

RESOLUTION NO. 2023-249

**CERTIFYING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1205**

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65350 et. seq., public hearings were held before the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in Riverside, California on September 12, 2023 and before the Riverside County Planning Commission in Riverside, California on August 2, 2023 and August 16, 2023, to consider General Plan Amendment No. 1205 (GPA 1205).

WHEREAS, all the procedures of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Riverside County Rules to Implement CEQA have been met, and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), prepared in connection with GPA 1205 and related cases (referred to alternatively herein as the "Project"), is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially significant effects of the Project on the environment and measures necessary to avoid or substantially lessen such effects have been evaluated in accordance with CEQA and the above referenced Rules; and,

WHEREAS, in compliance with CEQA, the EIR analyzed several alternatives, including Alternative No. 3 that encompasses the Project adopted in GPA 1205 and evaluated changes to the existing residential, mixed-use, and community center designations within the Colinas del Oro Specific Plan area to LI (Light Industrial). The environmental impacts of Alternative No. 3 are consistent with the evaluation of impacts described for the Project. As discussed below, Alternative No. 3 shall incorporate all mitigation measures identified in the EIR. The EIR adequately and appropriately discloses all environmental impacts associated with the Project as described in Alternative No. 3.

WHEREAS, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15151, the evaluation of environmental effect is to be completed in light of what is reasonably feasible; and,

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Planning Department circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a 30-day public review period commencing May 9, 2019 to June 10, 2019 and held one public scoping meeting on May 16, 2019. The County prepared a Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2019059042) to address GPA 1205. The Draft EIR (DEIR) was circulated for public review and comment as specified in

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: AARON G. GETTIS
DATE: 12-4-23

1 the State CEQA Guidelines for a 45-day period (April 26, 2023 through June 9, 2023). Public comments
2 were received by the County and have been responded to by the County in accordance with CEQA
3 requirements. The Project’s Final EIR (FEIR) with Responses to Comments document was published on
4 August 11, 2023 (the “Responses”).

5 **WHEREAS**, the matter was discussed fully with testimony and documentation presented by the
6 public and affected government agencies; now, therefore,

7 **BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Board of Supervisors
8 of the County of Riverside in regular session assembled on September 12, 2023 that:

- 9 A. The Project includes GPA 1205 which was considered concurrently at the public hearings
10 before the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission.
- 11 B. GPA 1205 proposes the following: to modify the existing General Plan Land Use
12 Designations, policy areas, and policies within the Highway 74 Community Plan planning
13 area in the Mead Valley and Elsinore Area Plans; the removal the RVLUO for all sites within
14 the planning area; Either update both the foundational components and land use
15 designations, or only land use designation of sites; Remove the Perris Policy Area, Good
16 Hope Policy Area, Meadowbrook Town Center and the Good Hope and Meadowbrook Rural
17 Village Land Use Overlays; Remove the Warm Springs Policy Area that overlaps
18 Neighborhood 3.
- 19 C. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared that evaluates GPA 1205 as discussed in
20 Alternative 3. The EIR analyzed the Project's potential significant effects on the
21 environment and made the required findings in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines
22 and Riverside County CEQA implementing procedures. As demonstrated in the EIR,
23 adoption of this alternative would lessen the severity of, but would not avoid, the significant
24 unavoidable air quality and transportation impacts associated with the proposed project.
- 25 D. Based on the findings and conclusions in the EIR and the conditions of approval applied to
26 the Project by the County of Riverside, GPA 1205 will not cause serious public health
27 problems.

28 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors the following discussion of

1 environmental impacts summarizes the potential effects associated with adoption of Alternative No. 3. As
2 discussed in the EIR, Alternative No. 3 would lessen the severity of, but would not avoid, the significant
3 unavoidable air quality and transportation impacts associated with the proposed project. The Increased
4 Industrial Use Alternative would lessen the impacts associated with recreation and utilities and service
5 systems as compared with the analyzed project. There would be similar impacts associated with aesthetics,
6 light, and glare; agriculture and forest resources; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources;
7 energy; geology, soils, and seismicity; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards and hazardous materials;
8 hydrology and water quality; land use; mineral resources; noise; paleontological resources, public services;
9 transportation; tribal cultural resources, and wildfire. This alternative would result in slightly increased
10 impacts associated with population and housing; however, as discussed below, impacts would be less than
11 significant, and no mitigation would be required. Moreover, Alternative No. 3 would fully advance the
12 project objectives related to highway access, public transit, and bicycle/pedestrian connections, aesthetic
13 alternat elements, parking, hazardous waste, and utilities.

14 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following environmental
15 impacts associated with the Project are determined to have no environmental impacts in consideration of
16 existing regulations and project design features.

17 **A. Agriculture Resources and Forest Resources**

18 **Impact AG-4(a): The project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland,**
19 **or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant**
20 **to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to**
21 **nonagricultural use. (Draft EIR, Page 3.2-6).**

22 **1. No impact.**

23 According to the Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
24 (FMMP), the planning area is not located within an area designated as Prime Farmland, or Unique
25 Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The FMMP designates much of the planning area
26 as Urban and Built Up Land. As shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 3.2-1, several areas are designated as
27 Farmland of Local Importance; however, these lands do not meet the CEQA definition of Farmland
28 as defined above. The southern side of Perris, north of Margarth Street, consists of 22.6 acres of

1 Farmland of Local Importance that would intersect with a small portion of the Highway 74
2 Community Plan. Additionally, there are 14.3 acres of Farmland of Local Importance adjacent to
3 the west side of Highway 74 at Meadowbrook Avenue, and an additional 7.7 acres of Farmland of
4 Local Importance adjacent to the west side of Highway 74 near Trellis Lane; most of this land is not
5 located within the planning area. A small portion of a 39- acre area designated as Farmland of Local
6 Importance is located within the planning area near the intersection of Mauricio Street and Wasson
7 Canyon Road in Lake Elsinore. The proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique
8 Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared
9 pursuant to the FMMP of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use (Draft EIR at
10 Pages 3.2-5 to 3.2-6).

11 **Impact AG-4(b): The project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning,**
12 **agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside**
13 **County Agricultural Preserve. (Draft EIR, Page 3.2-7).**

14 **1. No impact.**

15 Draft EIR Table 2-2 shows the current zoning as a mix of: C-1/C-P (General Commercial),
16 C-P-S (Scenic Highway Commercial), I-P (Industrial Park), M-SC (Manufacturing-Service
17 Commercial), R-A (Residential Agriculture), R-R (Rural Residential), W-1 (Watercourse,
18 Watershed, and Conservation Areas), and W-2-M (Controlled Development Area with Mobile
19 Homes). The R-A zones allow for some agricultural uses and are typically single-family dwellings.
20 As part of the entitlement process, the proposed project would require a GPA. The amendment
21 necessitates a legislative policy decision by the County and does not signify a potential
22 environmental effect. As such, the proposed GPA, if approved, constitutes a self-mitigating aspect
23 of the proposed project that would serve to correct what would otherwise be a conflict. Future
24 projects within the Community Plan area would require environmental review to analyze potential
25 project impacts related to conflict with agricultural zoning. Furthermore, the proponents of future
26 projects may initiate zone changes to ensure project consistency with the General Plan designation
27 and zoning. Therefore, no impacts related to agricultural zoning would occur. Because the planning
28 area is not subject to a Williamson Act contract and does not contain a County Agricultural Preserve,

1 and because the proposed project would not conflict with the General Plan Land Use Designation
2 or zoning for agricultural use, there would be no impact. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.2-6 to 3.2-7).

3 **Impact AG-4(c): The project would not cause development of nonagricultural uses**
4 **within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 “Right-to-Farm”). (Draft**
5 **EIR, Page 3.2-8).**

6 **1. No impact.**

7 Ordinance No. 625 (cited as the Riverside County Right-To-Farm Ordinance) intends to
8 reduce the County’s loss of its agricultural resources by limiting the circumstances under which
9 agricultural operations may be deemed to constitute a nuisance. The intent of Ordinance No. 625 is
10 to conserve, protect, and encourage the development, improvement, and continued viability of its
11 agricultural land and industries for the long-term production of food and other agricultural products
12 and for the economic well-being of the County’s residents. Ordinance No. 625 prohibits agricultural
13 activity from being deemed a nuisance after three years of operation if it was not a nuisance at the
14 time it began. Any final land division proposed for recordation that is within 300 feet of agricultural
15 land will be notified of subsection (a) of the ordinance. Additionally, the Highway 74 Community
16 Plan does not propose specific development projects; any future projects would be subject to
17 environmental analysis, review, and approval to ensure consistency with Ordinance No. 625. (Draft
18 EIR at Pages 3.2-7 to 3.2-8).

19 **Impact AG-4(d): The project would not involve other changes in the existing**
20 **environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland,**
21 **to nonagricultural use. (Draft EIR, Page 3.2-8).**

22 **1. No impact.**

23 The proposed project would not involve the conversion of Farmland because the planning
24 area does not contain any Farmland. Additionally, the use of the planning area for residential/mixed-
25 use purposes would not cause any conversion of Farmland to a nonagricultural use in another
26 location. The planning area would be used for residential/mixed-use purposes that would not have
27 any direct or indirect impacts on Farmlands. The planning area is not used for agriculture and is not
28 zoned for Farmland uses. (Draft EIR at Page 3.2-8).

1 **Impact FOR-5(a): The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause**
2 **rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland**
3 **(as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland**
4 **Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g)). (Draft EIR, Page 3.2-9).**

5 **1. No impact.**

6 According to Figure 4.5.2 of the General Plan EIR, Forestry Resources, the planning area
7 and surrounding area is not zoned for forest land or timberland. Therefore, the proposed project
8 would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land uses or timberland zoned Timberland
9 Production and would not conflict with any existing zoning for forest land or timberland. No impacts
10 are anticipated to occur. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on existing zoning
11 of forest land. The proposed project would not involve the conversion of forest land because the
12 planning area does not contain any forest land as the planning area is primarily Urban and Built Up
13 Land. The planning area would be part of a Community Plan that proposes to re-designate General
14 Plan land uses along Highway 74 from City of Perris to City of Lake Elsinore. The planning area is
15 not used for forest use and is not zoned for forest uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have
16 no impact on forestry resources. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.2-8 to 3.2-9).

17 **Impact FOR-5(b): The project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion**
18 **of forest land to non-forest use. (Draft EIR, Page 3.2-9).**

19 **1. No impact.**

20 The proposed project would not involve the conversion of forest land because the planning
21 area does not contain any forest land. Additionally, the use of the planning area for
22 residential/mixed-use purposes would not cause any conversion of forest land to a non-forest use in
23 another location. The planning area would be used for residential/mixed-use purposes that would
24 not have any direct or indirect impacts on forest lands. The planning area is not used for forest use
25 and is not zoned for forest uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on forestry
26 resources. (Draft EIR at Page 3.2-9).

27 **Impact FOR-5(s): The project would not involve other changes in the existing**
28 **environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land**

1 **to non-forest use. (Draft EIR, Page 3.2-9).**

2 **1. No impact.**

3 The proposed project would not involve the conversion of forest land to non-forest use
4 because the planning area does not contain any forest land. Additionally, the proposed project would
5 not result in other changes that would cause conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. The
6 planning area would be used for residential/mixed-use purposes that would not have any direct or
7 indirect impacts on forest lands. The planning area is not used for forest use and is not zoned for
8 forest uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on forestry resources. (Draft EIR
9 at Page 3.2-9).

10 **Impact MIN-25b: The project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally**
11 **important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or**
12 **other land use plan. (Draft EIR, Page 3.12-5).**

13 **1. No impact.**

14 There are no known mineral resources within the surrounding region, and the project area is
15 not designated as a resource recovery site. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the planning area
16 contains significant resources. The General Plan's Multipurpose Open Space Element (Figure OS-
17 6) identifies most of western Riverside County as MRZ-3, indicating that the significance of
18 potential mineral deposits is undetermined, and Unstudied (no MRZ designation issued). The entire
19 planning area is designated MRZ-3. These designations indicate that there are no locally important
20 mineral resource recovery sites delineated within the planning area. Furthermore, neither the MVAP
21 nor the ELAP designate any sites within the planning area as a resource recovery site. (Draft EIR at
22 Page 3.12-5).

23 **Impact MIN-25c: The project would not potentially expose people or property to**
24 **hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines. (Draft EIR, Page 3.12-5).**

25 **1. No impact.**

26 The planning area is not adjacent to a State-classified, designated area, existing surface, or
27 dormant mine. The lands adjacent to the planning area to the north, south, east, and west are not
28 designated Open Space-Mineral Resource (OS-MIN) by the County, which would allow for mineral

1 extraction and processing facilities. The California Department of Conservation does not designate
2 the planning area as having any proposed, existing, or abandoned mines or quarries. Therefore,
3 buildout of the proposed project would not impact any ongoing mining operations as there are no
4 known active or dormant mining sites within the vicinity of the planning area. The proposed project
5 would not expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or
6 mines. (Draft EIR at Page 3.12-5).

7 **B. Noise**

8 **Impact NOI-26a: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such**
9 **a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, the**
10 **project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise**
11 **levels. (Draft EIR, Page 3.13-19).**

12 **1. No impact.**

13 The nearest public airport to the planning area is the Corona Municipal Airport, located
14 approximately 20 miles to the northwest. At this distance, the planning area is located well outside
15 of the airport's 65 dBA CNEL noise contours. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project
16 would not expose persons residing or working at future Findings:

17 **Impact NOI-26b: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, the**
18 **project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise**
19 **levels. (Draft EIR, Page 3.13-19).**

20 **1. No impact.**

21 The nearest private airport to the development area is the Perris Valley Airport, located
22 approximately 1.5 miles east of the planning area. At this distance, the planning area is located well
23 outside of the airport's 65 dBA CNEL noise contours. Therefore, implementation of the proposed
24 project would not expose persons residing or working at future development within the planning
25 area to noise levels from airport activity that would be in excess of normally acceptable standards.
26 (Draft EIR at Page 3.13-19).

27 **Impact REC-35c: The project would not be located within a Community Service Area**

1 **or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees).**
2 **(Draft EIR, Page 3.17-9).**

3 **1. No impact.**

4 According to the 2015 County of Riverside General Plan EIR, the planning area is not
5 located with a Community Service Area (CSA) or a recreation and park district. Thus, there would
6 be no impacts associated with a CSA or a Community Parks and Recreation Plan. (Draft EIR at
7 Page 3.17-9)

8 **Impact TRANS-38(a): The proposed project would not include the construction or**
9 **expansion of a bike system or bike lanes. (Draft EIR, Page 3.18-17).**

10 **1. No impact.**

11 On a program level, no bike lanes are planned along the Highway 74 corridor. The General
12 Plan Circulation Element does not identify planned bicycle routes along Highway 74. Development
13 under the proposed project would not include restriping of Highway 74 to accommodate bicycle
14 lanes or provide other connections to the County’s bicycle network. (Draft EIR at Page 3.18-17)

15 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following
16 environmental impacts associated with the EIR are determined to be less than significant in
17 consideration of existing regulations, standard conditions, which are not considered unique
18 mitigation, and project design features.

19 **A. Aesthetics, Light, and Glare**

20 **Impact AES-1(a): The project would not have a substantial adverse effect upon a scenic**
21 **highway corridor within which it is located. (Draft EIR, Page 3.1-11).**

22 **1. Less than Significant Impact.**

23 The proposed project does not include any specific development. The proposed project
24 provides a framework for development that would enhance the aesthetic value of the Highway 74
25 corridor. The California Scenic Highway Mapping System indicates that the section of Highway 74
26 between the City of Perris and the City of Lake Elsinore is “State-Eligible,” which means that this
27 portion of the highway is eligible for designation as a State Scenic Highway (Draft EIR Exhibit 3.1-
28 1). The proposed project does not include any specific development. Rather, it would guide the

1 development and redevelopment of residential neighborhoods of varying densities, commercial
2 retail, mixed use, light industrial, business park, public facilities, rural, open space, recreation areas,
3 and infrastructure improvements. GPA No. 1205 would establish consistency with the existing
4 development within the planning area and surroundings and, therefore, would not significantly alter
5 the viewshed from the planning area. The proposed project provides a framework for development
6 that would enhance the aesthetic value of the Highway 74 corridor, in compliance with ELAP Policy
7 5.14 and 11.1 and MVAP Policy 3.7, 4.3, and 12.1, all of which stress the importance of enhancing
8 the attractiveness of the corridor and protecting scenic qualities and viewsheds. The proposed
9 project would emphasize cohesive development designs that would connect the existing scattered
10 commercial and industrial uses along Highway 74 while promoting safe and effective circulation.
11 Policy ELAP 5.7 and MVAP 3.7 require that trees, signage, landscaping, street furniture, public art,
12 and other aesthetic elements are used to enhance appearance. Furthermore, implementation of the
13 proposed project would ensure that future development complies with setbacks and height limits
14 such that buildout would not result in the alteration of the viewshed or scenic vistas. Finally, the
15 proposed project does not propose any billboards or other freeway-oriented displays that are
16 recognized as incompatible with a designated State Scenic Highway (Draft EIR at Page 3.1-10).

17 **Impact AES-1(b): The project would not substantially damage scenic resources,**
18 **including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and unique or landmark features;**
19 **obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an**
20 **aesthetically offensive site open to public view. (Draft EIR, Page 3.1-12).**

21 **1. Less than significant impact.**

22 Buildout of the proposed project has the potential to result in an alteration of the visual
23 character within the plan boundaries. However, this change in and of itself is not considered
24 significant unless the quality of scenic resources would be substantially diminished. The proposed
25 Community Plan is a policy document that supplements the local General Plan with goals, policies,
26 and programs that are specific and unique to the community or area that it covers. The proposed
27 project is designed to guide development that would enhance the aesthetic value of the Highway 74
28 corridor. Future buildout of the proposed project would be required to comply with Riverside

1 County Ordinance No. 655 to restrict the permitted use of certain light fixtures emitting into the
2 night sky undesirable light rays and would not, therefore, interfere with the nighttime use of the
3 Mount Palomar Observatory or with Riverside County Ordinance No. 655. Future buildout of the
4 proposed project would also comply with applicable ELAP and MVAP policies. For example, future
5 development would adhere to the Hillside Development and Slope section of the General Plan Land
6 Use Element and the Scenic Resources section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element to preserve
7 ridgelines as a visual resource (Policy ELAP 21.1). The proposed project would implement Policy
8 MVAP 4.3, which assigns a high priority to the development that increases the attractiveness of this
9 area as a site for the location of new business establishments, relocation of existing business
10 establishments, and provision of employment opportunities. The proposed land use designations
11 complement the surrounding land uses by clustering commercial and industrial development around
12 the Highway 74 corridor while supporting the development of residential neighborhoods of varying
13 densities. Furthermore, Policy MVAP 12.1 requires scenic highways to be protected from change
14 that would diminish the aesthetic value of adjacent properties. Additionally, the proposed project
15 does not propose specific development standards or projects; any future project design that is
16 proposed within the planning area boundaries would be subject to applicable environmental
17 analysis, review, and approval, including review related to design standards and guidelines, thereby
18 ensuring that future development would be visually compatible with surrounding land uses. (Draft
19 EIR at Pages 3.1-11 to 3.1-12).

20 **Impact AES-1(c): In non-urbanized areas, the project would not substantially degrade**
21 **the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (public**
22 **views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). In an urbanized**
23 **area, the project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing**
24 **scenic quality. (Draft EIR, Page 3.1-12).**

25 **1. Less than significant impact.**

26 The proposed project contemplates the development of residential neighborhoods of varying
27 densities, commercial retail, mixed use, light industrial, business park, public facilities, rural, open
28 space, and recreation areas in a non-urbanized area. Buildout of the proposed project would alter

1 the visual character within the plan boundaries and has the potential to affect public views of the
2 site. However, this change in and of itself is not considered a significant adverse effect unless the
3 visual character or quality of the site are substantially diminished. Although buildout of the proposed
4 project has the potential to result in the fundamental and irreversible change in the visual character
5 of the planning area, the development and land use activities contemplated would achieve a high-
6 quality design that would be visually compatible with surrounding land uses. As already noted, the
7 proposed project is designed to encourage cohesive development that would enhance the aesthetic
8 value of the Highway 74 corridor. Moreover, the approval of GPA No. 1205 would amend the
9 General Plan and resolve any land use and policy inconsistencies between the proposed project and
10 the General Plan that could result in environmental impacts. Furthermore, as applications for
11 development are submitted, they would be subject to review and approval, including design review
12 of individual projects subject to discretionary review, thereby ensuring that future development
13 would be compatible with the specific plan and General Plan and visually compatible with
14 surrounding land uses. (Draft EIR at Page 3.1-12).

15 **Impact AES-2(a): The project would not interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt.**
16 **Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655. (Draft EIR,**
17 **Page 3.1-13).**

18 **1. Less than significant impact.**

19 The entire planning area is within Zone B per Riverside County Ordinance No. 655, which
20 extends to all property within 45 miles of the Mount Palomar Observatory. The planning area ranges
21 between 34 miles and 37 miles from Mount Palomar Observatory and any new development or
22 redevelopment of existing uses would be required to comply with the lighting restrictions that apply
23 to Zone B. The ordinance would not apply to light fixtures that are already installed and operational.
24 Additionally, the ordinance does not apply to low-pressure sodium lighting being used by single-
25 family dwellings for security purposes. The proposed project does not include specific development
26 standards or a proposal for specific construction projects; however, buildout of the proposed project
27 could potentially create new sources of light. Future buildout of the proposed project would be
28 required to comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 and would not, therefore, interfere

1 with the nighttime use of the Mount Palomar Observatory or with Riverside County Ordinance No.
2 655. Furthermore, Policy ELAP 8.1 and Policy MVAP 8.1 specify adherence to Riverside County
3 Ordinance No. 655. (Draft EIR at Page 3.1-13).

4 **Impact AES-3(a): The project would not create a new source of substantial light or**
5 **glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. (Draft EIR, Page 3.1-**
6 **14).**

7 **1. Less than significant impact.**

8 The planning area and its surrounding areas currently contain several sources of light and
9 glare, including street lighting, illuminated signage, and headlights from traffic on Highway 74, as
10 well as from building-mounted lighting, freestanding exterior lighting, and facilities that are
11 illuminated along the highway corridor and in the communities of Perris, Lake Elsinore,
12 Meadowbrook, Good Hope, and Warm Springs. Although the proposed project would not approve
13 any specific development projects, it would identify opportunities for new development and land
14 use activities, including residential neighborhoods of varying densities, commercial retail, mixed
15 use, light industrial, business park, and public facilities. These new uses would provide the same
16 types of light and glare as the existing uses within the planning area, including street lighting,
17 illuminated signage, building-mounted lighting, and freestanding exterior lighting. Many of these
18 uses would be illuminated during the nighttime and early morning hours for safety and security
19 purposes. Development consistent with the proposed project would not substantially alter existing
20 conditions and present substantial new sources of light and glare. Furthermore, the proposed project,
21 the General Plan, and the applicable zoning restrictions have established standards for new sources
22 of light and glare that are intended to prevent adverse impacts to daytime or nighttime views. Land
23 use activities within the planning area would be subject to these zoning development standards for
24 light and glare. (Draft EIR at Page 3.1-13 to 3.1-14).

