for monitoring, reporting, delivery and curating the fossils at the institution where the fossils will be placed, and shall provide confirmation to the County Geologist that such funding has been paid to the institution.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 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?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2, “Earthquake Fault Study Zones,” GIS database, Geotechnical Investigation Report (Matrix 2014); Riverside County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 15.12

**Findings of Fact:**

a) A geotechnical investigation report (Matrix 2014, Appendix B) was conducted for the proposed project and found the proposed project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as shown in Figure 5, Earthquake Faults). The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects such as risk of loss, injury, or death. In its review, the geotech report found a possible fault trace located within approximately 200 feet of the eastern portion of the property. The fault trace appears to control the contact of a portion of the Cretaceous Estelle Mountain Volcanics with very old Quaternary alluvial deposits just east of Temescal Canyon Road. The presence of this postulated fault is not likely to affect the site with strong ground motions. The proposed project includes the construction of new buildings that are required to be constructed in accordance with the current California Building Code (CBC) as referenced in Chapter 15.12 (Uniform Building Code) of the Riverside County Code, which establishes, in part, requirements for buildings to be structurally sound, would apply to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

b) As previously mentioned, the proposed project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Also, no known faults (active, potentially active, or inactive) were discovered onsite. The Elsinore Fault...
Zone is the nearest major fault system to the proposed project. It is located approximately one mile southwest of the site within the Lake Mathews Quadrangle United States Geological Survey (USGS) map and follows a northwestern alignment west of the I-15 freeway. The proposed project would be located on the eastern side of the I-15 freeway and is approximately one mile northeast of the fault. The Elsinore Fault Zone is one of the largest in Southern California, but has also been one of the least active systems historically. In its review, the geotech report found a possible fault trace located within approximately 200 feet of the eastern portion of the property. The fault trace appears to control the contact of a portion of the Cretaceous Estelle Mountain Volcanics with very old Quaternary alluvial deposits just east of Temescal Canyon Road. The presence of this postulated fault is not likely to affect the site with strong ground motions. The proposed project would not subject to rupturing of a known fault. Impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

12. Liquefaction Potential Zone
a. Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3, “Generalized Liquefaction”; Geotechnical Investigation Report (Matrix 2014); County of Riverside, Building & Safety Department, Grading and Grading Permit (website url in references section of this document); Riverside County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 15.12

Findings of Fact:

a) Liquefaction is the result of soils being partially or fully saturated where loss of strength and stiffness of the soil causes the soil to act like a liquid. Earthquakes and ground shaking can cause liquefaction to occur in areas susceptible to liquefaction. Riverside County’s General Plan Figure S-3 “Generalized Liquefaction” depicts areas within the County with liquefaction susceptibilities to levels of ‘Very High,’ ‘High,’ ‘Moderate,’ ‘Low,’ and ‘Very Low.’ The proposed project is within an area on this map signified as ‘Low’ susceptibility where most of the remainder of the proposed project’s footprint is in an area that has yet been defined for liquefaction susceptibility. The proposed project would involve construction of multiple buildings with parking spaces that would follow and be subject to a grading permit from the County’s Department of Building and Safety, which includes grading safety standards that would ensure liquefaction potential is not significant. The proposed project would follow Chapter 15.12 (Uniform Building Code) of the Riverside County Code, which establishes, in part, requirements for buildings to be structurally sound. Additionally, the conclusion in the Geotechnical Investigation Report (Appendix B) was the potential for liquefaction to occur is negligible. The proposed project would include proper grading and compacting and, therefore, would not include a high risk for liquefaction. Impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

13. Ground-shaking Zone
a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 “Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map,” and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), Geotechnical Investigation Report (Matrix 2014)

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project, along with most of Southern California, is within a seismically active area. The County’s General Plan illustrates in Figure S-17 that the proposed project site is within an area known to have a ‘Very High’ risk to general ground shaking. As outlined in the Geotechnical Investigation Report (Appendix B), active or potentially active faults were not identified, known to exist on, or project towards the site. The proposed project
would include the construction of multiple buildings. Construction would comply with California’s Building Code regulations to ensure the stability and integrity of the structures and minimize the potential for ground shaking to result in loss, injury, or death from the proposed project. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is necessary.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is necessary.