25 **Impact AES-3(b): The project would not expose residential property to unacceptable**
26 **light levels. (Draft EIR, Page 3.1-14).**

27 **1. Less than significant impact**

28 The planning area is partially developed with scattered residential, commercial, and

1 industrial uses and, as such, currently has numerous existing sources of light and glare (including
2 during nighttime and early morning hours). The development contemplated by the proposed project
3 would not substantially alter this existing condition. Furthermore, the General Plan and the
4 applicable zoning restrictions have established standards for new sources of light and glare that are
5 intended to prevent adverse impacts to daytime or nighttime views. Compliance with all applicable
6 regulations would ensure residential property would not be exposed to unacceptable light levels.
7 (Draft EIR at Page 3.1-14).

8 **B. Air Quality**

9 **Impact AIR-6(d): The project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading**
10 **to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people. (Draft EIR, Page 3.3-58).**

11 **1. Less than significant impact.**

12 Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include exhaust from
13 diesel construction equipment. However, because of the temporary nature of these emissions, the
14 intermittent nature of construction activities, and the highly diffusive properties of diesel exhaust,
15 nearby receptors would not be affected by diesel exhaust odors associated with project construction.
16 Odors from these sources would be localized and generally confined to the immediate area
17 surrounding the proposed project site. The proposed project would utilize typical construction
18 techniques, and the odors would be typical of most construction sites and temporary in nature.
19 Impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR at page 3.3-59). For odor sources listed above,
20 the closest source to the planning area would be Gerber Collision & Glass (GCG), which is located
21 1.1 miles southwest of the planning area boundaries. It is anticipated that the GCG would include
22 all necessary odor control systems to minimize odor emissions leaving their site operations.
23 However, this potential odor source is also located at a sufficient buffer distance (per Draft EIR
24 Table 3.3-14) to avoid any potential odor impacts.

25 The proposed project includes light industrial land uses, and so there is the potential for land
26 uses typically considered to be associated with odors to be developed in the planning area. Land
27 uses typically associated with odors may include wastewater treatment facilities, waste disposal
28 facilities, or other stationary sources. The proposed project would also develop different types of

1 residential and retail activities, which are not typical odor-generating land uses. In addition to
2 existing regulatory programs and General Plan policies, development within the project would be
3 required to comply with the General Plan mitigation measures as specified at Draft EIR page 3.3-
4 60. Compliance with these mitigation measures, as already required for projects in the General Plan
5 area, would further reduce objectionable odors. (Draft EIR at Page 3.3-60).

6 **C. Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources**

7 **Impact CUL-8(a) and CUL-8(B): The project would not alter or destroy a historic site**
8 **or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, pursuant to**
9 **California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5. (Draft EIR, Pages 3.5-20 to 3.5-21).**

10 **1. Less than significant impact.**

11 As future implementing projects are considered by the County, each project would be
12 evaluated for conformance with the General Plan, Municipal Code, and other applicable State
13 regulations. Subsequent development and infrastructure projects would also be analyzed for
14 potential environmental impacts, consistent with requirements of CEQA. The General Plan includes
15 policies and programs intended to reduce impacts to and conserve historical resources. Policies OS-
16 19.2, OS-19.3, and OS-19.4 help ensure protection and preservation of historical resources by
17 implementing a process where proposed developments are reviewed for the possibility of cultural
18 resources being present. Specifically, OS 19.3 requires review of proposed development for the
19 possibility of cultural resources and for compliance with the cultural resources program, which
20 would include preparation of Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment and reviewing evaluating
21 structured for California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) eligibility on a project-by-project
22 basis. Therefore, future implementing projects would comply with applicable regulations to ensure
23 that project impacts related to cultural and historical resources are less than significant. (Draft EIR
24 Pages 3.5-20 to 3.5-21).

25 **Impact CUL-9(a) and CUL-9(b): The project would not alter or destroy an**
26 **archaeological site or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an**
27 **archaeological resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5. (Draft**
28 **EIR, Page 3.5-21 to 3.5-23).**

1 **1. Less than significant impact.**

2 As future development and infrastructure projects within the planning area are considered
3 by the County, each project will be evaluated for conformance with the General Plan, Municipal
4 Code, and other applicable State regulations. Subsequent development and infrastructure projects
5 would also be analyzed for potential environmental impacts, consistent with requirements of CEQA.
6 The General Plan includes policies and programs intended to reduce impacts to and conserve
7 historical resources. Policies OS-19.2, OS-19.3, and OS-19.4 help ensure protection and
8 preservation of archaeological resources by implementing a process where proposed developments
9 are reviewed for the possibility of cultural resources being present. Specifically, OS 19.3 requires
10 review of proposed development for the possibility of cultural resources and for compliance with
11 the cultural resources program, which would include preparation of Phase I Cultural Resources
12 Assessment and reviewing evaluating structured for CRHR eligibility on a project-by-project basis.
13 Furthermore, future implementing projects are required to implement the County condition of
14 approval related to discovery of unanticipated cultural resources during ground disturbance
15 activities as outlined at page 3.5-22 of the Draft EIR. Implementation of these policies and condition
16 of approval would ensure that adverse effects on archaeological resources are reduced to a less than
17 significant at the programmatic level, and individual projects would be evaluated on a case-by-case
18 basis to analyze impacts. (Draft EIR at Page 3.5-21 to 3.5-22).

19 **Impact CUL-9(c): The project would not disturb any human remains, including those**
20 **interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Draft EIR, Page 3.5-23).**

21 **1. Less than significant impact.**

22 As future development and infrastructure projects are reviewed by the County, each project
23 will be evaluated for conformance with the General Plan, Municipal Code, and other applicable
24 State regulations. Under CEQA, human remains are protected under the definition of archaeological
25 materials as being “any evidence of human activity.” Public Resources Code Section 5097 has
26 specific stop-work and notification procedures to follow when Native American human remains are
27 inadvertently discovered during excavation and construction activities. This requirement, listed as
28 a condition of approval at page 3.5-23 of the Draft EIR, applies to all construction projects within

1 the planning area. Implementation would ensure that adverse effects on human remains are reduced
2 to a less than significant at the programmatic level, and individual projects would be evaluated on a
3 case-by-case basis to analyze impacts. (Draft EIR at Page 3.5-23).

4 **D. Energy**

5 **Impact ENER-10a: The project would not result in potentially significant**
6 **environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy**
7 **resources, during project construction or operation. (Draft EIR, Page 3.6-15).**

8 **1. Less than significant impact.**

9 Limitations on idling of vehicles and equipment and requirements that equipment be
10 properly maintained would result in fuel savings. California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections
11 2449 and 2485, limit idling from both on-road and off-road diesel-powered equipment and are
12 enforced by the ARB. Additionally, given the cost of fuel, contractors and owners have a strong
13 financial incentive to avoid wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during
14 construction. Because of the temporary nature of construction and the financial incentives for
15 developers and contractors to use energy-consuming resources in an efficient manner, the
16 construction phase of the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary
17 consumption of energy. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.6-15 to 3.6-16).

18 Future development projects would be designed and constructed in accordance with the
19 County's latest adopted energy efficiency standards, which are based on the California Title 24
20 energy efficiency standards. Title 24 standards include a broad set of energy conservation
21 requirements that apply to the structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems in a building.
22 For example, the Title 24 Lighting Power Density requirements define the maximum wattage of
23 lighting that can be used in a building based on its square footage. Title 24 additionally requires new
24 low-rise residential developments to include rooftop solar systems meeting a minimum system
25 capacity consistent with calculations contained in Title 24, Part 6, Subchapter 8. Title 24 standards,
26 widely regarded as the most advanced energy efficiency standards, would help reduce the amount
27 of energy required for lighting, water heating, and heating and air conditioning in buildings and
28 promote energy conservation. The reduction measures of the Riverside County CAP reinforce these

1 State standards. The General Plan additionally includes energy conservation policies designed to
2 reduce energy demand through improving energy efficiency of homes and businesses, facilitating
3 residential and commercial renewable energy, and promoting recycling and water conservation
4 efforts. For example, the General Plan's Air Quality policies aim to adopt incentives and/or
5 regulations to enact energy conservation requirements and encourage energy efficient design for
6 private and public developments. The Air Quality policies also promote the increased densities,
7 mixed use, electric vehicles, and improved circulation to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and
8 energy consumption. The Land Use policies would encourage the development of renewable energy
9 resources and related infrastructure. The proposed project also encourages urban greening, complete
10 streets, improved public transit services and transportation circulation. Future development projects
11 envisioned under the proposed project would be required to comply with stipulations originating
12 from these General Plan and CAP policies; however, when these policies do not stipulate
13 requirements for individual development projects, they focus on actions to be taken by the County
14 and would not be applicable to future development projects. As such, compliance with the applicable
15 General Plan and CAP policies would help avoid building energy consumption that would be
16 considered wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.6-16 to 3.6-17).

17 The planning area encompasses a 6.8-mile corridor of Highway 74 between the City of Lake
18 Elsinore and the City of Perris in western Riverside County. The existing transportation facilities
19 and future development projects would provide future residents, visitors, and employees associated
20 with the planning area with access to better circulation and more convenient public transportation,
21 thus further reducing fuel consumption demand. For these reasons, operational-related
22 transportation fuel consumption would not result in a significant environmental impact due to
23 wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. (Draft EIR at Page 3.6-17).

24 **Impact ENER-10b: The project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or Local**
25 **plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. (Draft EIR, Page 3.6-18).**

26 **1. Less than significant impact.**

27 California Code of Regulations Title 13, Sections 2449 and 2485, limit idling from both on-
28 road and off-road diesel-powered equipment and are enforced by the ARB. The proposed project

1 would comply with these regulations. There are no policies at the local level applicable to energy
2 conservation specific to the construction phase. Thus, it is anticipated that construction of the
3 proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the
4 purpose of reducing energy use or increasing the use of renewable energy. (Draft EIR at Page 3.6-
5 18).

6 California's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) requires that 33 percent of electricity retail
7 sales be served by renewable energy sources by 2020. The proposed project would be served with
8 gas provided by SoCalGas. SoCalGas offers renewable natural gas captured from sources like
9 dairies, wastewater treatment plants and landfills. The proposed project would be served with
10 electricity provided by SCE. In 2020, SCE obtained 30.9 percent of its electricity from renewable
11 energy sources, while the remaining electricity was sourced from nuclear (8.4 percent), natural gas
12 (15.2 percent), and large hydroelectric (3.3 percent). While SCE's 2020 RPS reporting showed that
13 only 30.9 percent of electricity sales sourced from eligible renewable sources, the RPS requirements
14 apply to a 3-year average of utility provider electricity sourcing to allow for fluctuations in market
15 demand and supply availability. Nonetheless, the proposed project's electricity provider is required
16 to meet the State's 2020 objective of 33 percent and is making progress toward the State's 2024
17 RPS target of 44 percent. The proposed project's electricity demands would also be required to meet
18 the State's future objective of 60 percent electricity from renewable energy sources by 2030. The
19 State's Title 24 energy efficiency standards establishes mandatory measures for residential
20 buildings, including material conservation and resource efficiency. The proposed project would be
21 required to comply with these mandatory measures. The proposed project would also comply with
22 the California Building Codes Standards requiring proposed low-rise residential buildings to include
23 rooftop solar systems. In addition, per the CBC, the proposed building would be required to provide
24 wiring that would allow installation of electric vehicle (EV) charging equipment in any private
25 garages or carports. Policies AQ 20.5 and AQ 20.8 of the General Plan support conservation of
26 transportation fuel by requiring all new residential units to install circuits and provide capacity for
27 EV charging stations, and by increasing options for non-vehicular access through urban design
28 principles that promote higher residential densities with easily accessible parks and recreation

1 opportunities nearby. Policies AQ 20.10 and AQ 20.11 of the General Plan are aimed at reducing
2 the energy consumption of new developments through efficient site design that takes into
3 consideration solar orientation and shading, as well as passive solar design, and through efficient
4 use of utilities (water, electricity, natural gas) and infrastructure design, as well as increasing energy
5 efficiency through the use of energy efficient mechanical systems and equipment. Future
6 development projects would be required to comply with these County-mandated policies. Other
7 policies that promote energy conservation at the local level are voluntary. Compliance with the
8 aforementioned mandatory measures would ensure that future development projects would not
9 conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing energy
10 use or increasing the use of renewable energy. (Draft EIR Pages 3.6-18 to 3.6-19).

11 **E. Geology and Soils**

12 **Impact GEO-11a: The project would not be subject to rupture of a known earthquake**
13 **fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by**
14 **the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault with**
15 **implementation of mitigation. (Draft EIR 3.7-15).**

16 **1. Less than significant impact.**

17 As shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 3.7-1, there are no active fault zones within the planning area
18 boundaries. The nearest fault zone is the Elsinore Fault, located 1.5 miles southwest of the project
19 boundary. This fault is not part of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest Alquist-
20 Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone is the San Jacinto Fault Zone, located 10.5 miles northeast of the
21 project boundary. Because the planning area is located 10.5 miles outside of the nearest Alquist-
22 Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, the proposed project would not be subject to earthquake rupture as
23 delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. In addition to the
24 Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, the General Plan has mapped Riverside County Fault Zones.
25 The nearest Riverside County fault zone is located in the City of Lake Elsinore, along the northeast
26 shore of Lake Elsinore, which is located 1.75 miles southwest of the project boundary. Therefore,
27 future development within the planning area would not be subject to earthquake rupture from a
28 known fault. The planning area is located in Southern California, which is a seismically active

1 region. Future development within the planning area would be required to comply with Policy S 1.1
2 of the General Plan, which requires the adoption and enforcement of current building codes, and
3 with Policy S 2.1, which requires development to minimize fault rupture hazards. The proposed
4 project would not include grading or the development or redevelopment of any structures. However,
5 future development that occurs within the planning area must be constructed in accordance with the
6 current CBC and to minimize fault rupture hazards, in accordance with the General Plan and the
7 Community Plan. (Draft EIR at Page 3.7-15).

8 **Impact GEO-18a: The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of**
9 **topsoil. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-22).**

10 **1. Less than significant impact.**

11 Following development, soils would be covered with buildings, paved areas, and
12 landscaping, so no exposure of soils or erosion would be anticipated. As discussed in Section 3.10,
13 Hydrology and Water Quality, the California State Water Resources Control Board (State Water
14 Board) adopted a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for
15 Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, Order No.
16 2009-0009-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002, as amended in 2011 (Construction General Permit).
17 To obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit, a project applicant must submit various
18 documents, including a Notice of Intent and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).
19 Activities subject to the Construction General Permit include clearing, grading, and disturbances to
20 the ground, such as grading or excavation. The purpose of the SWPPP is to identify the sources of
21 sediment and other pollutants that could affect the quality of stormwater discharges and to describe
22 and ensure the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce or eliminate
23 sediment and other pollutants in stormwater as well as non-stormwater discharges resulting from
24 construction activity. With implementation of the SWPPP and BMPs, impacts would be less than
25 significant. (Draft EIR at Page 3.7-22).

26 **F. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

27 **Impact HAZ-21a: The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or**
28 **the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials with**

1 **implementation of mitigation. (Draft EIR, Page 3.9-15).**

2 **1. Less than significant impact.**

3 If disturbed soils or rubbish are determined to be hazardous, all standard regulations related
4 to hazardous materials remediation and removal procedures would be adhered to. Transport of
5 hazardous materials would occur only on designated routes and would avoid residential areas and
6 areas with sensitive uses such as hospitals or schools. Disposal of hazardous materials would comply
7 with all applicable regulations for such disposal. Thus, compliance with federal, State, and local
8 health and safety requirements, including Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), the
9 TSCA, USDOT regulations in 49 Code of Federal Regulations, and hazardous materials regulations
10 in California Code of Regulations Title 26, and the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) and
11 County Hazardous Waste Management Plan (CHWMP), potential impacts associated with future
12 development within the planning area creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment
13 during the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would remain less than
14 significant. The proposed project seeks to promote land use compatibility by designating land uses
15 for the most sensitive uses (i.e., residential and school) apart from the most intensive uses.
16 Additionally, by designating land uses, the proposed project would separate non-sensitive land uses
17 (e.g., office, retail, research and development, etc.) from intensive uses and the most sensitive uses
18 to minimize hazards to the public or environment. As such, the proposed project would minimize
19 exposure of the public or environment to existing routine hazardous materials usage within and near
20 the planning area. Future development implemented pursuant to the proposed project could include
21 industrial uses. Should new uses within the planning area propose the use of large quantities of
22 hazardous materials, the new use would be evaluated for compatibility with surrounding land uses
23 during project review and, if necessary, would be required to incorporate appropriate protection
24 measures. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.9-15 to 3.9-16).

25 **Impact HAZ-21b: The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or**
26 **the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the**
27 **release of hazardous materials into the environment. (Draft EIR, Page 3.9-16).**

28 **1. Less than significant impact.**

1 Uses of routine chemicals for typical residential and retail/commercial uses would not be of
2 sufficient quantity to pose a significant hazard to the public or environment. Additionally, the
3 retail/commercial uses of the project would comply with all applicable laws regarding the use,
4 storage, and disposal of hazardous materials, including provision of spill prevention kits in
5 accordance with California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) standards.
6 Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment
7 through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions related to the release of hazardous
8 materials into the environment. The operations on-site would comply with all applicable federal,
9 State, and local laws regarding warehouse land uses, and there are no uses contemplated that would
10 involve the use of hazardous materials. (Draft EIR at Page 3.9-16 to 3.9-17).

11 **Impact HAZ-21c: The project would not impair implementation of or physically**
12 **interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. (Draft**
13 **EIR, Page 3.9-17).**

14 **1. Less than significant impact.**

15 The proposed project would not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with,
16 an emergency response plan and/or emergency evacuation plan. The County has an established
17 Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). The proposed project is not anticipated to interfere with the
18 EOP, as it proposes no roadway closures or narrowing, nor would it result in incompatible land uses
19 that could present additional risks to public safety. During construction of future development,
20 traffic management plans will be in place to ensure that no impacts or delays to emergency response
21 occur. Once operational, future projects would not impede emergency response access on any area
22 roadway. Future development within the planning area would include adequate access for
23 emergency response vehicles and personnel, as developed in consultation with RCFD personnel.
24 Project frontage improvements would provide adequate access for emergency vehicles. Therefore,
25 the proposed project would have a less than signifi Impact HAZ-21d

26 The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous
27 materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (Draft
28 EIR, Page 3.9-18).

1 There are no schools within 0.25 mile of any portion of the planning area. The nearest school,
2 Perris Elementary School, is located 0.40 mile east of the planning area. The proposed project's land
3 use changes would be consistent with the existing surrounding uses and would not have any unique
4 operations or features that would create a safety risk. Although a limited amount of cleaning supplies
5 and other potentially hazardous cleaning-related supplies may be stored on-site, they are not
6 anticipated to be of sufficient quantity to pose a significant hazard to the public or environment.
7 Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in hazardous emissions or
8 otherwise cause hazardous materials impacts upon school facilities located within 0.25 mile of an
9 existing or proposed school. There would be no impact. (Draft EIR at Page 3.9-18).

10 **Impact HAZ-21e: The project would not be located on a site which is included on a list**
11 **of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as**
12 **a result, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. (Draft EIR,**
13 **Page 3.9-18).**

14 **1. Less than significant impact.**

15 There are no active Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) cleanup sites in the
16 planning area. There is one landfill located at 18938 Mermack Avenue and there are 140 sites listed
17 as hazardous waste generators either within the planning area boundaries or within 0.25 mile of the
18 boundaries. Generally, the hazardous waste generator sites listed in the Government Records Report
19 consist of businesses in the construction industry or auto body and automotive industry, retail stores,
20 medical facilities, and landscaping. Future development may be required to comply with additional
21 investigation as required by local and State regulations, including a Phase I Environmental Site
22 Assessment (Phase I ESA), as well as soil, groundwater, or soil gas sampling. Compliance with all
23 applicable regulations would be required. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.9-18 to 3.9-19).

24 **Impact HAZ-22a: The project would not result in an inconsistency with an Airport**
25 **Master Plan. (Draft EIR, Page 3.9-19).**

26 **1. Less than significant impact.**

27 The nearest airport is the Perris Valley Airport, a public use airport located 1.29 miles east
28 of the planning area. Additionally, the March Air Reserve Base is located 5.6 miles north of the

1 planning area. The northern portion of the planning area is located within Zone E of the Airport
2 Influence Area of the March Air Reserve Base and is also located within Zone E of the Airport
3 Influence Area of the Perris Valley Airport. Therefore, the proposed Neighborhood 1 is within the
4 County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) compatibility zones and would be subject to County
5 ALUC land use review. Because development pursuant to the proposed project would be reviewed
6 by the County ALUC, who would ensure land use compatibility and assess potential risks from
7 airport operations, the proposed project would not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master
8 Plan. Impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR at Page 3.9-19).

9 **Impact HAZ-22b: The project would require review by the Airport Land Use**
10 **Commission. (Draft EIR, Page 3.9-19).**

11 **1. Less than significant impact.**

12 The northern portion of the planning area is located within Zone E of the Airport Influence
13 Area of the March Air Reserve Base and is also located within Zone E of the Airport Influence Area
14 of the Perris Valley Airport. Proposed Neighborhood 1 is within the County ALUC compatibility
15 zones and would be subject to County ALUC land use review. Therefore, the proposed project
16 would require review by the ALUC. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.9-19 to 3.9-20).

17 **Impact HAZ-22c: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such**
18 **a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, the project**
19 **would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. (Draft**
20 **EIR, Page 3.9-20).**

21 **1. Less than significant impact.**

22 As shown in the Perris Valley Airport document in Exhibit PV-8, General Plan Land Use
23 Designations, the northernmost part of Neighborhood 1 is within compatibility Zone E for the Perris
24 Valley Airport. Neighborhood 1 is within Zone E of the March Air Reserve Base, as shown in
25 Exhibit MA-7A of the March Air Reserve Base document. Zone E represents Other Airport
26 Environs, the noise impacts are categorized as low and are beyond a 55 Community Noise
27 Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour, which means there are occasional overflight intrusions to some
28 outdoor activities. The risk level of Zone E is considered low and within outer or occasionally used

1 portions of flight corridors. Neighborhoods 2 and 3 are not located within an airport influence area
2 or an airport compatibility zone. Any land use within the County ALUC compatibility zones would
3 be subject to County ALUC land use review. Therefore, Neighborhood 1 is subject to County ALUC
4 review to ensure compliance with the compatibility criteria set forth in Policy 1.5.2. The proposed
5 project elements include typical industrial, residential, and commercial/retail buildings, similar to
6 surrounding uses, which would not have any unique operations or features that would present a
7 higher safety risk for people working or living in the planning area related to a nearby airport than
8 would be typical throughout the region. All development would be required to comply with Federal
9 Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations concerning building heights. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.9-
10 20 to 3.9-21).

11 **Impact HAZ-22d: For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, the**
12 **project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.**
13 **(Draft EIR, Page 3.9-21).**

14 **1. Less than significant impact.**

15 There are no private airstrips or helipads in the vicinity of the project site. There are three
16 heliports within the vicinity of the planning area. The nearest heliport to the planning area is Castle
17 Heliport, which is privately owned and located approximately 0.98 miles northwest of
18 Neighborhood 1. The second nearest heliport is the Southern California Edison (SCE) Perris District
19 Heliport located approximately 1.36 miles east of Neighborhood 1 and the third nearest heliport is
20 the SCE San Jacinto Valley Service Center Heliport located approximately 6.01 miles away from
21 Neighborhood 1. The proposed project includes typical residential, commercial/retail, industrial
22 buildings, and open space that are similar to the surrounding uses and would not have any unique
23 operations or features that would present a higher safety risk for people working or residing in the
24 planning area than would be typical throughout the region. (Draft EIR at Page 3.9-21).

25 **F. Hydrology and Water Quality**

26 **Impact HYD-23a: The project would not violate water quality standards or waste**
27 **discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.**
28 **(Draft EIR, Page 3.10-15).**

1 **1. Less than significant impact.**

2 Prior to the issuance of grading or construction permits, the project applicant for individual
3 development pursuant to the proposed project would be required to prepare a SWPPP that conforms
4 to the State Water Board NPDES permit. With compliance to NPDES requirements, all development
5 that results from the proposed project’s buildout would employ source control BMPs to reduce water
6 quality impacts. Source control BMPs must be addressed in each project-specific Water Quality
7 Management Plan (WQMP), this includes both nonstructural and structural source control BMPs.
8 Nonstructural source control BMPs applicable to the proposed project include activity restrictions,
9 irrigation system and landscape maintenance, and drainage facility inspection and maintenance.
10 Structural source control BMPs would be applicable to the projects that would result from the
11 proposed project’s buildout. Furthermore, any construction that results from the proposed project
12 would comply with SWPPP and WQMP requirements as well.

13 Additionally, the SWPPP would identify BMPs to prevent construction-related pollutants
14 from reaching stormwater and all products of erosion from moving off-site. In addition, the
15 Riverside County WQMP states that MS4 Permits which include significant redevelopment projects
16 and new development projects represented by a map or permit for which discretionary approval is
17 sought, are required to prepare, approve, and implement a project-specific WQMP. Project-specific
18 WQMP preparation includes site design and source control BMPs and where applicable, project-
19 specific treatment control BMPs or a regional watershed approach is included with an operation and
20 maintenance program. Therefore, temporary construction impacts would be considered less than
21 significant. Future development (including redevelopment of existing developed sites) that disturbs
22 1 acre or more of soil or that is part of a common plan of development that disturbs 1 acre or more
23 of soil must obtain permit coverage under the Construction General Permit by filing a Notice of
24 Intent (NOI) and SWPPP with the RWQCB prior to commencement of construction. The SWPPP
25 must describe the site, the facility, erosion and sediment controls, runoff water quality monitoring,
26 means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, control of construction sediment
27 and erosion control measures, maintenance responsibilities, and non-stormwater management
28 controls. Inspection of construction sites before and after storms is also required to identify

1 stormwater discharge from the construction activity and to identify and implement erosion controls,
2 where necessary. Additionally, future development pursuant to the proposed project would be
3 required to comply with the CWA, NPDES requirements, and regulations enforced by the RWQCB
4 to control stormwater discharges during project operation. In addition, future projects would comply
5 with requirements of the County Code of Ordinances and General Plan, MVAP, and ELAP policies
6 and actions related to water quality. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.10-16 to 3.10-17).

7 **Impact HYD-23b: The project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies**
8 **or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede**
9 **sustainable groundwater management of this basin. (Draft EIR, Page 3.10-17).**

10 **1. Less than significant impact.**

11 Although the proposed project could increase impervious surfaces compared to existing
12 conditions, the proposed project would comply with WQMP requirements by including site design
13 BMPs. Site design BMPs are intended to create a hydrologically functional project design that
14 mimics the natural hydrology, such as including a stormwater drainage system that allows water to
15 infiltrate the project site soils through bioretention basins. These measures would minimize urban
16 runoff and impervious footprints, and conserve natural areas or by minimizing directly connected
17 impervious areas where applicable. Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD) and
18 Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) provide water services to the planning area. A portion
19 of the EVMWD's water supply comes from the Elsinore Valley Subbasin and the Bedford-
20 Coldwater Subbasin. EMWD produces potable groundwater from the West San Jacinto Basin and
21 the Hemet/San Jacinto Basin, both located within the San Jacinto Groundwater Basin. GSPs are
22 required by the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) for these subbasins. The GSPs
23 determine the sustainable water budget for these subbasins, develop sustainable management
24 criteria, establish minimum thresholds to evaluate groundwater conditions, and implement a
25 monitoring network. According to the General Plan Final EIR, roughly one-third of the County's
26 water demand is met by groundwater, whose unpredictability and variability means that significant
27 impacts associated with the proposed project's operation over time cannot be ruled out. However,
28 the adverse effects associated with potential demands on groundwater and effects on groundwater

1 recharge would be avoided, reduced, or minimized through adherence to and compliance with
2 federal, State, and local regulations and General Plan policies.

3 As discussed in Draft EIR Section 3.20, Utilities, future implementing projects would
4 comply with federal, State, and local water conservation standards to ensure that the future demands
5 would not lead to substantial decrease in groundwater supplies. Implementation of the proposed
6 project has the potential to increase impervious surfaces on-site with future development. The
7 conversion of permeable land to impervious surfaces could reduce groundwater recharge.
8 Development under the proposed project could reduce the area available for aquifer recharge and
9 interfere with the process of groundwater recharge. However, General Plan policies and actions as
10 well as MVAP and ELAP policies designed to reduce reliance on septic systems would reduce the
11 impacts of the proposed project on groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge. Further,
12 compliance with mandatory NPDES permit requirements, adherence to the County Code of
13 Ordinances, preparation of a WQMP and SWPPP (if required), and implementation of General Plan
14 policies and actions would ensure that impacts related to groundwater supplies would be reduced to
15 a less than significant level. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.10-17 to 3.10-18).

16 **Impact HYD-23c: The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage**
17 **pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through**
18 **the addition of impervious surfaces. (Draft EIR, Page 3.10-18).**

19 **1. Less than significant impact.**

20 The proposed project would comply with mandatory NPDES permit requirements, prepare
21 a WQMP and SWPPP (if required), and implement General Plan policies and actions to ensure that
22 the proposed project reduces impacts on drainage patterns to the maximum extent possible.
23 Specifically, the proposed project would implement General Plan Policy OS 3.7, which states to
24 decrease stormwater runoff by reducing pavement in development areas, reducing dry weather urban
25 runoff, and by incorporating Low Impact Development (LID) requirements, and other BMPs such
26 as permeable parking lots and the use of less pavement where feasible. Development pursuant to the
27 proposed project would not occur within or adjacent to existing streams or rivers. General Plan
28 Policy OS 4.4 requires incorporating natural drainage systems into development where feasible,

1 while General Plan Policy OS 4.6 requires retaining stormwater at or near the site of generation. In
2 addition, Chapter 13.12.060 of the County Code of Ordinances states new development or
3 redevelopment projects shall control stormwater runoff with BMPs such as increasing permeable
4 areas, directing runoff to permeable areas, or maximizing stormwater storage. Therefore, by
5 managing stormwater and implementing BMPs, these regulations would reduce impacts associated
6 with grading land or altering streams to a less than significant level. The proposed project would
7 guide the development of residential neighborhoods of varying densities, commercial retail, mixed-
8 use, light industrial, business park, public facilities, rural, open space, and recreation areas.
9 However, development associated with the proposed project would be reviewed to ensure coverage
10 under the Construction General Permit and site-specific environmental review would be required
11 for all future development projects to ensure compliance with the CWA. Further, compliance with
12 existing regulations and General Plan policies, as well as adherence to the County Code of
13 Ordinances, would reduce long-term impacts due to altered drainage pathways and is considered to
14 be less than significant. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.10-18 to 3.10-19).

15 **Impact HYD-23d: The project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on-**
16 **site or off-site. (Draft EIR, Page 3.10-19).**

17 **1. Less than significant impact.**

18 Implementation of the proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or river or
19 substantially alter the existing drainage patterns within the planning area. As part of future project-
20 specific implementation, grading of land surfaces would occur prior to construction. On-site grading
21 has the potential to result in substantial erosion or siltation; however, the project would not
22 substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in erosion.
23 Buildout of the planning area and development within watersheds that are tributary to the planning
24 area, but not a part of the planning area, could increase the amount of paved impervious surfaces.
25 Construction activities that result from the proposed project could result in erosion or siltation.
26 However, compliance with applicable policies, laws, and regulations would minimize the potential
27 to increase sedimentation or siltation. With the implementation of these uniformly applied standards
28 and procedures, construction impacts related to erosion or siltation would be less than significant.

1 Development within the watersheds or drainage areas tributary to the planning area that are within
2 the County are also required to comply with the grading plan check process. Grading construction
3 projects require professional inspections, soil compaction (fill placement) testing, and a final
4 grading report from a professional licensed engineer verifying that the grading construction was
5 done correctly. Further, County grading inspectors ensure the work follows the approved grading
6 plans, the WQMP, building codes and local ordinances, and assure a safe site development for public
7 safety welfare. These processes would ensure that the development sites in the planning area are
8 properly graded in accordance with applicable ordinances and the NPDES Construction General
9 Permit. Additionally, Chapter 13.12 of the County Code of Ordinances sets forth rules and
10 regulations to manage stormwater and urban runoff and control stormwater discharge to prevent and
11 reduce pollutants from entering the storm drainage system. Compliance with existing regulations
12 and General Plan policies, as well as adherence to the County Code of Ordinances, would further
13 reduce the potential for erosion and off-site siltation. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.10-19 to 3.10-20).

14 **Impact HYD-23e: The project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of**
15 **surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site. (Draft EIR, Page**
16 **3.10-20).**

17 **1. Less than significant impact.**

18 Implementation of the proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or river or
19 substantially alter existing drainage patterns within the planning area. New development or
20 redevelopment pursuant to the proposed project could increase impervious areas within the
21 planning area and increase stormwater runoff, which could result in flooding. However, the County
22 Code of Ordinances contains regulations that minimize impervious surfaces, minimize impacts to
23 stormwater runoff, and follow LID requirements. Further, General Plan Policy OS 3.7 would further
24 reduce impacts from surface runoff. Development within the watersheds or drainage areas tributary
25 to the planning area that are within the County are also required to adhere to the grading plan check
26 process. These processes ensure that the developments within the planning area are properly graded
27 consistent with existing ordinances and the NPDES Construction General Permit. Compliance with
28 existing regulations and General Plan policies, as well as adherence to the County Code of

1 Ordinances, would maximize infiltration and rainwater retention, which in turn would reduce
2 stormwater runoff that could result from project implementation. (Draft EIR at Page 3.10-20).

3 **Impact HYD-23f: The project would not create or contribute runoff water that would**
4 **exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial**
5 **additional sources of polluted runoff. (Draft EIR, Page 3.10-20).**

6 **1. Less than significant impact.**

7 Development under the proposed project would comply with NPDES requirements and
8 employ source control BMPs to reduce water quality impacts. Furthermore, any construction that
9 results from the proposed project would comply with SWPPP and WQMP requirements as well. All
10 future development would be reviewed for consistency with General Plan Policy OS 3.3 to minimize
11 pollutant discharge into storm drainage systems, natural drainages and aquifers and General Plan
12 Policy OS 4.3 to ensure that aquifer water recharge areas are preserved and protected. Therefore, all
13 development that results from the proposed project's buildout would comply with General Plan
14 policies and be subject to preparing a project-specific WQMP that outlines nonstructural and
15 structural source control BMPs. All future development would require the implementation of water
16 quality and watershed protection measures and comply with NPDES and other applicable CWA
17 regulations. Therefore, future development would not result in substantial additional sources of
18 polluted runoff. In addition, Chapter 13.12 of the County Code of Ordinances sets forth rules and
19 regulations to manage stormwater and urban runoff and control of stormwater discharge. (Draft EIR
20 at Page 3.10-21).

21 **Impact HYD-23g: The project would not impede or redirect flood flow. (Draft EIR,**
22 **Page 3.10-21).**

23 **1. Less than significant impact.**

24 Riverside County is a participating community in the National Flood Insurance Program
25 (NFIP), which requires participating agencies to adopt floodplain management ordinances. The
26 intent of the ordinance, Ordinance No. 458, is to ensure that new construction and/or substantial
27 improvements within mapped floodplains are done in a manner that reduces damage to the public
28 and property. Any development or substantial improvement within a regulatory floodplain under

1 the proposed project may require floodplain review by the County. This includes the submittal of a
2 floodplain application permit form to County Building and Safety along with corresponding fees
3 and attachments. General Plan Policy LU 12.1 would apply certain requirements to areas where
4 development is allowed and that contain natural slopes, canyons, or other significant elevation
5 changes that could result in flood hazards, regardless of land use designation. Specifically, in areas
6 at risk of flooding, General Plan Policy LU 12.1 would limit grading, cut, and fill to the amount
7 necessary to provide stable areas for structural foundations, street right-of-way, parking facilities,
8 and other intended uses. Furthermore, General Plan Policy LU 9.4 encourages clustered
9 development to keep development out of watercourses and steep slope areas that contain 100-year
10 floodplains, streams, or watercourses, which would minimize flood risks. General Plan Policy OS
11 4.6 requires stormwater retention through LID or BMPs to help mitigate flooding. General Plan
12 Policies OS 5.3, OS 5.5, and OS 5.6 are designed to address floodways, the floodplain fringe, and
13 riparian areas, including the requirement that development shall be set back from floodway
14 boundaries. Policy S 4.5, S 4.7, and S 4.10 prohibit and apply certain requirements regarding
15 substantial modification to watercourses. The ELAP and MVAP each impose additional policies
16 related to flooding. For example, Policy ELAP 18.2 and Policy MVAP 18.3 require development
17 projects that are subject to flood hazards to be submitted to the Riverside County Flood Control and
18 Water Conservation District for review. Policy ELAP 18.4 and Policy MVAP 18.1 require
19 adherence to the policies identified in the Flood and Inundation Hazards Abatement section of the
20 General Plan Safety Element. Implementation of the above policies would help to reduce the risk of
21 flooding.

22 Furthermore, future development in the project area would be required to implement the
23 2015 County of Riverside General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures related to flood risk. Specifically,
24 implementation of MM 4.9.1A, MM 4.9.1B, MM 4.9.1C, MM 4.9.1D, MM 4.9.2A, MM 4.9.2B,
25 MM 4.9.2C, and MM 4.9.2D would ensure that future development projects in the project area
26 would not expose people or structures to significant flood risks. Additionally, the proposed project
27 would include the land use designation of Open Space – Water, which would include bodies of
28 water or artificial drainage corridors. The Open Space – Conservation designation would include

1 the protection of open space for natural hazard protection. Project compliance with Ordinance No.
2 458, as well as General Plan, MVAP, and ELAP policies, the General Plan EIR MMs outlined
3 above, and the proposed land use designations would render any impacts to structures due to a flood
4 hazard area less than significant. (Draft EIR at Page 3.10-22).

5 **Impact HYD-23h: In flood hazard tsunami, or seiche zones, the project would not risk**
6 **the release of pollutants due to project inundation. (Draft EIR, Page 3.10-23).**

7 **1. Less than significant impact.**

8 The planning area is not located in a tsunami or seiche zone. A seiche is defined as a standing
9 wave in an enclosed or partially enclosed body of water. The nearest bodies of surface water near
10 the proposed planning areas include Canyon Lake (approximately 1.8 miles east of the project area),
11 Lake Elsinore (approximately 1.8 miles south of the project area), and Lake Perris (approximately
12 5.6 miles north of the project area). Because of the proposed project's distance from each lake, the
13 proposed project would not be subject to impacts associated with a seiche. The dam failure
14 inundation zones of these lakes are shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 3.10-2. Likewise, the planning area's
15 distance from the Pacific Ocean precludes any impacts associated with tsunamis. The planning area
16 does not contain any areas that are mapped by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
17 as a 100-year flood hazard zone, as shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 3.10-1. However, portions of the
18 planning area are located in a flood hazard zone as mapped by the County. Specifically, County-
19 designated flood hazard zones occur in the northern portion of the planning area between Mountain
20 Avenue and Mapes Road and adjacent to Highway 74 from Mapes Road to Spring Street. There is
21 also a linear flood hazard zone crossing Highway 74 between Kimes Way and River Road, and a
22 linear flood hazard zone between Peach Street and Wasson Canyon Road, which crosses Aubrey
23 Street, Larimark Street, and Greenwald Avenue in the southern portion of the project site.
24 Development would be required to adhere to the applicable policies, including General Plan Policies
25 LU 12.1, LU 9.4, OS 4.6, OS 5.3, OS 5.5, OS 5.6, S 4.5, S 4.7, and S 4.10. Additionally, Policy
26 ELAP 18.2 and Policy MVAP 18.3, Policy ELAP 18.4, and Policy MVAP 18.1 would apply.
27 Furthermore, Mitigation Measures 4.9.1A, 4.9.1B, 4.9.1C, 4.9.1D, 4.9.2A, 4.9.2B, 4.9.2C, and
28 4.9.2D would be implemented as required.

1 The project’s stormwater drainage system includes open channels, storm drain facilities, and
2 extended detention basins. Additionally, a riparian mitigation area along the majority of the southern
3 planning area boundary, as well as other mitigation, will be provided to offset project impacts to
4 natural water/drainage courses and riparian areas. These drainage improvements help reduce flood
5 hazard impacts while collectively encouraging on-site and adjacent off-site percolation and
6 groundwater recharge. Drainage patterns would not substantially change in the planning area as a
7 result of development pursuant to the proposed project. Future development would not involve
8 substantial transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and inundation of the planning area by
9 seiche is not likely because of the distance of existing waterbodies from the planning area.
10 Furthermore, General Plan Policy OS 3.3 requires minimizing pollutant discharge into storm
11 drainage systems, natural drainages, and aquifers in order to maintain water quality. Project
12 compliance with Ordinance No. 458, as well as General Plan, MVAP, and ELAP policies and the
13 General Plan EIR MMs outlined above would be required. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.10-23 to 3.10-24).

14 **Impact HYD-23i: The project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or**
15 **sustainable groundwater management plan. (Draft EIR, Page 3.10-24).**

16 **1. Less than significant impact.**

17 Currently, the County relies on imported water and local groundwater for its municipal water
18 supplies. Desalted groundwater is also being pursued as a supply option in western Riverside
19 County. To maintain acceptable water quality, future development would be required to comply
20 with federal, State, and local regulations and policies. The General Plan’s policies help reduce
21 significant water quality impacts by addressing wastewater treatment and protection of water quality
22 through pollution discharge standards and compliance with the NPDES. The Santa Ana RWQCB
23 provide water quality policy guidance for the County (e.g., via NPDES general permits and MS4
24 Permits). In particular, the NPDES permit process mandates the use of BMPs to minimize the
25 adverse effects of pollution and to protect water quality. With the implementation of the above
26 regulations and General Plan policies, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct
27 implementation of a water quality control plan or groundwater management plan. (Draft EIR at Page
28 3.10-24).

1 **G. Mineral Resources**

2 **Impact MIN-25a: The project would not result in the loss of availability of a known**
3 **mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State. (Draft EIR,**
4 **Page 3.12-4).**

5 **1. Less than significant impact.**

6 The planning area does not currently contain any known mineral resources. The General
7 Plan’s Multipurpose Open Space Element (Figure OS-6) identifies most of western Riverside
8 County as being within Mineral Resources Zone (MRZ)-3 (significance of mineral deposits
9 undetermined) and Unstudied (no MRZ designation issued). Western Riverside County also
10 contains a small number of areas designated as MRZ-1 (no significant mineral deposits), MRZ-2
11 (known or inferred significant mineral resources), and MRZ-4 (presence and significance of mineral
12 deposits undetermined). According to Figure OS-6, the entire planning area is within the MRZ-3
13 designation. Areas with the MRZ-3 designation are described as areas where the available geologic
14 information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist; however, the significance of the
15 deposit is undetermined. The General Plan provides no specific policies regarding property
16 identified as MRZ-3 and does not designate the Highway 74 Corridor for mineral resource-related
17 uses; therefore, there is no indication that the planning area contains any mineral resources that
18 would be of value to the region or to residents of the State. Furthermore, the proposed project
19 comprises a series of General Plan Amendments; no specific development is proposed and no
20 earthwork or earthmoving activities would occur as a result of the implementation of the proposed
21 project. Any future development proposed as a result of the proposed project would require
22 additional study to determine whether any significant mineral resources exist on an individual
23 property at the time such a project is proposed. Such additional study is typically required on a case-
24 by-case basis when the County Geologist determines it is needed. Subsequent development
25 applicants would be required to submit such studies as may be required by the County Geologist
26 during the entitlement process and would be required to implement any identified recommendations.
27 (Draft EIR at Pages 3.12-4 to 3.12-5).

28 **H. Paleontological Resources**

1 **Impact PALEO-28(a): The proposed project would/would not directly or indirectly**
2 **destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature. (Draft EIR, Page**
3 **3.14-3).**

4 **1. Less than significant impact.**

5 According to the Riverside County Map My County GIS database, the planning area
6 predominantly contains areas of low paleontological sensitivity, as well as areas with undetermined
7 paleontological sensitivity. General Plan Policy OS 19.7 states that: Whenever existing information
8 indicates that a site proposed for development has low paleontological sensitivity as shown on
9 General Plan Figure OS-8, no direct mitigation is required unless a fossil is encountered during site
10 development. Should a fossil be encountered, the County Geologist shall be notified, and a
11 Paleontologist shall be retained by the project proponent. The Paleontologist shall document the
12 extent and potential significance of the paleontological resources on the site and establish
13 appropriate mitigation measures for further site development.

14 Furthermore, General Plan Policy OS 19.8 states that: Whenever existing information
15 indicates that a site proposed for development has undetermined paleontological sensitivity as
16 shown on General Plan Figure OS-8, a report shall be filed with the County Geologist documenting
17 the extent and potential significance of the paleontological resources on-site and identifying
18 mitigation measures for the fossil and for impacts to significant paleontological resources prior to
19 approval of that department. Lastly, General Plan Policy OS 19.9 states that: Whenever
20 paleontological resources are found, the County Geologist shall direct them to a facility within
21 Riverside County for their curation, including the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet. In
22 addition to such County policies, there are a number of existing State and federal laws that regulate
23 development impacts to paleontological resources, including those outlined under the California
24 Public Resources Code Paleontological Resources Preservation Act (PRPA). Because of the low
25 paleontological sensitivity and unique geologic features within the planning area and required
26 conformance with existing regulations intended for the protection of sensitive paleontological
27 resources, impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant. (Draft EIR at Page
28 3.14-3).