---

### 14. Landslide Risk

a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Sources:** On-site inspection, Riverside County General Plan, Figure S-5, “Regions Underlain by Steep Slope”, Geotechnical Investigation Report (Matrix 2014)

**Findings of Fact:**

a) The proposed project site is not located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that is expected to become unstable as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project would not potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards. The review of the pertinent geologic literature and geologic mapping did not indicate the presence of landslides on or adjacent to the proposed project site. The potential for the existence of landslides is considered negligible since the proposed project site is underlain by hard to very dense older alluvium and formational bedrock and is not located within an area mapped as being potentially affected by earthquake-induced landsliding. Additionally, based upon the lack of free-face conditions on or adjacent to the site and the proposed location of the building, the potential for lateral spreading at the site is considered to be low. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is necessary.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is necessary.

---

### 15. Ground Subsidence

a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Sources:** Geotechnical Investigation Report (Matrix 2014)

**Findings of Fact:**

a) The proposed project is not located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that is expected to become unstable as a result of the proposed project. Based on the Geotechnical Investigation Report (Matrix 2014), the proposed project is considered to be susceptible to subsidence from scarification and recompaction of exposed bottom surfaces in removal areas to receive fill. This susceptibility varies from negligible to approximately 0.05-foot in bedrock areas and up to 0.1-foot in the alluvial northern area. These estimates are expanded on in more technical detail within the Geotechnical Investigation Report referenced herein. If the proposed project follows the recommendations within the Geotechnical Investigation Report, then the potential for subsidence shall be considered negligible. Impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.
16. Other Geologic Hazards

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

Sources: Geotechnical Investigation Report (Matrix 2014)

Findings of Fact:

a) Based on the elevation of the proposed development of the site, which varies from approximately 1,060 feet Above Mean Sea Level (AMSL) to 1,200 feet AMSL, and with respect to sea level and its distance from large open bodies of water, the site proximity to Lee Lake (0.34-mile), with an approximate water surface elevation of 1,138 feet AMSL, Lake Elsinore (7 miles), with an approximate water surface elevation of 1,239 feet AMSL, and Lake Matthews (5 miles), with an approximate water surface elevation of 1,388 feet AMSL, the potential for seiche and/or tsunami waves is considered to be negligible with no impact. The project site is located south of Lake Matthews; however, the Estelle Mountains are located between Lake Matthews and the project site. If Lake Matthews were to overtop its spillways, flows could reach Temescal Creek but downstream of the project site where they would continue on downstream which is in a northwestern direction, away from the project site. The project site is located downstream of Lee Lake. If Lee Lake were to overtop its spillway, flows would follow Temescal Creek downstream and northeast of the project site. The project site is located on terraces at a higher elevation than the creek and flows would not be expected to reach the project site elevations. There would be a negligible opportunity for mudflows given the low topography of the proposed project site. Additionally, the proposed project is not located near a volcano, thus, volcanic hazards would not be anticipated. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

17. Slopes

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?

c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?

Sources: Project Application Materials, Geotechnical Investigation Report (Matrix 2014)

Findings of Fact:

a, b) The proposed project site consists of moderate sloping terrain traversing the long axis of the property, with drainage channels in the canyon areas, and a general elevation of the property of 1,060 feet to 1,200 feet AMSL. Local drainage generally flows towards the east. Currently, portions of the site have been cleared and grubbed with the balance of the site having a sparse cover of annual weeds and grasses and some small to significant trees within the low area in the northern portion of the property. The proposed project site would be mass graded during Phase I and would create compacted fills and cuts where necessary for the construction of the buildings. As outlined in the Geotechnical Investigation Report, the proposed project includes cut slopes at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) up to a maximum height of approximately 25 feet as well as fill slopes at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) or flatter up to a maximum height of approximately 40 feet. The Geotechnical Investigation Report includes recommendations for cut slopes, fill slopes, fill-over-cut slopes, and slopes toeing into alluvial canyons. The project will be conditioned to comply with all recommendations of the geotechnical investigation.
With implementation of all recommendations contained in the Geotechnical investigation Report, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

c) The proposed project’s grading is not anticipated to affect or negate subsurface sewage disposal systems. Therefore, there should be less than significant impacts and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