1 **I. Population and Housing**

2 **Impact POP-29a: The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing**
3 **people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (Draft**
4 **EIR, Page 3.15-9).**

5 **1. Less than significant impact.**

6 Overall, the proposed project would reduce the number of acres designated residential from
7 883.82 to 663.65 acres but would increase mixed-use designations, which could include residential,
8 from 193.08 to 455.92 acres. Other changes to the Rural Foundation Component would result in a
9 decrease of rural residential (5-acre minimum) from 305.31 to 57.23 acres and Rural Community–
10 Very Low-Density Residential (1-acre minimum) from 527.59 to 376.07 acres. The differences in
11 buildout potential between the existing General Plan land use designations and the proposed project
12 within the planning area are shown in Draft EIR Table 2-5 and at Draft EIR page 3.15-10. The
13 Highway 74 planning area policies and related land use plan are designed to support the provision
14 of housing opportunities through development of residential neighborhoods of varying densities,
15 neighborhood-serving commercial uses, and local employment center areas clustered along the
16 Highway 74 corridor. In general, Neighborhoods 1 and 2 are primarily single-story homes on large
17 lots with adjacent establishments such as markets, vehicle and tire service repair shops. Very low-
18 density residential is located on the outskirts of Neighborhood 3. As noted, land use designations in
19 these neighborhoods include Commercial Retail, Business Park, and Mixed-Use Areas, Light
20 Industrial, and Very Low-Density Residential. The proposed project would cluster development and
21 consolidate parcels to facilitate appropriate built environments that promote economic development,
22 consistent with General Plan criteria. Additionally, the proposed project would promote more
23 Community Development land uses and fewer Rural, Rural Community, and Open Space land uses.
24 Implementation of the proposed project could result in removal of some existing housing; however,
25 it should be noted that existing zoning and land use designations could similarly allow removal of
26 housing and the proposed project would not result in substantially different or increased impacts
27 related to removal of housing than those identified in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR
28 stated that as with all future development accommodated by the General Plan, it is expected that

1 existing built land uses, including residences, would generally remain and that new development
2 would occur predominantly on vacant or sparsely developed land. Where occurring on vacant land,
3 future development consistent with the proposed project would not displace any existing residents.
4 A significant impact could only occur where a substantial number of existing residences would be
5 displaced by development or redevelopment.

6 According to County-provided data, there are 847 dwelling units in the overall planning area.
7 There are currently 528 dwelling units in the planning area that are subject to land use designation
8 changes pursuant to the proposed project. It should be noted that not all of these dwelling units
9 would be redeveloped to nonresidential uses resulting in potential displacement, since many of the
10 land use designations simply change from one residential category to another and would not
11 represent major changes in land uses allowed on those particular sites. In addition, buildout of the
12 plan would occur over a 20-year planning horizon and individual sites would be redeveloped at
13 different points in time and it is entirely speculative to assume that all existing development would
14 be redeveloped. However, for a conservative analysis, this discussion considers the worst-case
15 scenario where all 528 dwelling units would be demolished to accommodate redevelopment.
16 Utilizing the unincorporated County pph ratio of 3.2 (which is actually anticipated to decrease), this
17 would result in displacement of a maximum of approximately 1,690 residents. The proposed project
18 would accommodate nearly 4,000 new multi-family residential units, providing increased housing
19 opportunities in the planning area. Because none of the areas proposed for land use changes under
20 the proposed project contain substantial numbers of existing homes whose loss would displace
21 substantial numbers of residents at any given time and because replacement housing would occur
22 within the planning area coinciding with any removal of existing homes, development consistent
23 with the proposed project would not necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
24 (Draft EIR at Pages 3.15-9 to 3.15-11).

25 **Impact POP-29b: The project would not create a demand for additional housing,**
26 **particularly housing affordable to households earning 80 percent or less of the County's**
27 **median income. (Draft EIR, Page 3.15-11).**

28 **1. Less than significant impact.**

1 The land use designations proposed by the project would allow for the future construction
2 of up to approximately 4,000 multi-family housing units. A percentage of these housing units would
3 be expected to be affordable housing, as the County is required to include provision of affordable
4 housing per its RHNA allocation. Based on a pph ratio of 3.20, if all approximately 4,000 dwelling
5 units were constructed, a population increase of up to 12,800 residents could be anticipated in the
6 planning area. This would represent a 3.3 percent increase in the existing resident population of
7 unincorporated Riverside County and 0.12 percent increase in population of Riverside County
8 overall. These increases are relatively small and would be offset by the residential component of the
9 proposed project. Accordingly, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in a substantial
10 increased demand for housing. Specific development projects are not proposed under the project,
11 and future development that would occur with proposed project implementation would be based on
12 market conditions and other future considerations. As the County receives development
13 applications, those applications will be reviewed by the County to assess each proposed
14 development and the site-specific environmental impacts associated with new housing through
15 project-level CEQA analysis at such time that their design and specific locations are known. (Draft
16 EIR at Pages 3.15-11 to 3.15-12).

17 **Impact POP-29c: The project would not induce substantial unplanned population**
18 **growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or**
19 **indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). (Draft EIR, Page**
20 **3.15-12).**

21 **1. Less than significant impact.**

22 The proposed project includes policies and programs that promote cohesive and compatible
23 development and planned growth. It does not approve or entitle any specific development. While
24 the physical construction of homes and/or businesses are not proposed as a component of the
25 proposed project, the proposed land use designations would allow for future construction of new
26 residential and commercial development as well as the extension of existing infrastructure within
27 the planning area. Based on a pph ratio of 3.20, if all approximately 4,000 dwelling units were
28 constructed, a population increase of up to 12,800 residents could be anticipated in the planning

1 area. This would represent a 3.3 percent increase in the existing resident population of
2 unincorporated Riverside County and 0.12 percent increase in population of Riverside County
3 overall. Future development that would occur following project implementation would be based on
4 market conditions and other future considerations. At such time as a development application is
5 submitted for review by the County, the County would assess each proposed development and the
6 site-specific environmental impacts associated with new housing through project-level CEQA
7 analysis when their design and specific locations are known.

8 The Highway 74 planning area policies and related land use plan are designed to support the
9 provision of housing opportunities through development of residential neighborhoods of varying
10 densities, neighborhood-serving commercial uses, and local employment center areas clustered
11 along the Highway 74 corridor. A number of commercial uses could be redeveloped for mixed uses.
12 Similarly, portions of the project area would be changed from residential land use to mixed-use and
13 may therefore experience slightly increased development intensity. However, the existing
14 development in the planning area is generally consistent with the proposed land use designations
15 and implementation of the proposed project would not promote unplanned growth. Impacts would
16 be less than significant, largely similar in nature and intensity to those identified in the General Plan
17 EIR. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.15-12 to 3.15-13).

18 **J. Public Services**

19 **Impact PS-30: The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts**
20 **associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for**
21 **new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause**
22 **significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response**
23 **times or other performance objectives for fire protection. (Draft EIR, Page 3.16-7).**

24 **1. Less than significant impact.**

25 The County requires the payment of Development Impact Fees prior to the final inspection
26 by the Building and Safety Department for any residential dwelling. Future development within the
27 planning area would also be subject to General Plan Policy LU 5.1, General Plan Policy S 5.1, and
28 County Ordinance Nos. 659 and 787. Policy LU 5.1 prohibits new development from exceeding the

1 ability to adequately provide supporting infrastructure and services, including fire protection
2 services, and Policy S 5.1 requires proposed development to incorporate fire prevention features.
3 Future development would be required to demonstrate compliance with any applicable California
4 Building and Fire Codes, which are implemented to ensure new development meets minimum
5 standards for access, fire flow, building ignition and fire resistance, fire protection systems and
6 equipment, defensible space, and setback requirements. Adherence to the above-mentioned existing
7 General Plan Policies and Ordinances, as well as existing State regulations, would ensure that
8 potential physical impacts associated with the provision of fire protection services remain less than
9 significant on a program level. (Draft EIR at Page 3.16-7).

10 **Impact PS-31: The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts**
11 **associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for**
12 **new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause**
13 **significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response**
14 **times or other performance objectives for sheriff services. (Draft EIR, Page 3.16-8).**

15 **1. Less than significant impact.**

16 Development accommodated under the proposed project would result in an incremental
17 increase in new residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Therefore, development and growth
18 under the proposed project would incrementally increase demand for law enforcement services. As
19 the demand for services increases, there may be a need to increase staffing, equipment, and facilities
20 to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, and other performance standards. To maintain
21 adequate funding for law enforcement facilities, the County has implemented the Development
22 Impact Fee Program. This fee can be used to pay for one-time capital improvements, such as the
23 purchase of land and equipment or the construction of new facilities. The proposed project would
24 be required to pay the established development mitigation fee prior to issuance of a certificate of
25 occupancy for the proposed project buildings.

26 The proposed project does not include or approve any specific construction of new facilities
27 and the precise size and location of future sites is too speculative to identify at this time. With project
28 buildout, new or expanded police facilities may be proposed; however, those projects would be

1 reviewed by the County for compliance with the policies and actions of the General Plan as well as
2 the County Ordinances. Likewise, as the County receives development applications for subsequent
3 development under the proposed project that includes new or expanded police facilities, those future
4 discretionary actions would be evaluated for project-specific environmental effects at the time they
5 are proposed. Therefore, based on the discussion above, and in view of the known size requirements
6 of a sheriff's station and the general area within which the additional facilities necessarily could
7 reasonably be placed, the physical effects on the environment from the construction of new or
8 expanded sheriff facilities with implementation of the proposed project would be less than
9 significant on a program level. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.16-8 to 3.16-9).

10 **Impact PS-32: The proposed project would not result insubstantial adverse physical**
11 **impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the**
12 **need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could**
13 **cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios,**
14 **response times or other performance objectives for schools. (Draft EIR, Page 3.16-9).**

15 **1. Less than significant impact.**

16 To offset potential impacts to school facilities that may result from the proposed project's
17 buildout, as new development is proposed, all future projects would be subject to impact mitigation
18 fees for school facilities. The California State Legislature, under SB 50, has determined that payment
19 of school impact fees provides full and complete mitigation for impacts to school facilities. All
20 development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to pay the school impact fees
21 adopted by each school district, and this requirement is considered to fully mitigate the impacts of
22 the proposed project on school facilities. As the County proceeds with the construction of new or
23 expanded school facilities required by development under the proposed project, those projects would
24 be reviewed by the County for compliance with the policies and actions of the General Plan as well
25 as the County Ordinances. Likewise, as the County receives development applications for
26 subsequent development under the proposed project that includes new or expanded school facilities,
27 those future discretionary actions would be evaluated for project-specific environmental effects at
28 the time they are proposed. Therefore, the physical effects on the environment from the construction

1 of new or expanded school facilities on a program level would be less than significant. (Draft EIR
2 at Page 3.16-9).

3 **Impact PS-33: The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts**
4 **associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for**
5 **new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause**
6 **significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response**
7 **times or other performance objectives for libraries. (Draft EIR, Page 3.16-10).**

8 **1. Less than significant impact.**

9 Development and growth that results from the proposed project's buildout would increase
10 demand for public services, including libraries and other public and governmental services. As the
11 demand for services increases, there may be a need to increase staffing and equipment to maintain
12 acceptable service ratios and other performance standards. However, all future projects would be
13 required to comply with General Plan policies, the County Ordinances, and other local, State, or
14 federal regulations. Further, the allocation of other municipal services is determined annually by the
15 County Board of Supervisors based upon local needs and resources. There could be environmental
16 impacts associated with the construction of new or expanded municipal services facilities. However,
17 it is not possible to identify the timing or relative specifics of these improvements is unknown at
18 this time and it would be premature to consider these projects on a project-specific level as part of
19 the Draft Program EIR for the proposed project, as these projects have not yet been sited or designed
20 and other key project components that would influence potential environmental impacts have not
21 yet been determined. Accordingly, it would be inappropriate and speculative under CEQA to
22 conduct a project-specific analysis in this Draft Program EIR. As the County proceeds with the
23 construction of new or expanded library services and/or facilities identified in the proposed project,
24 those projects will be reviewed by the County for compliance with the policies of the General Plan
25 as well as the County Ordinances. Likewise, as the County receives development applications for
26 subsequent development under the proposed project that includes new or expanded services, those
27 future discretionary actions would be evaluated for project-specific environmental effects at the time
28 they are proposed. Therefore, the physical effects on the environment from the construction of new

1 or expanded library services would be less than significant on a program level. (Draft EIR at Page
2 3.16-10).

3 **Impact PS-34: The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts**
4 **associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for**
5 **new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause**
6 **significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response**
7 **times or other performance objectives for health services. (Draft EIR, Page 3.16-11).**

8 **1. Less than significant impact.**

9 There are approximately 18 hospitals in the County. With the proposed project's buildout,
10 there would be potential to draw new residents to the planning area because of new employment
11 and housing opportunities. The proposed project would accommodate nearly 4,000 new residential
12 units, which would result in a maximum new resident population of 12,800 if all units are built
13 (assuming all new residents). This increase is not expected to substantially increase demands on
14 existing health services, because overall this population growth is not substantial and would not
15 place an undue burden on the 18 hospitals in the County. It is anticipated that most employment
16 opportunities would be filled by employees already living within the local region, and it is further
17 assumed that these employees would already be utilizing the existing local health services. Thus, it
18 is not expected that a substantial quantity of people will relocate within these hospitals' general
19 service area as a result of the proposed project. (Draft EIR at Page 3.16-11).

20 **K. Recreation**

21 **Impact REC-35a: The project would not include recreational facilities or require the**
22 **construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect**
23 **on the environment. (Draft EIR, Page 3.17-7).**

24 **1. Less than significant impact.**

25 Some of the development that would occur with implementation of the proposed project
26 could include parks and recreational facilities, such as pocket parks, common open spaces, paseos,
27 or new or extended trails. It is not anticipated that new development would include major
28 recreational facilities such as community centers or other recreational venues. It is also not expected

1 that neighborhood, local, or regional parks would be developed pursuant to the proposed project, as
2 the amount of open space would decrease compared to the existing land use designations. The
3 proposed project would not authorize any immediate development that could affect the need for
4 recreational facilities. Future development would be required to either provide recreational facilities
5 and open space in accordance with the land use and density proposed or would be required to pay
6 development impact fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 659, thereby supporting the construction of
7 facilities identified in the County's Public Facilities Needs List and/or the acquisition of open space
8 and habitat. Small parks and recreational facilities that would be expected under the proposed project
9 would not include major construction that would have substantial environmental impacts, such as
10 air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, or traffic, nor would they result in any significant
11 operational impacts on the environment. As discrete development projects are proposed pursuant to
12 the proposed project, site-specific CEQA review would be required to determine whether any would
13 result in significant environmental impacts. (Draft EIR at Page 3.17-7).

14 **Impact REC-35b: The project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or**
15 **regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of**
16 **the facility would occur or be accelerated. (Draft EIR, Page 3.17-8).**

17 **1. Less than significant impact.**

18 The County's adopted standard for parks and open space is 3 acres of parks and open space
19 for every 1,000 residents. The County maintains 35 Regional Parks, encompassing roughly 23,317
20 acres. Based on the County's total population of 2.43 million persons in 2020 (Table 3.16-1), the
21 County provides 9.2 acres of parks and open space per 1,000 residents, exceeding this threshold.
22 While there are no parks within the planning area, there are 32.2 acres of existing parks within 1
23 mile of the planning area boundaries in addition to the nearly 50 acres available in Colinas del Oro.
24 Buildout of the proposed project would result in the intensification of land uses such as residential
25 neighborhoods, commercial, retail, mixed use, light industrial, business park and public facilities
26 and would decrease the amount of acreage designated as open space. Development of approximately
27 4,000 multi-family residential units that could be accommodated under the proposed project would
28 create additional demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities and

1 could result in increased use of existing parks and recreational facilities. Based on a persons per
2 household (pph) ratio of 3.20, if all approximately 4,000 dwelling units were constructed, a
3 population increase of up to 12,800 residents could be anticipated in the planning area. This would
4 represent a 3.3 percent increase in the existing resident population of unincorporated Riverside
5 County and 0.12 percent increase in population of Riverside County overall, still resulting in 9.2
6 acres of parks and open space per 1,000 residents.

7 These increases would not exceed the County's standard, are small, and would not be
8 expected to result in increased use of existing parks and recreational facilities in the County such
9 that deterioration would occur. Future development pursuant to the proposed project would be
10 required to either provide recreational facilities and open space in accordance with the land use and
11 density proposed or would be required to pay development impact fees pursuant to Ordinance No.
12 659, thereby supporting the construction of facilities identified in the County's Public Facilities
13 Needs List and/or the acquisition of open space and habitat. Compliance with these ordinances
14 would facilitate development of parks and recreational facilities, both within or outside of the
15 planning area, which would maintain the County's current ratio of parks to population and provide
16 additional recreational opportunities. Thus, substantial deterioration of existing parks and
17 recreational facilities would not occur. With compliance with local regulations and ordinances,
18 impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR at Page 3.17-8).

19 **Impact REC-36a: The project would not include the construction or expansion of a**
20 **trail system. (Draft EIR, Page 3.17-9).**

21 **1. Less than significant impact.**

22 Since the planning area contains trails that are included in the Trails and Bikeway System,
23 all projects within the planning area would be expected to be consistent with Policy 16.4. No specific
24 project extending the existing trail system is proposed at this time. As future specific development
25 is proposed under the project, individual review will evaluate whether the project includes any
26 recreational trail components that could result in environmental effects. All development under the
27 proposed project would be expected to be consistent with the policies within the specific plan and
28 General Plan to protect and enhance existing and planned recreational trails. Impacts on a program

1 level would be less than significant. (Draft EIR at Page 3.17-10 to 3.17-11).

2 **L. Transportation**

3 **Impact TRANS-37a: The project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance,**
4 **or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and**
5 **pedestrian facilities. (Draft EIR, Page 3.18-12).**

6 **1. Less than significant impact.**

7 Specific development projects that would result from implementation of the proposed
8 project are unknown. Future development on-site would be required to comply with all applicable
9 Riverside County ordinances related to the circulation system, including, but not limited to,
10 Ordinance No. 460, regulating the division of land in the County and includes design requirements
11 relating to required access, street improvements, roadway dedications, and roadway design. Because
12 site-specific designs showing driveway locations have not been developed, there are no specific
13 details to review and assess impacts on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. As part of the
14 standard development review process, the County would require all future proposed development
15 of parcels to go through a review of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities in the area surrounding
16 the individual development project to ensure that future developments do not conflict with existing
17 or planned facilities supporting those travel modes. All pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities
18 proposed would be designed using the appropriate design standards. During the review and approval
19 process of a planning application submittal, all future development would be required to
20 demonstrate compliance with the Circulation Element of the General Plan and Code or Ordinances,
21 including the identification of appropriate mitigation measures, where needed on a project-specific
22 basis, to reduce impacts to less than significant. This analysis is based on a program level and does
23 not approve any specific development on any specific site; accordingly, site-specific mitigation
24 measures cannot be identified at this time. Future implementing projects' compliance with the
25 General Plan Circulation Element and Code of Ordinances, along with identification and
26 implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, would ensure that future implementing projects
27 would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system,
28 including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. (Draft EIR at Page 3.18-12).

1 **Impact TRANS-37c: The project would not substantially increase hazards due to a**
2 **design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm**
3 **equipment) with implementation of mitigation. (Draft EIR, Page 3.18-15).**

4 **1. Less than significant impact.**

5 Development consistent with the proposed project would undergo individual design review
6 at the time of application and additional project-specific environmental review may be required. It
7 is not anticipated that development would substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design
8 feature or incompatible uses because the County would require review proposed future
9 developments, for consistency with applicable regulations, including the policies in the General
10 Plan, designed to ensure safety, during design review to eliminate any such hazards. (Draft EIR at
11 Pages 3.18-15 to 3.18-16).

12 **Impact TRANS-37d: The project would not cause an effect upon, or a need for new or**
13 **altered maintenance of roads. (Draft EIR, Page 3.18-16).**

14 **1. Less than significant impact.**

15 The proposed project would result in development that would increase VMT along area
16 roadways. These roadways are routinely maintained according to local and County maintenance
17 schedules. Increased VMT would likely result in increased maintenance required for these roads,
18 but the additional wear and tear would not be anticipated to be substantial. For instance, no roadway
19 widening would be required; localized sidewalk and driveway apron improvements and some
20 restriping for turn lanes may be required on a project-specific basis, but these improvements are not
21 anticipated to be extensive enough to warrant major altered maintenance of area roadways. No new
22 roadways are anticipated as a result of implementation of the proposed project. (Draft EIR at Page
23 3.18-16).

24 **M. Tribal Cultural Resources**

25 **Impact TCR-39(a): The proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in**
26 **the significance of a tribal cultural resource listed or eligible for listing in the California**
27 **Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in**
28 **Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k). (Draft EIR, Page 3.19-6).**

1 **1. Less than significant impact.**

2 A Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File search did not identify
3 any TCRs within the planning area, however a records search conducted at the EIC identified listed
4 prehistoric sites that meet the definition of a tribal cultural resource within the planning area.
5 Additionally, consultation with tribal representatives pursuant to SB 18 and AB 52 noted the high
6 potential for resources to be located within the planning area. It is always possible that subsurface
7 excavation activities may encounter previously undiscovered TCRs. Therefore, any unidentified
8 resources could be adversely affected by development under the proposed project and create a
9 potentially significant impact. While the proposed project does not directly propose any adverse
10 changes to any recorded TCRs, future development allowed under the plan could affect known or
11 previously unidentified resources. In addition, the potential for additional undiscovered eligible
12 TCRs to be present within the planning area exists, but varies by location. As future development
13 and infrastructure projects within the planning area are considered by the County, each project will
14 be evaluated for conformance with the General Plan, Code of Ordinances, and other applicable State
15 regulations. Subsequent development and infrastructure projects would also be analyzed for
16 potential environmental impacts, consistent with requirements of CEQA. The General Plan includes
17 policies and programs intended to reduce impacts to and conserve cultural resources, which include
18 TCRs. Policies OS-19.2, OS-19.3, and OS-9.4 help ensure protection and preservation of these
19 resources by implementing a process where proposed developments are reviewed for the possibility
20 of cultural resources being present. Furthermore, future implementing projects are required to
21 implement the County conditions of approval related to discovery of unanticipated cultural
22 resources and human remains during ground disturbance activities. By adhering to these policies, as
23 well as those outlined in SB 18 and AB 52, potential impacts to existing or undiscovered eligible
24 TCRs within the planning area would be reduced to less than significant at the programmatic level,
25 and individual projects would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to analyze impacts. (Draft EIR
26 at Page 3.19-6).

27 **Impact TCR-39(b): The proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in**
28 **the significance of a tribal cultural resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion**

1 **and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in**
2 **subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. (Draft EIR, Page 3.19-6).**

3 **1. Less than significant impact.**

4 The County completed all tribal consultation pursuant to SB 18 and AB 52 in 2017, and has
5 continued to consult with tribal representatives who requested consultation outside of the
6 timeframes established by both laws. At this time, the County, in its capacity as Lead Agency, has
7 not identified or determined any known TCRs pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of
8 Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. that will be adversely impacted by the General Plan Update.
9 While it is impossible to guarantee there would not be significant project level impacts under the
10 proposed project, by adhering to General Plan policies OS-19.2, OS-19.3, and OS-19.4, County
11 conditions of approvals related to discovery of unanticipated cultural resources and human remains,
12 as well as policies outlined in SB 18 and AB 52, potential impacts to existing or undiscovered
13 eligible TCRs within the planning area would be reduced to less than significant at the programmatic
14 level, and individual projects would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by the County to analyze
15 impacts. (Draft EIR at Page 3.19-7).

16 **N. Utilities and Service Systems**

17 **Impact USS-40a: The proposed project would not require or result in the relocation or**
18 **construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage**
19 **systems, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects.**
20 **(Draft EIR, Page 3.20-20).**

21 **1. Less than significant impact.**

22 As shown in Draft EIR Table 3.18-3, EVMWD has a water supply surplus of at least 4,361
23 AFY to meet future demands through 2045. As shown in Draft EIR Table 3.18-8, proposed future
24 buildout of Neighborhoods 2 and 3, which are served by EVMWD, would require a total of
25 approximately 415.1 AFY of water. Therefore, EVMWD is projected to have sufficient water
26 supplies to meet the future demands in the service area, including the proposed project's demands,
27 through the year 2045. As shown in Draft EIR Table 3.18-5, EMWD has the capacity to meet future
28 demands but does not have a surplus of water supply. As shown in Draft EIR Table 3.18-9, the

1 proposed future buildout of Neighborhood 1, which is served by EMWD, would require a total of
2 approximately 685.7 AFY of water. As noted in EMWD’s 2020 UWMP, EMWD plans to increase
3 regional supply reliability through a number of measures: increasing local supplies by increasing
4 local groundwater banking through the Enhanced Recharge and Recovery Program; expanding the
5 desalter program with the Perris II Desalter; and full utilization of recycled water through
6 implementation of indirect potable reuse. In addition to the development of local resources, EMWD
7 promotes the efficient use of water and also promotes reductions in water demands on retail water
8 use through the implementation of local ordinances, conservation programs, and an innovative tiered
9 pricing structure. Reducing demands allows existing and proposed water supplies to stretch farther
10 and reduces the potential for water supply shortages. County water agencies generally operate using
11 a “will serve” capacity by planning and constructing infrastructure and hiring staff based on demand
12 projections for their service areas. At the time of application, future projects would be reviewed by
13 the County for compliance with the policies and actions of the General Plan as well as the County
14 Code of Ordinances.

15 Compliance with County and State-required water management and conservation
16 regulations would assist in reducing the amount of water supplies required by future development.
17 For example, General Plan Policy OS 2.2 encourages the installation of water-conserving systems,
18 such as dry wells and graywater systems, in new developments. The County’s pre-application
19 review procedure (as stipulated by Ordinance 348, Section 18.2.B, Pre-Application Review) and
20 development review process would ensure consistency with these County General Plan policies.
21 Ordinance No. 859 requires new development projects to install water-efficient landscapes, thus
22 limiting water applications and minimizing water runoff and water erosion in landscaped areas. In
23 addition, General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4.17.1D requires compliance with federal, State,
24 and local standards for water conservation within residential, commercial or industrial projects.
25 Prior to approval of any development within the County, a future applicant will be required to submit
26 evidence to Riverside County that all applicable water conservation measures have been met, and
27 that a “can and will serve” letter has been issued by the water purveyor to serve the project as
28 proposed. Therefore, with the County and water agencies review of each future development project,

1 including proof of issuance of a “can and will serve” letter, and compliance with federal, State, and
2 local water conservation standards, water supplies would be adequate to accommodate buildout of
3 the proposed project without the need for new or expanded water facilities. (Draft EIR at Pages
4 3.20-22 to 3.20-23).

5 EMWD has a capacity to treat up to 75 mgd, and EVMWD has a capacity of 9.7 mgd. This
6 increase in wastewater generation represents 0.5 percent of EMWD’s wastewater treatment capacity
7 and 2.7 percent of EVMWD’s wastewater treatment capacity. The planning area currently contains
8 a well-developed regional wastewater system that has sufficient capacity to accommodate the
9 proposed land use changes. Nonetheless, the adequacy of wastewater facilities to serve specific
10 development proposals would be determined through the County’s development review process
11 where necessary infrastructure improvements would be required as conditions of approval. Future
12 development would also be subject to Ordinance No. 592, which sets various standards for sewer
13 use, construction, and industrial wastewater discharges to protect both water quality and the
14 infrastructure conveying and treating wastewater. Therefore, wastewater treatment systems would
15 be adequate to accommodate buildout of the proposed project without the need for new or expanded
16 wastewater treatment facilities. (Draft EIR at Page 3.20-23).

17 The planning area currently contains a well-developed regional water, sewer, and storm
18 network that generally has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed land use changes. New
19 utility infrastructure improvements may be required to provide services to projects that occur under
20 the proposed project. Development within the planning area would be required to comply with the
21 California Regional Water Quality Control Board. As such, each proposed development within the
22 planning area would be required to demonstrate that it would adequately treat any site runoff to
23 ensure the proper quality of the runoff leaving the site; would not increase the quantity, duration, or
24 peak flow of runoff from a site; and would employ proper construction management techniques
25 through the construction process to ensure adequate sediment and erosion control (addressed
26 through the State’s NPDES requirements). The proposed project would not substantially alter
27 existing drainage patterns within the planning area.

28 Additionally, the County Code of Ordinances contains regulations that minimize impervious

1 surfaces, minimize impacts to stormwater runoff, and follow Low Impact Development (LID)
2 requirements. Further, General Plan Policy OS 3.7 would further reduce impacts from surface
3 runoff. Furthermore, development within the watersheds or drainage areas tributary to the planning
4 area that are within the County are also required to adhere to the grading plan check process, and to
5 comply with NPDES requirements and employ source-control BMPs to reduce water quality
6 impacts, and to comply with SWPPP and WQMP requirements. Accordingly, new development
7 within the plan area would not increase flows substantially within the existing drainage system. New
8 drainage infrastructure that would serve future implementing development would be limited to
9 infrastructure necessary to serve future implementing development, and would be appropriately
10 sized and modeled through the existing drainage system to ensure proper sizing to handle
11 stormwater flows. (Draft EIR at Page 3.20-24).

12 **Impact USS-40b: The proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available**
13 **to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and**
14 **multiple dry years. (Draft EIR, Page 3.20-24).**

15 **1. Less than significant impact.**

16 EVMWD would have sufficient water supplies to accommodate the increased water demand
17 associated with the proposed project. EMWD plans to increase regional supply reliability through a
18 number of measures, including increased local groundwater banking, the promotion of efficient
19 water use, and reduction of demands on retail water use through the implementation of local
20 ordinances, conservation programs, and an innovative tiered pricing structure. Reducing demands
21 allows existing and proposed water supplies to stretch farther and reduces the potential for water
22 supply shortages. Compliance with County and State-required water management and conservation
23 regulations would assist in reducing the amount of water supplies required by future development.
24 For example, General Plan Policy OS 2.2 encourages the installation of water-conserving systems,
25 such as dry wells and graywater systems, in new developments. The County's pre-application
26 review procedure (as stipulated by Ordinance 348, Section 18.2.B, Pre-Application Review) and
27 development review process would ensure consistency with these County General Plan policies.
28 Ordinance No. 859 requires new development projects to install water-efficient landscapes, thus

1 limiting water applications and minimizing water runoff and water erosion in landscaped areas.
2 Therefore, with the County and water agencies review of each future development project, including
3 issuance of “can and will serve” letters, and compliance with federal, State, and local water
4 conservation standards, both EMWD and EVMWD would be able to serve development associated
5 with the proposed project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and
6 multiple dry years. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.20-24 to 3.20-25).

7 **Impact USS-41a: The proposed project would not require or result in the construction**
8 **of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing**
9 **facilities, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental**
10 **effects. (Draft EIR, Page 3.20-25).**

11 **1. Less than significant impact.**

12 Future development that occurs in the planning area would connect to the existing municipal
13 wastewater facilities. Buildout of the proposed project would generate an estimated 428,510.9 gpd
14 of wastewater in Neighborhood 1 and 260,002.7 gpd of wastewater in Neighborhoods 2 and 3. This
15 increase in wastewater generation represents 0.5 percent of EMWD’s wastewater treatment capacity
16 and 2.7 percent of EVMWD’s wastewater treatment capacity. The adequacy of wastewater facilities
17 to serve specific development proposals would be determined through the County’s development
18 review process where necessary infrastructure improvements would be required as conditions of
19 approval. Future development would also be subject to Ordinance No. 592, which sets various
20 standards for sewer use, construction, and industrial wastewater discharges to protect both water
21 quality and the infrastructure conveying and treating wastewater. Therefore, wastewater treatment
22 systems would be adequate to accommodate buildout of the proposed project without the need for
23 new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.20-25 to 3.20-26).

24 **Impact USS-41b: The project would result in a determination by the wastewater**
25 **treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve**
26 **the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments. (Draft**
27 **EIR, Page 3.20-26).**

28 **1. Less than significant impact.**

1 The proposed project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment
2 provider that serves or may serve the proposed project that it has adequate capacity to serve the
3 project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. (Draft EIR at Pages
4 3.20-23 to 3.20-26).

5 **Impact USS-42a: The project would not generate solid waste in excess of State or Local**
6 **standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the**
7 **attainment of solid waste reduction goals. (Draft EIR, Page 3.20-26).**

8 **1. Less than significant impact.**

9 As part of its long-range planning and management activities, the Riverside County
10 Department of Waste Resources (RCDWR) ensures that, at any given time, the County has a
11 minimum of 15 years of capacity for future landfill disposal. This 15-year disposal capacity
12 projection is prepared yearly as part of the annual reporting requirements for the Countywide
13 Integrated Waste Management Plan. The most recent 15-year projection submitted to the State
14 Integrated Waste Management Board indicates that no additional capacity is needed to dispose of
15 countywide waste through 2024, with a remaining disposal capacity of 28,561,626 tons in the year
16 2024. While there is adequate permitted landfill capacity to accommodate future growth, the
17 proposed project includes a policy to reduce impacts on solid waste services. The policy (Policy No.
18 10) is related to reducing illegal dumping, including hazardous waste, and increase access to
19 affordable composting and recycling facilities; encourage the appropriate permitting of waste sites
20 and reclamation of cleanup sites. Future development anticipated with the proposed project would
21 also be subject to the RCDWR Design Guidelines for Refuse and Recyclables Collection and
22 Loading Areas, as well as standard-practice Conditions of Approval, including the issuance of a
23 clearance letter by RCDWR. The clearance letter outlines project-specific requirements to ensure
24 that individual project developers provide adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable
25 materials, such as "paper products, glass and green wastes." No building permits would be issued
26 unless/until RCDWR verifies compliance with the clearance letter conditions.

27 Furthermore, all future development involving commercial uses generating more than 4
28 yards per week of solid waste and multi-family complexes with five units or more would be required

1 to have a recycling program in place consistent with the mandatory commercial and multi-family
2 recycling requirements of AB 341. These requirements would apply to all future development
3 activities in the planning area and would reduce the demand on landfills serving the community. In
4 addition, future development would be subject to solid waste-related General Plan EIR Mitigation
5 Measure 4.15.3B (requirement to achieve and maintain a 50 percent reduction in solid waste
6 disposal through source reduction, reuse, recycling and composting per State regulations),
7 Mitigation Measure 4.15.3E (requirement for all future commercial, industrial and multi-family
8 residential development to provide adequate areas for the collection and loading of recyclable
9 materials per AB 1327), and Mitigation Measure 4.15.3F (requirement for all development projects
10 to coordinate with appropriate [Riverside] County departments and/or agencies to ensure that there
11 is adequate waste disposal capacity to meet the waste disposal requirements of the proposed project).
12 Future implementing development projects on the currently vacant sites would also discourage
13 illegal dumping on these vacant sites. Accordingly, future development consistent with the proposed
14 project would not adversely impact existing landfill capacity and future project would be required
15 to comply with applicable State and County standards as discussed above to avoid potential impacts
16 relative to solid waste. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.20-26 to 3.20-28).

17 **Impact USS-42b: The project would comply with federal, State, and local management**
18 **and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County**
19 **Integrated Waste Management Plan). (Draft EIR, Page 3.20-28).**

20 **1. Less than significant impact.**

21 The proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations
22 related to solid wastes including the County Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). The
23 CIWMP was prepared in accordance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989,
24 Chapter 1095 (AB 939). AB 939 requires that local jurisdictions divert at least 50 percent of all solid
25 waste generated by January 1, 2000. The proposed project is not anticipated to conflict with the
26 Riverside County policies, other mandatory policies such as AB 341, or the CIWMP because
27 buildout of the proposed project would comply with requirements regarding solid waste disposal,
28 and future projects would be served by a solid waste disposal provider. (Draft EIR at Page 3.20-28).

1 **Impact USS-43: The project would not impact the following facilities requiring or**
2 **resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, whereby**
3 **the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects:**

4 **A. Electricity**

5 **B. Natural Gas**

6 **C. Communication Systems**

7 **D. Street Lighting**

8 **E. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads**

9 **F. Other governmental services (Draft EIR, Page 3.20-29)**

10 1. Less than significant impact.

11 All new residential and nonresidential development within the planning area would be
12 subject to the latest adopted edition of the Title 24 energy efficiency standards, which are among
13 the most stringent in the U.S. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not result in
14 the unnecessary, wasteful, or inefficient use of energy. The adequacy of utilities to serve specific
15 development proposals would be determined through the County's development review process
16 where any necessary infrastructure improvements would be required as conditions of approval.
17 Applicants associated with future development in the planning area would be required to coordinate
18 with individual utility service providers. In addition, project-specific utility impacts would be
19 evaluated through the CEQA process, and any necessary mitigation measures and/or conditions of
20 approval would be identified on a project level. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.20-29 to 3.20-30).

21 **O. Wildfire**

22 **Impact WILD-44a: The project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency**
23 **response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Draft EIR, Page 3.21-8).**

24 1. Less than significant impact.

25 The proposed project would be consistent with the local emergency response plans as well
26 as the General Plan Safety Element. The proposed project includes a series of General Plan
27 Amendments and does not propose any physical elements that would block or change identified
28 evacuation routes or evacuation plan features. The General Plan Safety Element provides

1 information, policies, and programs directed toward reducing the potential for human injury and
2 loss of life and minimizing property damage and economic and social disruption due to natural and
3 human-made hazards. For example, General Plan Policy S 4.1 requires fire department review to
4 ensure development and construction meets certain standards prior to issuance of a building permit.
5 General Plan Policy S 4.2 through Policy S 4.12 require additional measures such as fuel breaks and
6 vegetation management, appropriate siting, adequate emergency services, landscaping to reduce
7 hazards, certain building and design standards, fuel management practices, roadway compliance,
8 and site design that accounts for terrain that could affect susceptibility to wildfires. Any construction
9 activities associated with future buildout of the proposed project would be required to comply with
10 the California Fire Code's specifications for access and building materials such as tile or other fire-
11 resistant roofing. As part of the County's discretionary review process, the County would review
12 the future projects' application materials to ensure that appropriate emergency ingress and egress
13 would be available to and from the project site and that circulation on the project site was adequate
14 for emergency vehicles. The proposed project would not interfere with any emergency evacuation
15 plan or hinder evacuation along Highway 74 or otherwise conflict with an emergency response plan.
16 (Draft EIR at Pages 3.21-8 to 3.21-9).

17 **Impact WILD-44b: Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, the project would**
18 **not exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant**
19 **concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. (Draft EIR, Page 3.21-**
20 **9).**

21 **1. Less than significant impact.**

22 While the proposed project would allow future development adjacent to and within fire
23 hazard zones, the County's Building and Safety Department has developed a number of protocols
24 and regulations in order to protect development and reduce fire hazard impacts within these areas.
25 The County's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan provides a variety of mitigation strategies to reduce the
26 risks associated with wildland fires. These strategies include wildfire preparedness, prevention, and
27 design features, such as the creation of wildfire protection zones that reduce the risks to citizens and
28 firefighters from fire dangers; maintenance of fire roads throughout the County to provide Fire

1 Department access; fuel reduction projects throughout the County; construction and design
2 standards that include fire prevention features; long-range fire safe planning through code
3 adoption/policies consistent with the Safety Element; maintenance of roads and trees for fire
4 suppression; and more. Additional regulations include Riverside County Ordinance No. 787, which
5 adopts the Uniform Fire Code that requires future development to adhere to standards developed to
6 reduce loss of life and property due to fire risk, and Riverside County Ordinance No. 695, which
7 requires the abatement of hazardous vegetation. Structures constructed as part of buildout of the
8 proposed project would be required to comply with the California Fire Code's requirements for
9 emergency access and types of building materials. The proposed project would also comply with
10 the General Plan requirements.

11 Furthermore, all future discretionary development applications are sent to the RCFD's
12 Office of the County Fire Marshal for review and comment on each individual development's site-
13 specific project design and for recommendations on fire safety and emergency access. Each site-
14 specific project design would be modified as needed prior to approval to ensure compliance with
15 RCFD requirements to ensure that future development would not exacerbate wildfire risks due to
16 slope, prevailing winds, or other factors and, thereby, would not expose future occupants to pollutant
17 concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. The proposed project would
18 allow development clustering to retain slopes in natural open space whenever possible. The
19 proposed project would re-designate land uses, resulting in an overall reduction of Very Low
20 Density Residential uses and an increase of Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential,
21 and Very High Density Residential uses as compared to the existing land use designations. Studies
22 suggest that fire spread and structure loss is more likely to occur in low- to intermediate-density
23 development located among flammable vegetation; therefore clustering and an increase of density
24 would likely reduce fire risk. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.21-9 to 3.21-10).

25 **Impact WILD-44c: The project would not require the installation or maintenance of**
26 **associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or**
27 **other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing**
28 **impacts to the environment. (Draft EIR, Page 3.21-10).**

1 **1. Less than significant impact.**

2 The proposed project would alter development types in the planning area but would not be
3 anticipated to result in a significant increase in the installation or maintenance of new infrastructure.
4 The planning area currently contains a well-developed regional water, sewer, and storm network
5 that, in general, has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed land uses and densities without
6 exacerbating fire risk. Any construction activities associated with future buildout of the proposed
7 project, including new infrastructure improvements, would be required to comply with the
8 California Fire Code’s specifications for access and building materials, such as tile or other fire-
9 resistant roofing, and would be required to comply with required fire protection measures in the
10 General Plan, the ELAP, the MVAP, the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, and the County’s EOP.

11 Specifically, the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan would require infrastructure improvements
12 to include fire prevention features and fuel reduction, long-range fire safe planning through code
13 adoption/policies consistent with the Safety Element of the General Plan, maintenance of fire roads
14 throughout the County to provide Fire Department access, and maintenance of roads and trees for
15 fire suppression. Furthermore, all future discretionary development applications are sent to the
16 RCFD Office of the County Fire Marshal for review and comment on each individual development’s
17 site-specific project design and for recommendations on fire safety and emergency access.
18 Therefore, while project-specific infrastructure may be required, its implementation or maintenance
19 would not be expected to exacerbate fire risk due to compliance with existing fire risk reduction
20 regulations and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR at Pages 3.21-10 to 3.21-11).

21 **Impact WILD-44d: The project would not expose people or structures to significant**
22 **risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-**
23 **fire slope instability, or drainage changes. (Draft EIR, Page 3.21-11).**

24 **1. Less than significant impact.**

25 All future discretionary development applications would be sent to the RCFD Office of the
26 County Fire Marshal for review and comment on each individual development’s site-specific project
27 design and for recommendations on fire safety and emergency access. Each site-specific project
28 design would be modified as needed prior to approval to ensure compliance with Fire Department

1 requirements. Additionally, compliance with General Plan Policy LU 12.1 would apply relevant
2 policies to areas where development is allowed and that contain natural slopes, canyons, or other
3 significant elevation changes, regardless of land use designation. Implementation of this policy
4 would help to ensure slope stability and reduce risk of flooding both during project operation and
5 post-wildfire. Furthermore, future development in the project area would be required to implement
6 the 2015 County of Riverside General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures related to flood risk.
7 Specifically, implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.9.1A, 4.9.1B, 4.9.1C, 4.9.1D, 4.9.2A,
8 4.9.2B, 4.9.2C, and 4.9.2D would ensure that future development projects in the project area would
9 not expose people or structures to significant flood risks, including downslope or downstream
10 flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. (Draft
11 EIR at Pages 3.21-11 to 3.21-12).

12 **Impact WILD-44e: The project would not expose people or structures to significant**
13 **risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. (Draft EIR, Page 3.21-12).**

14 **1. Less than significant impact.**

15 The County's Building and Safety Department has developed a number of protocols and
16 regulations in order to protect development and reduce fire hazard impacts within these areas.
17 Compliance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 787 and No. 695, as well as General Plan Policies
18 S 4.1 through S 4.12, the RCFD Strategic Master Plan, Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, EOP, and the
19 relevant ELAP and MVAP policies would reduce potentially significant impact related to exposure
20 of people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires to a less than
21 significant level. All discretionary development applications are sent to the RCFD for review and
22 comment on each individual development's site-specific project design and for recommendations
23 on fire safety and emergency access. As needed, future project designs would be modified prior to
24 approval to ensure compliance with RCFD requirements, which would ensure that impacts related
25 to risk of loss, injury, or death due to wildland fire are less than significant. (Draft EIR at Page 3.21-
26 12).

27 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following
28 environmental impacts associated with the EIR are potentially significant unless otherwise

1 indicated, but each of these impacts would be avoided or substantially lessened to a level of less
2 than significant through existing regulations, standard conditions, and/or project design features,
3 which are not considered unique mitigation, and/or mitigation measures which are separately
4 specified in Attachment A (Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program) and which is
5 incorporated herein by this reference. Accordingly, the County makes the following findings as to
6 each of the following impacts pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a): "Changes or
7 alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially
8 lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR."