18. Soils

a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? □ □ □ □

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? □ □ □ □

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? □ □ □ □

Sources: Project Application Materials, Geotechnical Investigation Report (Matrix 2014); Riverside County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 15.12

Findings of Fact:

a) 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. Exposed soils would be subject to erosion during rainfall events or high winds due to the removal of 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 structure 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 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 Code, which establishes, in part, requirements for the control of dust and erosion during construction, would apply to the proposed project. 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 phase to reduce the site’s potential for soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Following construction, wind and water erosion 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 site’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. Under proposed conditions, catch basins would be installed to collect all runoff and discharge the flow into proposed detention basins. Ultimately, any excess flows would be discharged into existing storm drains, and thus would not cause or contribute any erosion hazards downstream. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

b) As outlined in the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the proposed project, the proposed project is not located on expansive soil and would not create substantial risks to life or property. The proposed project would follow CBC as referenced in Chapter 15.12 (Uniform Building Code) of the Riverside County Code, which
Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | ---

establishes, in part, requirements for buildings to be structurally sound. The proposed project would be subject to a grading permit from the County’s Department of Building and Safety, which includes grading safety standards that would ensure soil stability. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

c) The proposed project does not include the use of on-site septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. Sewer service for the project will be provided by Temescal Valley Water District. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

19. Erosion

a) Change deposition, siltation or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?

b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on- or off-site?

| Source: Preliminary WQMP (K&A 2014); Riverside County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 15.12 |
| Findings of Fact: |

a) Grading of the site would result in changes to the drainage and erosional potential during construction. However, the project is required to obtain and comply with a NPDES General Construction Permit, including preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be implemented during construction activities. Site development includes hardscaping, landscaping and bioretention swales that would minimize deposition, siltation and erosion off the site. The onsite storm drain facilities and water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) required to comply with the County’s MS4 permit are outlined Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) prepared for the project. Water erosion would be minimal with implementation of the WQMP. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

b) The proposed project would not result in any increase in water erosion on- or off-site. As mentioned above, pursuant to the requirements of the state Water Resources Board, the Project Applicant is required to obtain a NPDES permit for construction activities. 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 Code, which establishes, in part, requirements for the control of dust and erosion during construction, would apply to the proposed project. 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 phase to reduce the site’s potential for soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Following construction, wind and water erosion 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 site’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. Under proposed conditions, catch basins would be installed to collect all runoff and discharge the flow into proposed detention basins. Ultimately, any excess flows would be discharged into existing storm drains, and thus would not cause or contribute any erosion hazards downstream. Less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.
20. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. No. 460, Article XV & Ord. No. 484

Findings of Fact:

a) The County’s General Plan Figure S-8, “Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map,” shows the project site lies within a moderate area of wind erosion. The project will decrease the amount of exposed dirt, which is subject to wind erosion, with the incorporation of concrete, asphalt, and landscaping. No changes will be made on adjacent properties that would increase wind erosion offsite that would impact this project. Current levels of wind erosion on adjacent properties that would impact this site are considered less than significant. A condition has been placed on the project to control dust created during grading activities. This is a standard condition and therefore is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, impacts related to wind erosion is less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the Project:


a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of Fact:

a) This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the Project:

22. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Sources: Project application materials; DTSC Envirostor Database; Riverside County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 8.40