9 **A. Biological Resources**

10 **Impact BIO-7(a): The project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted**
11 **Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local,**
12 **regional, or State conservation plan (Draft EIR, Page 3.4-35).**

13 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

14 **1. Mitigation Measures**

15 Compliance with MM BIO-7(a). MSHCP and SKR HCP Compliance

16 All future implementing projects within the planning area would include payment the
17 Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan (SKR HCP) Mitigation Fee and preparation of
18 a Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Consistency Analysis report that would be
19 submitted to the County to document each individual future implementing project's consistency
20 with the goals, objectives, and requirements of the MSHCP. Additional surveys, studies, permitting,
21 agency coordination, and/or reporting measures may be required for the project to maintain
22 consistency with the MSHCP. Any such additional measures would be identified in the MSHCP
23 Consistency Analysis report prepared for each project. The project applicant for all development
24 projects proposed within the planning area would coordinate with the County and the Western
25 Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) to submit all applicable forms, fees,
26 and/or technical reports detailing any desktop analyses and/or biological field studies or surveys.
27 Conditions that may apply to future development within the planning area include the following:

- 28
- The completion of any required MSHCP wildlife and plant protocol surveys,

1 including riparian birds and burrowing owl.

2 • Evaluation of project impacts to Conservation Areas, Covered Roads, Covered
3 Public Access Activities, Public Quasi-Public Lands, and Riparian/Riverine Areas.

4 • The preparation of Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior
5 Preservation (DBESP), a mitigation plan required for any impacts to MSHCP resources such as
6 Riparian/Riverine habitat, etc., if triggered by the proposed project.

7 • Participation in the Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy
8 (HANS) process to determine conservation requirements if the development project occurs within
9 a Criteria Cell.

10 • Implementation of Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface for
11 projects located in or adjacent to Conservation Areas.

12 • The completion of any required mitigation and Best Management Practice (BMPs)
13 to offset impacts to any MSHCP-protected resources.

14 Development within the planning area would need to demonstrate consistency with the
15 MSHCP and compliance with applicable MSHCP requirements and would also be required to pay
16 the SKR HCP Mitigation Fee. Implementation of Mitigation Measure (MM) BIO-7(a), which
17 includes compliance with all applicable MSHCP and SKR HCP requirements for each future
18 implementing project proposed within the planning area would ensure that each development would
19 have a less than significant impact. (Draft EIR, Page 3.4-35–36.)

20 **Impact BIO-7(b): The project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly**
21 **or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title**
22 **14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of**
23 **Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12) (Draft EIR, Page 3.4-36).**

24 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

25 **2. Mitigation Measures**

26 MM BIO-7(b) For all future development plans within the planning area that could contain
27 special-status species that are listed but not covered by the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation
28 Plan (MSHCP) or Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan (SKR HCP), or habitat

1 conducive to hosting such species, inclusive of foraging, breeding, or dispersal habitats for wildlife,
2 the project applicant shall employ a qualified Biologist approved by the County to prepare a
3 Biological Study to evaluate potential impacts to sensitive biological resources regulated by the
4 United States Wildlife Service (USFWS), the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW),
5 or other local, regional plans or policies that may result from the development of the specific project.
6 The qualified Biologist shall conduct, at a minimum, a site-specific literature review, which shall
7 consider the future development project, site location, Geographic Information System (GIS)
8 information and known sensitive biological resources. The qualified Biologist shall, if the project
9 site has potential support habitat for special-status species or other species protected by federal,
10 State, or local laws or policies, conduct a site visit as part of project review. The review shall assess
11 the site for State or federally listed plants and/or wildlife or other special-status species, aquatic
12 resources, riparian or sensitive natural communities, wildlife movement corridors, or nurseries, or
13 potential nesting or roosting sites, or other regulated biological resources covered by the Endangered
14 Species Act, or California Endangered Species Act (CESA) that could be affected by the proposed
15 project. In some cases, such as a project site that is previously completely developed and contains
16 no potential habitat for protected species, a literature review would be sufficient for the Biologist to
17 make a no impact and/or a less than significant impact determination for all six of the thresholds of
18 significance for biological resources. In other cases, such as project sites that are all or partially
19 undeveloped or contain features that could provide soil substrates for special-status plants or
20 foraging, breeding, nesting, roosting, or dispersal habitats for special-status wildlife, a site survey
21 may be needed to assess the biological conditions on-site. The qualified Biologist employed by each
22 project applicant shall assess potential project impacts to non-listed, non-covered, special-status
23 species, identify threshold of significance with a significance conclusion, and document the findings
24 in a report. Additionally, future implementing projects may be required to incorporate additional
25 mitigation depending on results of such future biological studies.

26 Impacts to individual species shall be determined on a project-by-project basis. All proposed
27 developments within the planning area would be required to comply with applicable MSHCP and
28 SKR HCP requirements. In most cases, each project would complete (at minimum) an MSHCP

1 Consistency Analysis and would pay the SKR HCP per-acre Mitigation Fee. Additional surveys,
2 studies, or documentation may be required, which would be identified in the MSHCP Consistency
3 Analysis completed for each project. If all special-status species with potential to occur on the
4 project site are covered by the MSHCP or SKR HCP, no further work or mitigation would be
5 required beyond those identified in the MSHCP Consistency Analysis. However, it may be possible
6 that future implementing projects in the planning area support habitat for listed species that are not
7 covered by the MSHCP or SKR HCP. If any State- or federally listed, non-covered species is
8 assessed as having potential to occur on a future project site, the project proponent would be required
9 to implement MM BIO-7(b), which requires completion of a biological study to assess potential
10 project impacts to these species, identify threshold of significance with a significance conclusion,
11 and document the findings in a report. Additionally, future implementing projects may be required
12 to incorporate additional mitigation depending on results of such future biological studies. The
13 implementation of MM BIO-7(b) would allow each project proponent to identify potential impacts
14 to State- or federally listed species not covered by the MSHCP and SKR HCP and avoidance or
15 mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. (Draft EIR, Page 3.4-
16 36 – 37).

17 **Impact BIO-7(c): The project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or**
18 **through habitat modifications, or any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-**
19 **status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California**
20 **Department of Fish and Wildlife or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (Draft EIR, Page**
21 **3.4-38).**

22 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

23 **2. Mitigation Measures**

24 Implement MM BIO-7(b)

25 Impacts to individual species shall be determined on a project-by-project basis. Future
26 implementing projects in the planning area would be required to complete (at minimum) an MSHCP
27 Consistency Analysis as described in MM BIO-7(a). Also, as discussed in Impact BIO-7(b), if, in
28 implementing the MSHCP Consistency Analysis, any listed species not covered by the MSHCP or

1 SKR HCP is assessed as having potential to occur on any future implementing project in the
2 planning area, the project proponent would be required to prepare a biological study to analyze
3 potential impacts to listed, non-covered species, as described in MM BIO-7(b). However, it may be
4 possible that future implementing projects in the planning area support habitat for non-listed,
5 special-status species that are not covered by the MSHCP or SKR HCP. If any non-listed, non-
6 covered species is assessed as having potential to occur on a future project site, the project proponent
7 would be required to implement MM BIO-7(b), which is completion of a biological study to assess
8 potential project impacts to these species, identify threshold of significance with a significance
9 conclusion, and document the findings in a report. Additionally, future implementing projects may
10 be required to incorporate additional mitigation depending on results of such future biological
11 studies. The implementation of these measures would allow each project proponent to identify
12 potential impacts to non-listed, non-covered, special-status species and avoidance and mitigation
13 measures that would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. (Draft EIR, Page 3.4-38 – 39).

14 **Impact BIO-7(d): The project could interfere substantially with the movement of any**
15 **native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or**
16 **migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites (Draft EIR,**
17 **Page 3.4-40).**

18 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

19 **2. Mitigation Measures**

20 Implement MM BIO-7(b) and MM BIO-7(c)

21 MM BIO-7(c) Protection of Nesting Birds: For all future development plans within the
22 planning area that contain habitats or features that could provide nesting habitat for bird species
23 protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Fish and Game Code, the following
24 measures shall apply:

25 1. Removal of native vegetation shall be limited to only those necessary to construct a
26 proposed future project as reflected in the relevant project approval documents.

27 2. To the extent possible, vegetation shall be removed outside of the avian nesting
28 season, or from October 1 through January 31.

1 3. If a proposed future project requires vegetation to be removed during the nesting
2 season, or between February 1 and September 30, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted 7
3 days prior to tree removal to determine whether or not active nests are present.

4 4. If an active nest is located during a pre-construction survey, a qualified Biologist
5 shall determine an appropriately sized avoidance buffer based on the species and anticipated
6 disturbance level. A qualified Biologist shall delineate the avoidance buffer using Environmentally
7 Sensitive Area (ESA) fencing, pin flags, and or yellow caution tape. The buffer zone shall be
8 maintained around the active nest site(s) until the young have fledged and are foraging
9 independently. No construction activities or construction foot traffic is allowed to occur within the
10 avoidance buffer(s).

11 5. The qualified Biologist shall monitor the active nest during construction activities to
12 prevent any potential impacts that may result from the construction of the proposed project until the
13 young have fledged.

14 Development in the planning area would not interfere with any existing or proposed linkages
15 between existing MSHCP conservation areas. Future development within the planning area has the
16 potential to further impede the movement of wildlife. The construction of new roadways, in
17 particular, could interfere with wildlife movement. Any impacts to wildlife movement would need
18 to be determined on a case-by-case basis. If any features that facilitate wildlife movements are
19 identified on a site, the project proponent would be required to implement MM BIO-7(b), which
20 requires completion of a biological study to assess potential project impacts to these resources,
21 identification of the threshold of significance with a significance conclusion, and documentation of
22 the findings in a report. Additionally, future implementing projects may be required to incorporate
23 additional mitigation depending on results of such future biological studies. The implementation of
24 MM BIO-7(b) would allow each project proponent to identify potential impacts to wildlife
25 movements and avoidance or mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to less than significant
26 levels. Additionally, implementation of future projects in the planning area may impact breeding
27 and/or nesting activities of protected birds. Construction activities that occur during the avian
28 nesting season (February 1 to August 31) could disturb nesting sites for bird species protected under

1 the Fish and Game Code or MBTA. The removal of trees and other vegetation during the nesting
2 season could result in direct harm to nesting birds, while noise, light, and other man-made
3 disturbances may cause nesting birds to abandon their nests, which would require MM BIO-7(c)
4 (Draft EIR, Page 3.4-40).

5 **Impact BIO-7(e): The project could have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian**
6 **habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and**
7 **regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or United States Fish and**
8 **Wildlife Service. (Draft EIR, Page 3.4-41).**

9 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

10 **2. Mitigation Measures**

11 Implement MM BIO-7(a) and MM BIO-7(b)

12 The planning area may support natural vegetation communities that are considered sensitive
13 by CDFW. Sensitive natural vegetation communities ranked S1 to S3 are protected under CEQA
14 and subject to its environmental review processes. Project sites in the planning area that support
15 sensitive natural vegetation communities could potentially cause impacts to these communities. Any
16 proposed development within the planning area that may impact sensitive natural communities shall
17 be required to implement MM BIO-7(b).

18 Additionally, the planning area contains several drainages where riparian vegetation can be
19 found. Riparian/Riverine habitat is protected under the MSHCP. Development within the planning
20 area may have direct impacts resulting in the loss of riparian vegetation and may adversely impact
21 downstream water quality. Potential impacts to riparian habitat within the planning area are
22 regulated by the MSHCP and CDFW and mitigation would be required. The qualified Biologist
23 employed by each project applicant shall assess potential project impacts to Riparian/Riverine
24 habitats. Additional studies, documentation, or permitting, including preparation of Determination
25 of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP), may be required, depending on the
26 results of the MSHCP Consistency Analysis prepared for each project. During implementation of
27 the biological study performed under MM BIO-7(b), the qualified Biologist employed by each
28 project applicant shall assess potential project impacts to sensitive vegetation communities, identify

1 threshold of significance with a significance conclusion, and document the findings in a report.
2 Additionally, future implementing projects may be required to incorporate additional mitigation
3 depending on results of such future biological studies. (Draft EIR, Page 3.4-41–42).

4 **Impact BIO-7(f): The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on State or**
5 **federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.)**
6 **through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means (Draft EIR, Page**
7 **3.4-42).**

8 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

9 **2. Mitigation Measures**

10 Implement MM BIO-7(d) and MM BIO-7(e)

11 MM BIO-7(d) Determination of the Extent of Impacts to Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands

12 Any proposed development within the planning area that could impact any potentially
13 jurisdictional waters or wetlands shall prepare a separate jurisdictional delineation report to establish
14 the jurisdictional limits of any potentially regulated waters/wetlands.

15 MM BIO-7(e) Apply for Permits from Regulatory Agencies

16 Any project proponent that proposes impacts to jurisdictional waters or wetlands within the
17 planning area shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) regarding
18 a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement Permit, the United States Army Corps of Engineers
19 (USACE) regarding a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 Permit, and the Regional Water Quality
20 Control Board (RWQCB) regarding a CWA Section 401 Certification. Any project proponent that
21 proposes take of federal or State listed or candidate species that are not covered under the MSHCP
22 shall consult with the CDFW and/or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), as
23 applicable, regarding an Incidental Take Permit pursuant to Section 2081 of the California
24 Endangered Species Act (CESA) or Sections 7 or 10 of the federal Endangered Species Act. The
25 project applicant shall be required to obtain these permits as a condition of approval and prior to the
26 issuance of any grading, construction or building permits from the County and prior to the
27 commencement of any grading or construction activities. The project applicant shall implement the
28 mitigation measures as prescribed in the permits.

1 The planning area contains several drainages which may be considered jurisdictional by the
2 USACE, RWQCB, or CDFW and would meet definitions of State- or federally protected waters.
3 Development within the planning area could result in direct impacts to these potentially
4 jurisdictional drainages through the loss/modification of these features, as well as have adverse
5 impacts on downstream water quality. If any potentially jurisdictional drainage is identified, the
6 project proponent would be required to implement MM BIO-7(b), which requires completion of a
7 biological study to assess potential project impacts to the resource, identification of the threshold of
8 significance with a significance conclusion, and documentation of the findings in a report.
9 Additionally, future implementing projects may be required to incorporate additional permitting and
10 mitigation depending on results of such future biological studies. The implementation of MM BIO-
11 7(b) would allow each project proponent to identify potential impacts to wildlife movements and
12 avoidance or mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. If
13 potentially jurisdictional, State- or federally protected waters or wetlands are identified on any future
14 implementing project in the planning area during the implementation of MM BIO-7(a), the project
15 applicant shall employ a qualified Biologist to implement MM BIO-7(d) and BIO-7(e). These
16 measures include the delineation of the jurisdictional limits of any potentially regulated waters or
17 wetlands and the acquisition of permits from the respective regulatory agencies (USACE, RWQCB,
18 or CDFW). Mitigation for impacts to State or federally protected waters or wetlands, such as
19 measures pertaining to on-site habitat restoration or off-site habitat acquisition, shall be prescribed
20 in the regulatory permits. (Draft EIR, Page 3.4-42–43).

21 **Impact BIO-7(g): The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances**
22 **protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. (Draft EIR,**
23 **Page 3.4-44).**

24 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

25 **2. Mitigation Measures**

26 Implement MM BIO-7(b)

27 Oak woodland resources may be located on parcels in the planning area that would be
28 protected by County Oak Tree Management Guidelines. These guidelines require that a biological

1 study be performed by a qualified Biologist for all applications on properties that contain oak trees.
2 If any oak tree resources are present, the project proponent would be required to implement MM
3 BIO-7(b), which requires completion of a biological study to provide an inventory of on-site
4 vegetation, assessment of potential project impacts to the oaks, identification of the threshold of
5 significance with a significance conclusion, and documentation of the findings in a report.
6 Additionally, future implementing projects may be required to incorporate additional mitigation
7 depending on results of such future biological studies. The implementation of MM BIO-7(b) would
8 allow each project proponent to identify potential impacts to oak tree resources and avoidance or
9 mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

10 • Compliance with the Multipurpose Open Space Element of the General Plan is
11 consistent with LU 9.2, ELAP 17.1, MVAP 17.6.

12 • The biological study analyzing impacts on special-status species would be consistent
13 with MVAP 17.3, MVAP 17.6, ELAP 17.8, ELAP 17.7, ELAP 17.4, ELAP 17.1, OS 18.1, LU 9.2.

14 • Compliance with the MSHCP would also be consistent with OS 17.1, OS 17.2, OS
15 18.1, ELAP 17.1, MVAP 17.6.

16 • The Oak Tree policy is consistent with ELAP 16.1 and MVAP 16.1.

17 Riverside Ordinance No. 559 regulates the removal of native trees in the unincorporated area
18 of the County that is above 5,000 feet in elevation. The planning area lies below 5,000 feet in
19 elevation. Therefore, this ordinance would not be applicable to the planning area. (Draft EIR, Page
20 3.4-44-45).

21 **B. Geology and Soils**

22 **Impact GEO-12a: The project could be subject to seismic-related ground failure,**
23 **including liquefaction. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-16).**

24 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

25 **2. Mitigation Measures**

26 MM GEO-12a Prior to issuance of the first building permit for each development within the
27 Community Plan area, the project applicant shall submit a design-level geotechnical report to the
28 County of Riverside Building and Safety Department for review and approval. The design-level

1 investigation shall be prepared in accordance with California Building Standards Code (CBC) and
2 County of Riverside Code of Ordinance Standards and address the potential for seismic, soils, or
3 other geological hazards to occur on-site and identify abatement measures to reduce the potential
4 for such an event to acceptable levels. The recommendations of the approved design-level
5 geotechnical report shall be incorporated into the project plans.

6 The planning area is not located within a liquefaction zone as mapped by the California
7 Geological Survey and Riverside County. However, as shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 3.7-1, portions
8 of the planning area are mapped as having a very low to moderate susceptibility to liquefaction.
9 Areas of moderate liquefaction susceptibility are located between Ellis Avenue and Margarth Street,
10 as well as the area surrounding Conrad Avenue. Areas of very low to moderate liquefaction
11 susceptibility are scattered throughout the planning area. Additionally, as shown in the Draft EIR
12 Exhibit 3.7-1, an area mapped as having very high liquefaction susceptibility is located adjacent to
13 Highway 74 within the planning area south of Conrad Avenue near the City of Lake Elsinore. The
14 proposed project would not include the development or redevelopment of any properties. However,
15 future development that occurs within the Community Plan area may be subject to liquefaction and
16 other adverse effects related to seismic ground failure. Existing programs and policies would serve
17 to reduce risk associated with seismic hazards and liquefaction. However, to address all significant
18 impacts related to seismic hazards and liquefaction within the plan area, site-specific geotechnical
19 reports should be prepared for all development under the Highway 74 Community Plan, pursuant to
20 Mitigation Measure (MM) GEO-12a. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-16).

21 **Impact GEO-13a: The project could be subject to strong seismic ground shaking.**
22 **(Draft EIR, Page 3.7-17).**

23 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

24 **2. Mitigation Measures**

25 Implement MM GEO-12a.

26 Major regional faults located within the planning area are capable of producing violent
27 ground shaking, and a major seismic event is likely during the operational lifetime of development
28 and redevelopment projects undertaken under the Community Plan. Strong to violent seismic

1 shaking could cause serious structural damage to buildings not engineered and constructed to
2 comply with the current CBC and could cause extensive nonstructural damage to buildings in the
3 plan area. Existing federal and State programs, including the National Earthquake Hazards
4 Reduction Program (NEHRP), the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, the Seismic
5 Hazards Mapping Act, and the CBC are designed to provide current information detailing seismic
6 hazards, impose regulatory requirements regarding geotechnical and soils investigations, provide
7 limitations on the locations of structures for human habitation, impose requirements for hazard
8 notices to potential users, and establish structural standards for requirements for buildings and
9 grading projects. Existing programs and policies would serve to reduce risk associated with seismic
10 hazards. However, to address all significant impacts related to seismic hazards within the planning
11 area, site-specific geotechnical reports should be prepared for all development under the Highway
12 74 Community Plan. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-17).

13 **Impact GEO-14a: The project could be located on a geologic unit or soil that is**
14 **unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-**
15 **or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-17).**

16 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

17 **2. Mitigation Measures**

18 Implement MM GEO-12a.

19 The planning area currently includes urban development as well as large undeveloped
20 properties. Portions of the planning area have been developed over a relatively long history, with
21 some of the existing development predating current geotechnical engineering requirements. In
22 addition, the large, previously undeveloped parcels in the planning area are underlain by non-
23 engineered soils, and these parcels may potentially contain unstable geologic units or soils. The
24 Community Plan area may be subject to differential settlements and other adverse effects related to
25 unstable soils.

26 Most of the planning area is not prone to slope instability. There are a few isolated areas
27 along the Highway 74 corridor that are mapped as having high susceptibility to seismically induced
28 landslides and rockfalls. There are additional areas within the Highway 74 corridor that are mapped

1 as having low to locally moderate susceptibility to seismically induced landslides and rockfalls.
2 Areas with high susceptibility to seismically induced landslides and rockfalls are located primarily
3 near Meadowbrook, in the undeveloped hillside areas north of Mountain Avenue and extending to
4 Gardenias Street in Moreno Valley, as well as a small area south of the Meadowbrook RV Park.
5 The proposed project would comply with Policy LU 12.1, which contains certain requirements for
6 development in areas with natural slopes, canyons, or significant elevation changes. To address all
7 significant impacts related to geological hazards within the plan area, site-specific geotechnical
8 reports should be prepared for all development under the Highway 74 Community Plan.
9 Furthermore, implementation of MM GEO-12a would reduce the risks of on- or off-site landslide,
10 lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards to a level of less than significant. (Draft EIR, Page
11 3.7-17 – 18).

12 **Impact GEO-15a: The project could be located on a geologic unit or soil that is**
13 **unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in**
14 **ground subsidence. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-19).**

15 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

16 **2. Mitigation Measures**

17 Implement MM GEO-12a.

18 Although there are areas of liquefaction, there are no areas with documented subsistence
19 within or near the planning area. The nearest area with documented subsidence is southwest of the
20 City of Moreno Valley, more than 10 miles northeast of the planning area. Previously undeveloped
21 parcels in the planning area are underlain by non-engineered soils, and these parcels may potentially
22 contain unstable geologic units or soils. Future development that occurs within the planning area
23 may be subject to differential settlements and other adverse effects related to unstable soils.
24 Implementation of MM GEO-12a would reduce this impact. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-19).

25 **Impact GEO-16a: The project could be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche,**
26 **mudflow, or volcanic hazard. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-19).**

27 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

28 **2. Mitigation Measures**

1 Implement MM GEO-12a.

2 Because of the project site's distance from Lake Elsinore, the proposed project would not be
3 subject to impacts associated with a seiche. Likewise, the proposed project's distance from the
4 Pacific Ocean (48 miles) would preclude any impacts associated with tsunamis. Furthermore, there
5 are no volcanic hazards in western Riverside County. Future development within the Community
6 Plan area would not be subject to seiches or tsunamis or volcanic hazards.