Findings of Fact:

a, b) The routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials can result in hazards to the public through the potential for accidental release. Such hazards are typically associated with certain types of land uses, such as chemical manufacturing facilities, industrial processes, waste disposal, and storage and distribution facilities. The proposed project would include the construction of buildings with uses for restaurants, office, and retailers. While the proposed project would transport standard chemicals used in retail and restaurant settings, it does not include the routine transport or use of hazardous materials that if accidentally released (i.e. spilled) would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. As noted below in section e), per the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC) Envirostor database, the project site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites so the project is not anticipated to potentially release hazardous materials into the environment during construction activities. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

c) The proposed project would be accessed through public streets including Indian Truck Trail and Temescal Canyon Road. The Fire and Public Works Departments’ guidelines are in agreement with all streets involved. Construction of the proposed project would not inhibit or impair implementation of or physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

d) The proposed project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. As mentioned, the proposed project includes the construction of multiple buildings for uses to include: gasoline service station, restaurants, various retail establishments, and offices. The gasoline service station and other buildings would adhere to the State requirements for encasement of underground storage tanks and facilities, as well as safety measures. No hazardous materials or emissions are anticipated within the proposed project. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

e) The proposed project location is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, no impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

23. Airports

a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
24. Hazardous Fire Area

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

Findings of Fact:

a) Although the proposed project is within a wildfire susceptibility area that is considered “Very High” per the County’s General Plan, the proposed project would follow all County setback and landscape requirements to minimize the risk of wildland fires to buildings proposed by the project to acceptable levels. Less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the Project:

25. Water Quality Impacts

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

Findings of Fact:

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 “Wildfire Susceptibility,” GIS database
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Create or contribute to runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g., water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g., increased vectors or odors)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Email correspondence with Jeff Pape, General Manager of Temescal Valley Water District on May 9, 2017

Findings of Fact:

a,b) These topics will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

c) The proposed project is located on a narrow strip of land between I-15 and Temescal Canyon Road in the County of Riverside (County). Temescal Canyon Wash, which is the low point of the canyon through the project area is located east of the project site and east of Temescal Canyon Road. Surface elevations range from approximately 1,078 to 1,215 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) with areas of greater topographic relief located along the western boundary of the project site. A portion of the site has been disturbed, with some compaction of the soils, from prior storage yard use. Storm water generally sheet flows off of the site in a northeast direction and across (or under in existing culverts) Temescal Canyon Road to Temescal Canyon Wash. The project site does not currently support conditions that are conducive to significant stormwater infiltration and resulting groundwater recharge. Although the development of the site will result in an increase in impervious surfaces, the project is required to include site design Best Management Practices (BMPs) to support on-site infiltration, as a requirement of the County’s MS4 permit and site-specific Water Quality Management Plan. The proposed project would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

Temescal Valley Water District will provide potable and non-potable water for the project. The project is required to construct connection pipelines from the site to existing potable and non-potable lines located north of the project in Temescal Valley Road. Approximately 519 linear feet of 8- and 12-inch non-potable water line will be installed north of the project’s northernmost driveway. Approximately 4,234 linear feet of 8-, 10-, and 12-inch diameter waterline will be installed from Terramor Drive south to the project. The project is also required to irrigate...
landscaping with non-potable water. Per email correspondence with Jeff Pape, General Manager of Temescal Valley Water District on May 9, 2017, Temescal Valley Water District has sufficient water supplies available to serve the project at full build out from existing entitlements and resources. The proposed project will not substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. Additionally, the proposed project is not located within 100 feet of a water supply well. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

d) This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

e, f) The proposed project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard as mapped in the County's General Plan Figure S-9, “100- And 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones.” Additionally, the proposed project would not include any construction of residential areas and would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, no impact would occur and these topics will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

g,h) These topics will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

26. Floodplains

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NA - Not Applicable</th>
<th>U - Generally Unsuitable</th>
<th>R - Restricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 “100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones,” Figure S-10 “Dam Failure Inundation Zone”
Findings of Fact:

a) This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

b) This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

c) According to the County’s General Plan Figure S-10, “Dam Failure Inundation Zone,” the proposed project is not located within a dam inundation area, but is located near a dam inundation area that generally runs along Temescal Creek. Since the project area is located outside of the designated inundation area, no impacts to the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

d) This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

**LAND USE PLANNING**

Would the Project:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of Fact:

a,b) This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Be consistent with the site’s existing or proposed zoning?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of Fact:

a-e) These topics will be analyzed in the draft EIR.
MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