7 The planning area contains areas that may be susceptible to slope instability. Areas with high
8 susceptibility to seismically induced landslides and rockfalls are located in the ELAP area, primarily
9 north of Meadowbrook, in the undeveloped hillside areas north of Mountain Avenue and extending
10 to Gardenias Street in Moreno Valley, as well as a small area south of the Meadowbrook RV Park
11 (Draft EIR, Exhibit 3.7-4). There are no areas within the MVAP that are highly susceptible to
12 seismically induced landslides and rockfalls (Draft EIR, Exhibit 3.7-3). Future development within
13 the planning area would conform with General Plan Policy LU 12.1; which would restrict
14 development on hillside areas and reduce potential impacts. Future development that occurs within
15 the planning area would be required to comply with the requirements and restrictions for
16 development within areas with natural slopes, canyons, or significant elevation changes, in
17 accordance with the General Plan Policy LU 12.1. Therefore, the proposed project would not result
18 in mudflow hazards. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-19 – 20).

19 **Impact GEO-17a: The project could change topography or ground surface relief**
20 **features. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-20).**

21 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

22 **2. Mitigation Measures**

23 Implement MM GEO-12a.

24 Future development that occurs within the planning area may propose changing topography
25 or ground surface relief features. Pursuant to MM GEO-12a and the County of Riverside standards,
26 future development that occurs within the planning area will be designed in conformance with
27 recommendations made in the design-level geotechnical report. The design-level geotechnical
28 report would include design and construction measures to ensure that topography or ground surface

1 relief features do not create a hazard. Additionally, compliance with the Grading Development
2 Standards of the County of Riverside would be assured through County review of a grading plans.
3 The project would be required to conform to County design standards for grading and site design,
4 which would result in a safe design of stable slopes and topography for future development that
5 occurs within the Community Plan area. Furthermore, implementation of MM GEO-12a would
6 reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-20).

7 **Impact GEO-17b: The project could create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher**
8 **than 10 feet. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-21).**

9 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

10 **2. Mitigation Measures**

11 Implement MM GEO-12a.

12 Future development that occurs within the planning area may propose creating cut or fill
13 slopes. Pursuant to MM GEO-12a and the County of Riverside standards, future development that
14 occurs within the planning area would be designed in conformance with recommendations made in
15 the design-level geotechnical report. The design-level geotechnical report would include design and
16 construction measures to stabilize on-site soils. Additionally, compliance with the Grading
17 Development Standards of the County of Riverside would be assured through County review of
18 grading plans. The project would be required to conform to County design standards for grading
19 and site design, which would result in a safe design of stable slopes for future development that
20 occurs within the Community Plan area. Furthermore, implementation of MM GEO-12a would
21 reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-21).

22 **Impact GEO-17c: The project could result in grading that affects or negates subsurface**
23 **sewage disposal systems. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-21).**

24 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

25 **2. Mitigation Measures**

26 Implement MM GEO-12a.

27 Impacts associated with subsurface sewage disposal systems may occur if the grading were
28 not considered in the design and construction of development in the planning area. Implementation

1 of MM GEO-12a would reduce this potential impact related to subsurface sewage disposal systems
2 to a less than significant level by requiring geotechnical investigations to identify potential hazards
3 for new development and by requiring that the recommendations from a licensed professional be
4 implemented to reduce the identified hazard. For new development, future problems with grading
5 that affects subsurface sewage disposal systems would be prevented through proper site
6 investigation, soils testing, foundation design, and quality assurance during grading operations as
7 required by the Riverside County Building Code, the County of Riverside General Plan, and MM
8 GEO-12a. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-21 – 22).

9 **Impact GEO-18b: The project may be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section**
10 **1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to**
11 **life or property. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-23).**

12 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

13 **2. Mitigation Measures**

14 Implement MM GEO-12a.

15 The planning area includes areas with potentially expansive soils. Expansive soils can be
16 found in hillside areas as well as low-lying alluvial basins. Expansion testing and mitigation are
17 required by current grading and building codes. Special engineering designs are used effectively to
18 alleviate problems caused by expansive soils. These designs include the use of reinforcing steel in
19 foundations, drainage control devices, over-excavation, and backfilling with non-expansive soil. For
20 new development, future problems with expansive soils can be largely prevented through proper
21 site investigation, soils testing, foundation design, and quality assurance during grading operations
22 as required by the Riverside County Building Code and the latest California Building Code. Active
23 enforcement, peer review, and homeowner involvement are required to maintain these standards.
24 Homeowners are important because moisture control and modified drainage can minimize the
25 effects of expansive soils. Homeowners should be educated about the importance of maintaining a
26 constant level of moisture below their foundation. Excessive swelling and shrinkage cycles can
27 result in distress to improvements and structures. Although expansive soils are now routinely
28 alleviated through the Riverside County Building Code, problems related to past inadequate codes

1 may appear. Mitigation for expansive soils can be achieved through reinforcement of the existing
2 foundation or, alternatively, through the excavation and removal of expansive soils in an affected
3 area. Implementation of MM GEO-12a would reduce the potential impacts related to expansive soils
4 to a less than significant level by requiring geotechnical investigations to identify geological
5 hazards, including those related to expansive soils, for new development and by requiring that the
6 recommendations from a licensed professional be implemented to reduce the identified geological
7 hazard. For new development and redevelopment that occurs in the planning area, future problems
8 with expansive soils would be prevented through proper site investigation, soils testing, foundation
9 design, and quality assurance during grading operations as required by the Riverside County
10 Building Code, the County of Riverside General Plan, and MM GEO-12a. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-23).

11 **Impact GEO-18c: The project may have soils incapable of adequately supporting use**
12 **of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for**
13 **the disposal of wastewater. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-24).**

14 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

15 **2. Mitigation Measures**

16 Implement MM GEO-12a.

17 Impacts associated with septic tanks or alternative wastewater may occur if the ability of the
18 soils to support alternative wastewater disposal systems were not considered in the design and
19 construction of development in the planning area. Implementation of MM GEO-12a would reduce
20 this potential impact related to alternative wastewater systems to a less than significant level by
21 requiring geotechnical investigations to identify potential hazards for new development and by
22 requiring that the recommendations from a licensed professional be implemented to reduce the
23 identified hazard. For new development, future problems with alternative wastewater systems and
24 soils would be prevented through proper site investigation, soils testing, foundation design, and
25 quality assurance during grading operations as required by the Riverside County Building Code, the
26 County of Riverside General Plan, and MM GEO-12a. Additionally, new development would
27 comply with Policy ELAP 5.11, Policy MVAP 3.11, and Policy 11 of the Highway 74 Community
28 Plan, which encourages the connection of municipal water and wastewater services to community

1 residents and facilities to reduce reliance on septic systems in order to limit groundwater
2 contamination. Compliance with the applicable Riverside County Building Code, the General Plan,
3 MVAP, ELAP, and the Highway 74 Community Plan, as well as implementation of MM GEO-12a,
4 would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-24).

5 **Impact GEO-19a: The project would be impacted by or result in an increase in wind**
6 **erosion and blowsand, either on or off-site. (Draft EIR, Page 3.7-24).**

7 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

8 **2. Mitigation Measures**

9 Implement MM GEO-12a.

10 The planning area has a moderate wind erodibility rating but does not contain any areas that
11 are vulnerable to high or very high wind erosion susceptibility. Future development that occurs
12 within the planning area would be located within an area with moderate wind erosion susceptibility
13 and may require grading operations including excavation and fill in order to provide adequate
14 support for the development. Removal of existing vegetation or topsoil could indirectly result in an
15 increase in wind erosion or blowsand. Future development with the potential to be impacted by or
16 result in an increase in wind erosion or blowsand would be required to comply with Ordinance No.
17 484, which requires protective actions from landowners disturbing sandy or sandy loam soils to
18 prevent substantial quantities of soil from being deposited on public roads and private property.
19 Ordinance No. 484 identifies certain restrictions on land disturbance activities within these areas
20 and identifies procedures necessary to obtain a valid permit for such activities. As needed, an erosion
21 control plan would be prepared and submitted to the County with future discretionary applications
22 to identify methods by which potential soil runoff during rain events and erosion hazards would be
23 minimized to ensure that no adverse effects on water quality occur to downstream properties or
24 water bodies. Whenever a division of land is proposed in an area that is subject to wind erosion, the
25 soil erosion control requirements identified in Ordinance No. 460 would apply. (Draft EIR, Page
26 3.7-24–25).

27 **C. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

28 **Impact GHG-20a: The project could generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly**

1 or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. (Draft EIR, Page 3.8-
2 36).

3 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

4 **2. Mitigation Measures**

5 MM GHG-20a Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant/developers shall
6 prepare and submit documentation to the County of Riverside that demonstrates that proposed
7 development projects in the planning area that are determined to generate 3000 metric tons (MT) of
8 carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) or more per year, and which are not exempt from CEQA, will
9 achieve a score of 100 points or greater through the implementation of measures included in the
10 County of Riverside Climate Action Plan (CAP) Screening Tables, or shall otherwise mitigate
11 significant GHG emissions per County of Riverside-approved methodologies included in the CAP.
12 The project applicant shall prepare documentation consistent with the Screening Tables or other
13 County of Riverside CAP requirements applicable at the time of submittal. This measure will be
14 enforced as a condition of approval implemented by the County of Riverside.

15 The County of Riverside has developed a CAP that meets the description of mitigation found
16 in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(3) and Section 15183.5 and allows for streamlined
17 CEQA compliance for new development projects. Additionally, the CAP meets the South Coast Air
18 Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Draft Guidance Document Interim GHG Threshold
19 requirements for Tier 2 review under CEQA. The County of Riverside CAP was developed
20 consistent with AB 32, SB 32, and EO S-3-05, and supports State and international efforts to
21 stabilize climate change. The project's estimated GHG emissions are provided for informational
22 purposes only.

23 Per the CAP, development projects that are determined to be above the 3,000 MT CO₂e
24 annual emissions level are required to quantify and disclose the anticipated GHG emissions of the
25 proposed development. Future development projects envisioned under the proposed project would
26 be required to estimate their emissions and comply with the applicable requirements in the CAP,
27 consistent with mitigation measure MM GHG-20a.

28 Quantification of Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Informational Purposes

1 Table 3.8-2 of the Draft EIR presents the proposed project’s construction-related GHG
2 emissions by construction year and total amortized construction emissions. Table 3.8-3 of the Draft
3 EIR presents the proposed project’s annual operational emissions during full operation in 2040,
4 along with the amortized construction emissions. As shown in the tables, the proposed project’s
5 annual operational plus amortized construction emissions would generate an estimated 258,262 MT
6 CO₂e per year, which exceeds the applicable CAP significance threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per
7 year. Thus, GHG emissions generated by the proposed project would be considered potentially
8 significant.

9 Projects that exceed the 3,000 MT CO₂e annual emissions threshold are required to mitigate
10 emissions. The CAP Screening Tables provide a selection of mitigation measures that reduce a
11 project’s GHG emissions to support the County and State GHG emissions reductions goals and
12 targets. Table 1 of the CAP includes mitigation measures specific to residential developments, while
13 Table 2 outlines mitigation measures for commercial developments and public facilities. There are
14 mitigation measures included to improve the energy efficiency for the building envelope, indoor
15 space efficiencies, measures to improve clean energy utilization, water conservation measures,
16 waste to landfill reduction, and measures to promote the use of alternative transportation and
17 sustainable development design, such as mixed-use development and increased residential density.
18 Projects implementing the wide-ranging mitigation measures included in the CAP Screening Tables
19 would also be consistent with the GHG goals and policies included in the General Plan.

20 Implementation of the proposed project would increase the development intensities near
21 Highway 74, a major transportation corridor. The guiding principles of the proposed project include
22 encouraging consolidation of parcels to promote better land use development and project design,
23 encouraging access to Highway 74 through frontage/service road development, coordinating
24 development with the RTA to ensure bus routes are provided to community residents, including
25 live-work spaces, promoting a reduction in VMT, promoting planned neighborhoods that provide
26 housing, goods and services, open space, and multimodal transportation options within proximity
27 to each other. The current Community Plan policies also state that developments should be
28 encouraged to design and locate convenient pedestrian and bicycle connections, bus, or shuttle

1 connections that increase connections to adjacent and nearby communities and cities, businesses,
2 parks and open space areas, and new transit access opportunities. The guiding principles of the
3 proposed project are generally consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS and the GHG reduction policies
4 included in the County General Plan.

5 In jurisdictions where a qualified GHG emission reduction strategy has been reviewed under
6 CEQA and adopted by decision-makers, compliance with the GHG emission reduction strategy
7 would reduce a project's contribution to cumulative and project-level GHG emission impacts to a
8 less than significant level. The County of Riverside CAP was prepared in conformance with State
9 CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 and is considered a qualified reduction strategy. To ensure
10 consistency with the County of Riverside CAP and that the GHG emissions of future development
11 projects envisioned under the proposed project are less than significant, MM GHG-20a is required
12 for future development projects in the planning area. Future implementing projects would also be
13 required to comply with the CAP's measure of Clean Energy (R2-CE1) that requires the
14 incorporation of on-site renewable energy production (including but not limited to solar) for any
15 tentative tract map, plot plan, or conditional use permit that proposes to add more than 75 new
16 dwelling units of residential development or one or more new buildings totaling more than 100,000
17 gross square feet of commercial, office, industrial, or manufacturing development.

18 With implementation of MM GHG-20a, the proposed project would be consistent with
19 County of Riverside CAP, and therefore the proposed project and future development projects in
20 the planning area that comply with MM GHG-20a would have less than significant cumulative and
21 project-level GHG emissions. With implementation of MM GHG-20a, the proposed project would
22 also develop land uses consistent with the goals of the County of Riverside General Plan and CAP,
23 and the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. Through compliance with the CAP, the proposed project
24 would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact
25 on the environment, and would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an
26 agency, adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. (Draft EIR, Page 3.8-35-45).

27 **Impact GHG-20b: The project could conflict with an applicable plan, policy or**
28 **regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. (Draft EIR,**

1 **Page 3.8-36).**

2 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

3 **2. Mitigation Measures**

4 Implement MM GHG-20a.

5 See discussion under Impact GHG-20a above.

6 **D. Noise**

7 Impact NOI-27a

8 The project could generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise
9 levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise
10 ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. (Draft EIR, 3.13-20).

11 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

12 **2. Mitigation Measures**

13 MM NOI-27a Construction Noise Mitigation Plan

14 Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, a note shall be provided on grading and
15 building plans indicating that during grading and construction, the property owner/developer shall
16 be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-
17 related noise:

- 18 • The construction contractor shall limit construction activities to the daytime hours of
19 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday.
- 20 • The construction contractor shall ensure that all internal combustion engine-driven
21 equipment is equipped with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- 22 • The construction contractor shall locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far
23 as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction
24 project area. In addition, the project contractor shall place such stationary construction equipment
25 so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site.
- 26 • The construction contractor shall prohibit unnecessary idling (no more than 5
27 minutes) of internal combustion engines.
- 28 • The construction contractor shall, to the maximum extent practical, locate on-site

1 equipment staging areas to maximize the distance between construction-related noise sources and
2 noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.

3 • For construction activity within 50 feet of any noise-sensitive receptors, a temporary
4 noise barrier shall be installed by the applicant/developer. This temporary noise barrier shall be
5 installed prior to the onset of construction activities that would require the use of heavy construction
6 equipment. The barrier shall be located between the construction zone and all adjacent sensitive
7 receptor land uses. The temporary sound barrier shall provide a reduction in noise that shall meet
8 the County's construction noise threshold of 55 dBA Lmax as measured at the façade of the sensitive
9 receptor land uses. The noise barrier shall be a minimum height of 8 feet and be free of gaps and
10 holes and must achieve a Sound Transmission Class (STC) of 35 or greater. The barrier can be either
11 (a) a 0.75-inch-thick plywood wall OR (b) a hanging blanket/curtain with a surface density or at
12 least 2 pounds per square foot. For either configuration, the construction side of the barrier shall
13 have an exterior lining of sound absorption material with a Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC)
14 rating of 0.7 or higher.

15 • The construction contractor shall designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would
16 be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance
17 coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., bad muffler, etc.) and shall require
18 that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem.

19 • These measures may only be granted an exception if an application for construction-
20 related exception is made to and considered by the Building and Safety Department in accordance
21 with Section 9.52.070 of the Municipal Code.

22 Operational Noise Reduction Plan

23 Prior to issuance of building permits, the property owner/developer shall be responsible to
24 implement the following measures to limit on-site operational stationary noise source impacts:

25 • Any proposed development project that would include noise-sensitive land use
26 development along noise impacted roadway segments identified in Table 3.13-7 shall demonstrate
27 compliance with Noise Policies N 1.3, N 1.7, and N 2.2 of the County's Noise Element by submitting
28 a final acoustical report prepared to the satisfaction of the Planning Director that identifies any

1 necessary design features that would address potential traffic noise impacts to proposed noise-
2 sensitive land uses.

3 • Any proposed development projects that include parking structures, terminals, or
4 loading docks of commercial or industrial land uses shall demonstrate compliance with Noise Policy
5 N 4.8 of the County's Noise Element by submitting a final acoustical report prepared to the
6 satisfaction of the Planning Director that identifies design measures to adequately minimize the
7 potential noise impacts of vehicles on the site to adjacent land uses.

8 • For any future development project that would include stationary noise sources, such
9 as parking areas within 300 feet or mechanical systems within 50 feet of a residential receptor, the
10 property owner/developer shall submit a final acoustical report prepared to the satisfaction of the
11 Planning Director to address potential stationary source noise impacts to nearby residences. Noise
12 reduction design features may include, but are not limited to, locating stationary noise sources on
13 the site to be shielded by structures (buildings, enclosures, or sound walls) or by using equipment
14 that has a quieter rating.

15 • These reports shall demonstrate that the proposed project incorporates sufficient
16 noise attenuation features if needed to meet the County's exterior and interior noise standards. The
17 individual project owner/developer shall submit the noise mitigation report to the Planning Director
18 for review and approval. Upon approval by the County, the proposed acoustical design features shall
19 be incorporated into the future development.

20 Short-term Construction Impacts: Development that could occur from implementation of the
21 proposed project is expected to result in construction activities within the planning area. Noise
22 impacts from construction activities would be a function of the noise generated by construction
23 equipment, equipment location, sensitivity, of nearby land uses, and the timing and duration of the
24 construction activities. Short-term construction noise impacts would result from the increase in
25 traffic flow on local streets, associated with the transport of workers, equipment, and materials to
26 and from the planning area, and from noise generated during site preparation, grading, and
27 construction activities. Construction is performed in discrete steps, each of which has its own mix
28 of equipment, and consequently, its own noise characteristics. These various sequential phases

1 would change the character of the noise generated on-site. Thus, the noise levels vary as construction
2 progresses. The site preparation phase of a future project, which includes excavation and grading
3 activities, generates the highest noise levels because the noisiest construction equipment is
4 earthmoving equipment.

5 Development projects consistent with the Community Plan would be expected to require the
6 use of some of the loudest pieces of construction equipment. Assuming that each piece of
7 construction equipment operates at some distance from the other equipment, a reasonable worst-
8 case combined noise level during this phase of construction would be 90 dBA Lmax at a distance
9 of 50 feet from the acoustical center of a construction area. This would result in a reasonable worst-
10 case hourly average of 86 dBA Leq. Future project development in the planning area could result in
11 a relatively high single event noise exposure potential causing an intermittent noise nuisance that
12 could result in annoyance or sleep disturbances at nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, mitigation
13 is required to reduce this potential impact. Implementation of mitigation requiring use of best
14 management noise reduction techniques and practices and other site-specific noise reduction
15 measures would ensure that construction noise would not result in sleep disturbances at nearby off-
16 site sensitive receptors or expose persons to excessive noise levels.

17 Traffic Noise Impacts: The majority of modeled roadway segments would experience a
18 reduction in traffic noise levels with implementation of the proposed project, compared to conditions
19 that would exist without the proposed project, due to lower anticipated average daily trips generated
20 by the proposed land uses compared to the total development that could occur under existing land
21 use designations. However, several roadway segments would experience project-related increases
22 greater than 5 dBA, or would experience increases of 3 dBA or greater and also exceed the normally
23 acceptable threshold of 60 dBA CNEL for new residential low-density land use development. The
24 impacted roadway segments are as follows:

- 25 • Redlands Avenue (SR-74)–South of 4th Street
- 26 • Redlands Avenue (SR-74)–4th Street to I-215
- 27 • Rosetta Canyon Drive–South of SR-74
- 28 • Meadowbrook Avenue–West of SR-74

- 1 • Ethanac Road–East of SR-74
- 2 • A Street–North of 4th Street
- 3 • Perris Boulevard–North of 4th Street

4 These increases would be considered a significant impact and site-specific analysis would
5 be required for future development in these areas.

6 Noise Policy N 1.3 of the County’s Noise Element requires any proposed land use
7 development that would be exposed to noise levels higher than 65 dBA CNEL would require noise
8 attenuation measures. Noise Policy N 1.7 of the County’s Noise Element specifies that any proposed
9 land use development that would be exposed to unacceptably high noise levels shall be required to
10 prepare a noise study that identifies recommended structural and site design features that would
11 adequately mitigate potential noise impacts. Policy N 2.2 also requires any proposed noise-sensitive
12 land use development project that would be located within a noise impacted area, to prepare a site-
13 specific noise study that identifies mitigation design features to mitigate existing noise.

14 There are a variety of noise reduction measures that can be incorporated into future project
15 designs that would reduce traffic noise impacts to future land use development in the planning area.
16 For example, based on the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Protective Noise
17 Levels, with a combination of walls, doors and windows, standard construction in accordance with
18 building code requirements for residential developments would provide 25 dBA in exterior-to-
19 interior noise reduction with windows closed and 15 dBA or more with windows open. Setbacks
20 can also reduce traffic noise impacts to land uses along impacted roadways. For line sources, such
21 as traffic noise on a roadway, a 4.5 dBA/DD is typically observed for soft-site conditions. For
22 example, future development sites that are set back a minimum of 100 feet from the roadway
23 centerline would experience traffic noise levels 4.5 dBA lower than at 50 feet from the roadway
24 centerline. Effectively designed structural screening, such as building placement or sound walls, can
25 typically provide 6 dBA to 20 dBA in noise reduction for shielded areas compared to no shielding.
26 Therefore, any proposed development project that would include noise-sensitive land use
27 development along noise impacted roadway segments identified in Draft EIR Table 3.13-7 shall
28 demonstrate compliance with Noise Policies N 1.3, N 1.7, and N 2.2 of the County’s Noise Element

1 by implementing MM NOI-27a, which requires preparation of a noise study to identify appropriate
2 design measures, where required, to reduce the potential effect of traffic noise. (Draft EIR, 3.13-20
3 – 26).

4 **Impact NOI-27b: The proposed project could generate excessive groundborne**
5 **vibration impacts during construction. The proposed project would not generate excessive**
6 **groundborne vibration impacts during operation. (Draft EIR, 3.13-28).**

7 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

8 **2. Mitigation Measures**

9 MM NOI-27b Construction Vibration Reduction Plan

10 Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, a note shall be provided on grading and
11 building plans indicating that during grading and construction, the property owner/developer shall
12 be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-
13 related vibration impacts:

14 • For any future development projects that would necessitate the use of pile driving
15 within 200 feet of an off-site structure, shall submit a Construction Vibration Reduction Plan that
16 identifies specific techniques, such as the depth and location of temporary trenching, that would
17 reduce potential vibration impacts to less than significant for the impacted structure.