29. Mineral Resources

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a state classified or designated area or existing surface mine?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 “Mineral Resources Area”

Findings of Fact:

a, b) According to the Riverside County General Plan, the project site is designated as a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 3 area. MRZ-3 areas are defined as areas where the available geologic information indicates that deposits are likely to exist. However, the significance of these deposits is undetermined. While the project site is classified as MRZ-3, there are currently no mining operations on the project site or in the vicinity of the project site. The project site is not identified in the general plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, development of the proposed project would reduce the ability to extract minerals in the future, but there would be less than significant impacts and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

c) No adjacent properties are currently being mined, nor are these properties State classified or designated as surface mines. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

d) The project site does not contain existing or abandoned quarries or mines, nor does the project propose quarries or mines. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

NOISE

Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings

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

- NA - Not Applicable
- A - Generally Acceptable
- B - Conditionally Acceptable
- C - Generally Unacceptable
- D - Land Use Discouraged

30. Airport Noise

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 “Airport Locations,”
Findings of Fact:

a,b) The proposed project site is not located within in an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or private airport. Therefore, no noise related impact from airports would occur. This topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Generally Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Conditionally Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Generally Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Land Use Discouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Railroad Noise

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 “Circulation Plan”, GIS database, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

The proposed project site is not located near or adjacent to an active railroad line. Therefore, no impact would occur. This topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

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

32. Highway Noise

Findings of Fact:

This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

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

33. Other Noise

Sources: Project application materials, GIS database.

Findings of Fact:

There are no other existing land uses near the project site that produce or would generate a significant source of noise. Therefore, no impact would occur. This topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

### 34. Noise Effects on or by the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of Fact:

a-d) These topics will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

### POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the Project

#### 35. Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County’s median income?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is currently unimproved and does not include existing housing. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not displace existing housing or people. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.
b) The project would not include the demand for additional housing. Rather, it would provide services to existing housing as well as travelers on the I-15 freeway. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

c) The project site is currently unimproved and does not include existing housing. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not displace existing housing or people. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

d) The project site is not located within a County Redevelopment Area. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

e) The project does not include the development of housing and therefore, would not increase population in the area. The project would not cumulatively exceed regional or local population projections. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

f) The project does not include the development of housing and therefore, would not induce population growth. The project proposes the development of commercial uses, which would bring new jobs to the area. According to the Riverside County General Plan, there continues to be a severe shortage of jobs within the County, and a large majority of employees drive more than 30 miles to get to their place of work. Implementation of the proposed project would create jobs for the local housing rich/jobs poor condition. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

PUBLIC SERVICES

36. Fire Services

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 any of the public services?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact:

Due to the open space and mountainous nature of the area, much of Temescal Canyon’s outer regions are subject to high risk of fire hazards. The Riverside County Fire Department provides fire protection services to the proposed project area. Pursuant to the Riverside County Fire Department Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Master Plan the project would be classified as “Category II – Urban,” which requires a fire station to be within three roadway miles of the Project and a full first alarm assignment team operating on the scene within 15 minutes of dispatch. Station 64, Sycamore Creek Station, located at 25310 Campbell Ranch Road, Corona, provides fire protection service to the site. Station 64 is located approximately .87 miles from the project site, which would meet the level of service criteria established by the Riverside County Fire Department.

Development of the proposed project would impact fire protection services by increasing the demand on existing Riverside County Fire Department resources. To offset the increased demand for fire protection services, 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, fire sprinklers, 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, which requires a fee payment to assist the County in providing for fire protection services.

Payment of the DIF fee would ensure that the proposed project provide its fair share of funds for 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. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

37. Sheriff Services:

Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact:
The Riverside County Sheriff's Department provides community policing to the project area via the Lake Elsinore Station located at 333 Limited Avenue, Lake Elsinore, CA 92530. The Riverside County Sheriff's Department has set a minimum level of service standard of 1.0 deputy per 1,000 people. There is not a direct correlation between population growth, the number of crimes committed, and the number of Sheriff's Department personnel needed to respond to these increases. As the population and use of an area increases, however, additional financing of equipment and manpower needs are required to meet the increased demand. The proposed project would result in an increase in the cumulative demand for services from the Riverside Sheriff's Department.

The proposed project's demand on sheriff protection services would not require the construction of a new Sheriff station or physically alter an existing station. The project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County's DIF Ordinance, 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 its fair share of funds for 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. With the project's required payment of DIF fees, the project's incremental demand for sheriff protection services would have less than significant impacts and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

38. Schools:

Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?
sources: GIS database

findings of fact:
The proposed project would not directly add to the local population, which would not require additional schools to be constructed and would not affect current public school population projections. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

39. Libraries:

libraries: 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 any of the public services?

Sources: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:
The proposed project would not directly add to the local population, which would not increase the demand on existing libraries or require additional library facilities to be constructed. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

40. Health Services:

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 any of the public services?

Sources: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:
The proposed project would not directly add to the local population, which would not increase the demand on or require additional health services to be constructed. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.
RECREATION

41. Parks and Recreation

a) Would the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✗

b) Would the Project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✗

c) Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✗

Sources: GIS database, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications), Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees), Parks & Open Space Department Review

Findings of Fact:

a) The project proposes to develop commercial uses, and would not include the development of recreational uses. The proposed project would not directly add to the local population, which would not increase the demand on existing parks or require additional parks to be constructed. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

b) The project does not include housing which would impact local and/or regional parks. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

c) The project site is not located within a Community Service area or recreation and park district. Therefore, no impact would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

42. Recreational Trails

Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered recreational trails, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives? ☐ ☐ ✗ ☐

Sources: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-7 Documented Trails and Bikeway System

Findings of Fact:

No trails are located on the project site. However, according to the Riverside County General Plan, Temescal Canyon Road is designated as a Historic Trail which is adjacent to the project area. Project improvements to Temescal Canyon Road will be required to comply with all County standards and guidelines. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC
Would the Project:

43. Circulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

d) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?

e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

f) Cause an effect upon or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?

g) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project’s construction?

h) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?

i) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Sources: Project Information

Findings of Fact:

a,b) These topics will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

c,d,e) No design elements of the project would create an interference or significant change in air traffic patterns. Additionally, the project is not located near rail lines or bodies of water, and therefore, would not alter water or rail traffic. Additionally, nothing about the design would increase hazards in the project vicinity. All roadway improvements would be required to comply with all County standards and guidelines. Grading of the Caltrans ROW would not create an interference or significant change in air, water or rail traffic patterns or increase hazards due to a design change. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur. These topics will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

f) All private internal roadways systems would be required to be maintained by the project applicant/owner. All public roadways would be required to be maintained by the County of Riverside. No new roadways are proposed or substandard roadways are proposed that would cause new areas of maintenance or altered forms of maintenance to occur. The additional traffic generated by the project would result in additional incremental wear
on the existing roads, potentially requiring additional routine maintenance of the roads. Taxes and provisions of the County’s DIF Ordinance contributed by the proposed project would fund general County roadway maintenance. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur. These topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

g.h.i) The proposed project would construct the following road improvements: southbound right-turn-only lane at the Temescal Canyon Road/Indian Truck Trail intersection and northbound left-turn-only lane at the Temescal Canyon Road/Project Driveway 3 intersection. The project will also include construction of offsite water, sewer, and non-potable water pipeline extensions in Temescal Canyon Road to connect to existing lines. Temporary lane closures and minor detours may be required throughout construction, however, through traffic on Temescal Canyon Road in each direction would be maintained at all times during construction. The proposed project would not significantly impact emergency access and access to nearby uses and would not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways, and pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. With implementation of Mitigation Measure Trans-1, temporary impacts on traffic from construction will be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation:
Trans-1:
Prior to construction, a traffic control plan for each phase of construction shall be submitted to the County Transportation Department for review and approval and will be utilized throughout the construction phases of the project. The Traffic Control Plan shall outline all measures and signage required to ensure project construction will not result in a substantial effect on circulation, emergency access, public transit, bikeways, and pedestrian facilities along Temescal Canyon Road.

Monitoring: Riverside County Transpiration Department review and approval of traffic control plan, field inspections during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44. Bike Trails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:
No trails are located on the project site. Project improvements to Temescal Canyon Road will be required to comply with all County standards and guidelines, including any provisions for bicycle lanes. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES
Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)?
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 the subdivision (c) of the Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of Fact:

a,b) These topics will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS
Would the Project:

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

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

Sources: Temescal Valley Water District website, email communication with Jeff Pape, General Manager, Temescal Valley Water District on May 9, 2017.

Findings of Fact:

a,b) The proposed project would include construction of potable and non-potable water pipelines to connect to existing Temescal Valley Water District pipelines north of the site in Temescal Valley Road. Potable water would be supplied to the project by Temescal Valley Water District. Temescal Valley Water District obtains its water from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, who imports it from Northern California, commonly called “State Project Water.” Per email correspondence with Jeff Pape, General Manager, Temescal Valley Water District, there is both sufficient potable and non-potable water supplies available to serve the project at build out from existing entitlements and resources. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to require the construction of new water treatment facilities or require new or expanded water entitlements. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

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

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 needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sources: Department of Environmental Health Review, email communication with Jeff Pape, General Manager, Temescal Valley Water District on May 9, 2017.

Findings of Fact:

Findings of Fact:

a,b) Sewer collection and treatment will require gravity sewer pipeline extension from the project site north in Temescal Canyon Road. This pipeline extension is 1,818 linear feet of 8- and 12-inch diameter sewer pipeline from the projects’ northernmost driveway to an existing stub in Terramor Drive. The project will require buy-in of pumping capacity at the existing Terramor Regional Sewer Lift Station and purchase of capacity at the existing Temescal Valley Water District Sewer Treatment Facility. The proposed project would not require offsite construction of new wastewater treatment facilities. Less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

48. Solid Waste

| a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? | ☐ | ☐ | ✗ | ☐ |
| b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)? | ☐ | ☐ | ✗ | ☐ |

Sources: Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Waste management District Correspondence

Findings of Fact:

a) Construction and operation of the proposed project would result in the generation of solid waste that would need to be disposed of in the appropriate landfill. All solid waste generated within the project area is deposited at the El Sobrante Landfill. The El Sobrante Landfill is has a permitted disposal capacity of 70,000 tons per week. The El Sobrante Landfill is estimated to reach capacity, at the earliest time, in the year 2045; however, future landfill expansion opportunities exist at this site. During the third quarter of 2012, the El Sobrante Landfill accepted approximately 481,487.12 tons of landfilled waste (approximately 37,037.5 tons per week), which corresponds to approximately 53% of its permitted daily disposal volume. Construction waste generated by the project would be disposed at the El Sobrante Landfill at an estimated 4.23 tons per week. This landfill receives well below their maximum permitted daily disposal volume and construction waste generated by the project is not anticipated to cause the landfill to exceed their maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Furthermore, this landfill is not expected to reach their total maximum permitted disposal capacities during the project’s construction period. Because the project would generate a relatively small amount of solid waste per day, as compared to the permitted daily capacities for the El Sobrante Landfill, this landfill facility would have sufficient daily capacity to accept solid waste generated by the project. Impacts would be less than significant. Waste generated during operation of the proposed project (including commercial and restaurant uses) is anticipated to generate minor amounts of waste that would not significantly impact the El Sobrante Landfill. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

b) The California Integrated Waste Management Act (Assembly Bill (AB) 939), signed into law in 1989, established an integrated waste management system that focused on source reduction, recycling, composting, and land disposal of waste. In addition, the bill established a 50% waste reduction requirement for cities and counties by the year 2000, along with a process to ensure environmentally safe disposal of waste that could not be diverted.
Per the requirements of the Integrated Waste Management Act, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors adopted the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), which outlines the goals, policies, and programs the County and its cities will implement to create an integrated and cost-effective waste management system that complies with the provisions of AB 939 and its diversion mandates.

In order to assist the County of Riverside in achieving the mandated goals of the Integrated Waste Management Act, the proposed Project would be required to work with future refuse haulers to develop and implement feasible waste reduction programs, including source reduction, recycling, and composting. Additionally, in accordance with the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991 (Cal Pub Res. Code § 42911), the Project would provide adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials where solid waste is collected. The collection areas are required to be shown on construction drawings and be in place before occupancy permits are issued. The implementation of these programs would reduce the amount of solid waste generated by the project which would aid in the extension of the life of affected disposal sites. The project would comply with all applicable solid waste statutes and regulations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.

Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

49. Utilities

Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Electricity?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Natural gas?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Communications systems?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Storm water drainage?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Street lighting?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Other governmental services?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Project Information & Plans

Findings of Fact:

a) Southern California Edison (SCE) provides electrical services to the project site. There are existing poles located in Temescal Canyon Road, along the projects’ frontage and in an SCE easement. The project’s grading is anticipated to require changing the elevation of some poles due to the design elevation of the proposed grading plan. It is anticipated that new poles will be installed a few feet away from existing poles and the lines transferred to new poles. No additional or new offsite powerlines would be needed and SCE would connect the proposed project site into the existing power lines for electric power needs. Potential impacts are less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

b) Southern California Gas Company provides natural gas services to the project site. Natural gas lines would be extended within the right-of-way of roads adjacent to the project site. Potential impacts from the construction of underground lines would be concurrent with mass grading and construction impacts analyzed. No additional offsite expansion or new facilities for natural gas would be required for the proposed project. Potential impacts are less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

c) Several private corporations provide communication services (telephone and internet services) to the project area, including Charter Communications, Verizon, and AT&T. Potential impacts from the construction of underground lines would be concurrent with mass grading and construction impacts analyzed. No additional
offsite expansion or new facilities for communications systems would be required for the proposed project. Potential impacts are less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

d) Refer to 25. a) above. The proposed grading and the storm drain system will connect and/or outlet to existing drainage facilities just offsite. The connection to existing offsite drainage would not require additional offsite expansion or facilities that would cause significant construction impacts. Less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

e) Street lighting would be required to be implemented as part of the project, per the provisions identified in County Zoning Code Section 19.590.070 (Light and Glare) and Chapter 19.556 (Lighting). Construction of street lighting would be temporary and would not cause significant impacts. No additional or expansion of facilities would be needed. Impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

f) Refer to 43. f) above. No additional or expanded offsite public facilities would be required as part of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

g) The project would be developed with commercial uses, and is not expected to induce population growth that would impact the need for additional government services. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur and this topic will not be analyzed further in the draft EIR.

Mitigation: No mitigation is necessary.
Monitoring: No monitoring is necessary.

50. Energy Conservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?

Findings of Fact:
This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

51. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?

Findings of Fact:
This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Staff Review, Project application materials

Findings of Fact:
This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

53. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past project, other current projects, and probable future projects)?

Findings of Fact:
This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.

54. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Findings of Fact:
This topic will be analyzed in the draft EIR.
VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analysis 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 1503 (c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

Earlier Analyses Used, if any: None

Location Where Earlier Analyses, if used, are available for review: Not Applicable.
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