18 • For any future development projects that would necessitate the use of large vibratory
19 rollers within 30-feet of an off-site structure, or the use of other heavy construction equipment within
20 15-feet of an off-site structure, shall submit a Construction Vibration Reduction Plan that identifies
21 specific techniques, such as the depth and location of temporary trenching, that would reduce
22 potential vibration impacts to less than significant for the impacted structure.

23 • The individual project owner/developer shall submit the Construction Vibration
24 Reduction Plan to the Planning Director for review and approval. Upon approval by the County, the
25 construction vibration reduction measures shall be incorporated into the construction documents.

26 Draft EIR Table 3.13-3 provides approximate vibration levels for specific types of
27 construction equipment and activities. Of the variety of equipment used during construction, impact
28 pile drivers that could be used in the site preparation phase of construction would produce the

1 greatest groundborne vibration levels. Impact pile drivers produce groundborne vibration levels
2 ranging up to 0.644 inch per second (in/sec) PPV at 25 feet from the operating equipment.
3 Construction vibration levels from future development projects could exceed the Federal
4 Transportation Administration (FTA) damage threshold criteria of 0.12 in/sec PPV. Therefore,
5 mitigation would be required to reduce this potential impact. Construction vibration sources can be
6 mitigated to acceptable levels either at the source or on the adjacent property using alternate
7 equipment, adequate setbacks, or by digging temporary trenches between the source and the
8 receptor. For example, at a distance of 200 feet, vibration levels from an impact pile driver would
9 attenuate to 0.02 in/sec PPV. Therefore, implementation of MM NOI-27b, which requires
10 preparation of a Construction Vibration Reduction Plan, would ensure that these vibration level
11 impacts generated by future development projects would be reduced to a less than significant impact.

12 Future related development projects are not anticipated to include any permanent sources of
13 vibration that would expose persons in the project vicinity to excessive groundborne vibration
14 levels. In addition, there are no existing significant permanent sources of groundborne vibration
15 located within the planning area to which future development projects would be exposed. (Draft
16 EIR, 3.13-28 – 29).

17 **E. Transportation – Impact TRANS-37e**

18 **The project could cause an effect upon circulation during the project’s construction.**
19 **(Draft EIR, Page 3.18-16).**

20 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

21 **2. Mitigation Measures**

22 MM TRANS-37e Prior to commencement of construction, the project applicant of
23 future implementing projects shall prepare a traffic management plan that will specify traffic
24 controls required to maintain adequate circulation and access along Highway 74. At least one lane
25 shall remain open in each direction during construction and access to all existing businesses shall
26 be maintained.

27 Future implementing projects may require temporary lane closures or detours during
28 construction activity. However, all lane closures or detours would be coordinated with the sheriff

1 and fire departments to ensure that access to existing businesses and through circulation are
2 maintained, as well as emergency access. The construction contractor would provide signage, cones,
3 and/or flag persons as deemed necessary through a project-specific traffic management plan to
4 ensure adequate emergency access. With implementation of a traffic management plan, as required
5 by MM TRANS-37e, the potential impact on circulation would be reduced to less than significant.
6 (Draft EIR, Page 3.18-16).

7 **Impact TRANS-37f: The project could result in inadequate emergency access or access**
8 **to nearby uses. (Draft EIR, Page 3.18-17).**

9 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

10 **2. Mitigation Measures**

11 Implement MM TRANS-37e.

12 As noted, all future implementing development will be required to prepare a traffic
13 management plan to demonstrate to the County and the associated sheriff and fire departments that
14 emergency access would be maintained at all times during construction. Preparation of a traffic
15 management plan, as required by MM TRANS-37e, would reduce any impact of temporary lane
16 closures or detours to less than significant. (Draft EIR, Page 3.18-17).

17 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered,
18 consistent with CEQA's requirements, the impacts of the Project together with all other past, present,
19 and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts within the affected area for
20 each resource area, and finds that:

21 **A. Aesthetics, Light and Glare**

22 **The proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would**
23 **not have a cumulatively significant impact relating to aesthetics, light, and glare. (Draft EIR,**
24 **Page 4-5).**

25 **1. Less than significant impact.**

26 Cumulative development would be required to comply with the overall land use vision,
27 design review regulations and policies in local and regional planning documents to ensure that
28 aesthetic impacts are less than significant. Similarly, potential cumulative aesthetic impacts to

1 eligible scenic highways would be reduced to below a level of significance through participation in
2 the State Scenic Highway program and local ordinances and policies. Additionally, cumulative
3 projects within the City of Perris, City of Lake Elsinore, and the County of Riverside would be
4 required to comply with similar development guidelines and would be reviewed by the applicable
5 City or the County to ensure consistency with architectural standards, viewshed policies, and
6 lighting requirements. For these reasons, cumulative impacts to aesthetics, State Scenic Highways,
7 or nighttime lighting and daytime glare would be less than significant. Moreover, the proposed
8 project's incremental contribution to less than significant cumulative impacts would not be
9 significant. The proposed project, in conjunction with the projects listed in Draft EIR Table 4-1 and
10 shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 4-1, would result in changes related to views of scenic vistas, views
11 from Highway 74, visual character, and light and glare. However, the incremental changes that
12 would occur relative to the existing conditions would not be cumulatively considerable, because of
13 the extent and nature of existing development in the planning area. The proposed project would not
14 substantially alter the existing visual character of the planning area. The proposed project includes
15 GPA No. 1205 and Zone Consistency Program that would establish consistency with existing
16 development within the planning area and surroundings and, therefore, would not significantly alter
17 the viewshed from the planning area.

18 The proposed project would emphasize cohesive development designs that would connect
19 the existing scattered commercial and industrial uses within the planning area. Furthermore,
20 buildout of the proposed project has the potential to result in an alteration of the visual character
21 within the plan boundaries. However, this change in and of itself is not considered significant unless
22 the quality of scenic resources would be substantially diminished. The proposed project is a policy
23 document that supplements the local General Plan with goals, policies and programs that are specific
24 and unique to the community or area that it covers. Therefore, the proposed project is designed to
25 guide development that would enhance the aesthetic value of the planning area. Any future project
26 design that is proposed within the planning area boundaries would be subject to applicable
27 environmental analysis, review, and approval, including review related to design standards and
28 guidelines, thereby ensuring that future development would be visually compatible with surrounding

1 land uses. In regard to light and glare, the proposed project would not substantially alter existing
2 conditions and would not present substantial new sources of light and glare, since the proposed
3 project, the General Plan, and applicable zoning restrictions have established standards for new
4 sources of light and glare that are intended to prevent adverse impacts to daytime or nighttime views.
5 As such, no substantial increase in light and glare levels are anticipated as a result of the proposed
6 project. (Draft EIR at Page 4-4 to 4-5).

7 **Impacts related to odor or other emissions would be less than significant. (Draft EIR,**
8 **Page 4-7).**

9 **1. Less than significant impact with respect to odor or other emissions.**

10 For the issue of odors, the cumulative study area includes the planning area and lands in
11 close proximity, as odors diminish rapidly with distance from the source. As discussed under Impact
12 AIR-6(d), the project would not contribute to a cumulatively significant odor impact. (Draft EIR at
13 Page 4-7).

14 Agriculture Resources and Forest Resources

15 Cumulative Impact

16 The proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would not
17 result in any impacts to agricultural or forestry resources and the project would not contribute to a
18 cumulatively considerable impact to these resources. (Draft EIR, Page 4-5).

19 Findings: Less than significant impact.

20 Facts in Support of Findings: The geographic scope of the cumulative agriculture and forest
21 resources analysis is western Riverside County. As described in Draft EIR Section 3.2, Agriculture
22 and Forestry Resources, the planning area does not contain lands designated as Prime Farmland, or
23 Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The planning area has very few areas
24 designated for agriculture and there are no areas currently used for traditional agricultural such as
25 row crops. For these reasons, cumulative impacts to agriculture and forest resources would be less
26 than significant. Moreover, the proposed project's incremental contribution to less than significant
27 cumulative impacts would not be significant. Based on the section analysis, the proposed project
28 would not directly result in potential impacts to agricultural resources. Therefore, implementation

1 of the proposed project in conjunction with the projects listed in Draft EIR Table 4-1 and shown in
2 Draft EIR Exhibit 4-1 would not result in any impacts to agricultural or forestry resources and the
3 project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to these resources. (Draft EIR
4 at Page 4-5).

5 **B. Biological Resources**

6 **Cumulative impacts related to State- or federally listed and non-listed species as well**
7 **as to riparian habitat, natural communities, and State- or federally protected waters or**
8 **wetlands would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. With mitigation, the**
9 **proposed project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to these**
10 **resources. (Draft EIR, Page 4-8).**

11 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

12 **2. Mitigation Measures**

13 Implement MM BIO-7b, MM BIO-7f-1, and MM BIO-7f-2.

14 To avoid impacts to State- or federally listed and non-listed species, implementation of MM
15 BIO-7b would require future projects to prepare biological studies to evaluate and mitigate potential
16 impacts to sensitive biological resources. Further, MM BIO-7f-1 and MM BIO-7f-2 would be
17 implemented to reduce potential impacts to riparian habitat, natural communities, and State- or
18 federally protected waters or wetlands to less than significant levels. Therefore, as the proposed
19 project and future projects implemented in accordance with the Highway 74 Community Plan would
20 be required to implement MM BIO-7b, MM BIO-7f-1, and MM BIO-7f-2, the proposed project
21 would not directly result in potential impacts to biological resources and would not contribute to a
22 cumulatively considerable impact to these resources.

23 **The project would have a less than significant cumulative impact with respect to**
24 **conflicts with a Habitat Conservation Plan including the MSHCP, Natural Conservation**
25 **Community Plan, an approved local, regional, or State conservation plan; endangered or**
26 **threatened species; the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species;**
27 **existing or proposed linkages between existing MSHCP conservation areas; or any local**
28 **policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. (Draft EIR, Page 4-7–4-8).**

1 **1. Less than significant impact.**

2 The planning area lies within the boundaries of the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation
3 Plan (MSHCP). Therefore, any development within the planning area would be required to
4 demonstrate consistency with the MSHCP, including compliance with applicable MSHCP
5 requirements. Future projects would be required to submit an MSHCP Consistency Analysis report
6 to the County in order to document the project’s consistency with the goals, objectives, and
7 requirements of the MSHCP. The project applicants for all development projects implemented
8 pursuant to the proposed project would be required to coordinate with the County and the Western
9 Riverside County Regional Riverside Conservation Authority to submit all applicable forms, fees,
10 and/or technical reports. Development activities associated with other cumulative projects in the
11 region, including those projects listed in Draft EIR Table 4-1 and shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 4-1,
12 are located on sites with similar biological attributes and, therefore, may impact biological resources
13 including special-status plant and wildlife species if present. Future development from the proposed
14 project and cumulative projects are required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local
15 regulations related to biological resources. Standard pre-construction surveys and, if necessary,
16 avoidance or relocation procedures would be required for any project with the potential to affect
17 biological resources. For these reasons, cumulative impacts to biological resources would be less
18 than significant.

19 Moreover, the proposed project’s incremental contribution to less than significant
20 cumulative impacts would not be significant. In addition, to avoid impacts to State- or federally
21 listed and non-listed species, implementation of MM BIO-7b would require future projects to
22 prepare biological studies to evaluate and mitigate potential impacts to sensitive biological
23 resources. Further, MM BIO-7f-1 and MM BIO-7f-2 would be implemented to reduce potential
24 impacts to riparian habitat, natural communities, and State- or federally protected waters or wetlands
25 to less than significant levels. Therefore, as the proposed project and future projects implemented
26 in accordance with the Highway 74 Community Plan would be required to implement MM BIO-7b,
27 MM BIO-7f-1, and MM BIO-7f-2, the proposed project would not directly result in potential
28 impacts to biological resources and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to

1 these resources. Because of the urban, built-up nature of the planning area and the surrounding
2 region, the proposed project and other cumulative projects within the City of Perris, City of Lake
3 Elsinore, and the County of Riverside would be required to comply with similar development
4 guidelines and would be reviewed by the applicable City or the County to ensure consistency with
5 applicable federal, State, and local regulations and provisions of adopted conservation plans.
6 Therefore, the proposed project, in conjunction with other cumulative projects, would not have
7 cumulatively considerable impacts on biological resources. As a result, there is no potential for any
8 other significant individual or cumulative biological resource impacts. (Draft EIR at Pages 4-8 to 4-
9 9).

10 **C. Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources**

11 **The project would have a less than significant cumulative impact related to cultural**
12 **resources. (Draft EIR, Page 4-8 – 4-9).**

13 **1. Less than significant impact.**

14 Cultural resource impacts tend to be localized because the integrity of any given resource
15 depends on what occurs only in the immediate vicinity around that resource, such as disruption of
16 soils. For this reason, the geographic scope of the cumulative cultural resource analysis is the areas
17 within 500 feet of the proposed project's boundaries. The planning area and areas within 500 feet
18 of its boundaries are mostly built out and considered an urban environment. As described in Draft
19 EIR Section 3.4, Cultural Resources, a records search of the Eastern Information Center (EIC)
20 indicated that 213 cultural resources have been recorded within a 1-mile search radius. Of these, 66
21 are located within the boundaries of the planning area. Of the area-specific survey reports, 106 are
22 on file with the EIC that address areas within the 1-mile search radius, 17 of which address portions
23 of the planning area, indicating that segments have been previously evaluated. Known historic
24 buildings, districts, and resource sites are located throughout the planning area. Additional
25 undesignated sites and potentially unidentified sites exist within the planning area as well.
26 Additionally, known archaeological resource sites are located within the planning area, and it is
27 expected that additional undiscovered sites may exist in the planning area as well. Based on a review
28 of information available at the EIC, only a small portion of the planning area has been previously

1 surveyed for archaeological resources. While the proposed project does not directly propose any
2 adverse changes to any historical resources, future development allowed under the proposed project
3 could affect known resources, or previously unidentified or undesignated resources.

4 Cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable policies and programs and
5 adhere to the rules and regulations in the Municipal Code that protect cultural resources. Cumulative
6 projects would also be required to comply federal, State, and local policies that protect cultural
7 resources, including Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and Sections 5024.1 and 5097
8 of the Public Resources Code. Accordingly, because cumulative development would be required to
9 comply with long-term planning documents, and regulatory agency guidance establishing policies
10 (including, but not limited to, evaluation requirements and inadvertent discovery procedures) that
11 reduce impacts to potential cultural resources, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
12 While the proposed project does not directly propose any adverse changes to any cultural resources,
13 future development allowed under the plan could affect known or previously unidentified resources.
14 Potential cumulative impacts would be mitigated at an individual project level by adherence to
15 applicable local State and federal laws and regulations, as well as City and County laws, regulations,
16 and conditions of approval. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly result in potential
17 impacts to cultural resources and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to
18 these resources. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with the proposed project, as well as
19 other cumulative projects in the vicinity, including those projects listed in Draft EIR Table 4-1 and
20 shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 4- 1, would result in ground-disturbing activities that may encounter
21 previously undiscovered cultural resources. The implementation of the aforementioned conditions
22 of approval would ensure undiscovered cultural resources are not adversely affected by cumulative
23 project-related construction activities, which would prevent the destruction or degradation of
24 potentially significant cultural resources within the geographic scope. Therefore, the proposed
25 project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would not have a cumulatively
26 significant impact related to cultural resources. (Draft EIR at Pages 4-8 to 4-9).

27 **D. Energy**

28 **The proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would**

1 **not have a cumulatively significant impact related to energy consumption. (Draft EIR, Page**
2 **4-9 – 4-10).**

3 **1. Less than significant impact.**

4 All cumulative projects would be required to comply with City ordinances and County
5 policies that address energy conservation and energy efficiency, such as complying with the latest
6 California Energy Code and Title 24 standards. Accordingly, potential cumulative impacts would
7 be less than significant. Moreover, the proposed project would not have a significant incremental
8 contribution to cumulative impacts. Development associated with the proposed project, as well as
9 development associated with the cumulative projects identified in Draft EIR Table 4-1, would be
10 designed in accordance with Title 24, California’s Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and
11 Nonresidential Buildings. These standards include minimum energy efficiency requirements related
12 to building envelope, mechanical systems (e.g., HVAC and water heating systems), indoor and
13 outdoor lighting, and illuminated signs. The incorporation of the Title 24 standards into the proposed
14 project and cumulative projects would ensure that implementation of these projects would not result
15 in the inefficient, unnecessary, or wasteful consumption of energy. (Draft EIR at Page 4-9).

16 **E. Geology and Soils**

17 **The proposed project would not directly result in potential impacts to geology and soils**
18 **and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to these resources. (Draft**
19 **EIR, Page 4-9–4-10).**

20 **1. Less than significant impact.**

21 The planning area associated with the proposed project is located within a seismically active
22 region. Therefore, future development within the planning area would comply with State and local
23 policies and regulations and adopt and enforce current building codes to minimize potential impacts
24 related to seismic and geologic hazards. Other cumulative projects, such as those listed in Draft EIR
25 Table 4-1 and shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 4-1, would be exposed to similar seismic hazards and,
26 therefore, would implement site-specific recommendations for soil engineering and construction
27 practices. Accordingly, potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR at
28 Page 4-10).

1 **Impacts related to State- or federally listed and non-listed species would be less than**
2 **significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, Page 4-10).**

3 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

4 Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid
5 or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA
6 Guidelines, § 15091(a)(1)).

7 **2. Mitigation Measures**

8 Implement MM GEO-12a.

9 Facts in Support of Findings: Regarding unstable soils, portions of the planning area are
10 mapped as having a very low to moderate susceptibility to liquefaction and few areas could be
11 susceptible to landslides, collapse, rockfall hazards, soils hazards, and slope hazards. With
12 adherence to existing programs and policies that would reduce risk associated with these seismic
13 hazards, as well as implementing MM GEO-12a, which would require all seismic and geological
14 hazards to be addressed through the preparation of site-specific geotechnical reports for all future
15 development under the proposed project, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.
16 For instance, each site-specific geotechnical report would include recommendations for each future
17 development project to incorporate into construction and design plans to avoid and mitigate potential
18 significant impacts related to seismic, soils, or other geological hazards that may arise. Other
19 cumulative projects would be required to implement similar measures to ensure structural and
20 foundational soundness. As such, the proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and
21 approved projects, would not have a cumulatively significant impact associated with geological
22 hazards. (Draft EIR, Page 4-10).

23 **F. Greenhouse Gases**

24 **With implementation of MM GHG-20a, the proposed project, in conjunction with**
25 **other planned and approved projects, would not have a cumulatively significant impact**
26 **related to GHG emissions. (Draft EIR, Page 4-10–4-11).**

27 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

28 **2. Mitigation Measures**

1 Implement MM GHG-20a.

2 Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions related to implementation of the proposed project are not
3 confined to a particular air basin but are dispersed worldwide. Therefore, the analysis under Impacts
4 GHG-1 and GHG-2 also addresses cumulative impacts. Furthermore, all cumulative projects would
5 be required to comply with City of Perris, City of Lake Elsinore, or County of Riverside ordinances,
6 respective General Plan policies and adopted Climate Action Plans to reduce GHG emissions. These
7 plans and policies have been developed to ensure that a project's GHG emissions would be less than
8 significant. Cumulative projects will also be required to comply with existing federal, State, and
9 local regulations and policies to reduce community-wide GHG emissions. Lastly, cumulative
10 projects would be required to comply with the requirements of CEQA and obtain all necessary
11 clearances and permits. Accordingly, potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

12 Moreover, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact to GHG
13 emissions because it would not emit construction and operational GHG emissions at levels that
14 would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds. In jurisdictions where a qualified GHG emission reduction
15 strategy has been reviewed under CEQA and adopted by decision-makers, compliance with the
16 GHG emission reduction strategy would reduce a project's contribution to cumulative and project-
17 level GHG emission impacts to a less than significant level. The County of Riverside Clean Air Plan
18 (CAP) was prepared in conformance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 and is
19 considered a qualified reduction strategy. To ensure consistency with the County of Riverside CAP
20 and that the GHG emissions of future development projects envisioned under the proposed project
21 are less than significant, MM GHG-20a is required for future development projects in the planning
22 area.

23 With implementation of MM GHG-20a, the proposed project would be consistent with the
24 County of Riverside CAP, and therefore the proposed project and future development projects in
25 the planning area that comply with MM GHG-20a would have less than significant cumulative and
26 project-level GHG emissions. With implementation of MM GHG-20a, the proposed project would
27 also develop land uses consistent with the goals of the County of Riverside General Plan and CAP,
28 and the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. (Draft EIR, Page 4-10-4-11).

1 **G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

2 **The proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would**
3 **not have cumulatively considerable impacts on hazards and hazardous materials. (Draft EIR,**
4 **Page 4-11 – 4-12).**

5 **1. Less than significant impact.**

6 There are no active LUST cleanup sites in the planning area. Although the proposed project
7 would not directly result in potential hazardous impacts as it does not authorize any immediate
8 development, future development that occurs as a result of the proposed project’s buildout may be
9 required to comply with additional investigation as required by local and State regulations, including
10 but not limited to a Phase I ESA, as well as soil, groundwater, or soil gas sampling. Compliance
11 with all applicable regulations would be required. Other cumulative projects, such as those listed in
12 Draft EIR Table 4-1 and shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 4-1, would be required to comply with
13 applicable federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to the transportation, storage, use,
14 and disposal of hazardous materials during construction activities and at operation. Potential impacts
15 would be reduced to below a level of significance because construction must comply with the
16 California Code of Regulations and other regulations to prevent hazardous materials spills and
17 protect public safety. Development consistent with the proposed project will be required to
18 implement all applicable policies during the design review process. As the County receives
19 development applications for subsequent development, those applications will be reviewed for
20 compliance with local, State, and federal regulations. (Draft EIR at Pages 4.11 to 4.12).

21 **H. Hydrology and Water Quality**

22 **The proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would**
23 **not interfere substantially with groundwater supply, recharge, or groundwater management**
24 **to create cumulatively considerable groundwater impacts. Additionally, the proposed project,**
25 **in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would slow, reduce, and meter the**
26 **volume of runoff leaving project sites and ensure that downstream storm drainage facilities**
27 **are not inundated with stormwater runoff that could create cumulatively considerable**
28 **drainage impacts. (Draft EIR, Page 4-12 – 4-13).**

1 **1. Less than significant impact.**

2 The Santa Ana RWQCB is responsible for protecting water quality in the region and
3 administers the NPDES stormwater permitting program for construction activities. Construction
4 activities disturbing 1 acre or more of land are subject to the permitting requirements of the NPDES
5 General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Runoff Associated with Construction Activity
6 (General Construction Permit). The General Construction Permit requires the preparation and
7 implementation of a SWPPP or WQMP, which must also be completed before construction begins.
8 Implementation of the SWPPP starts with the commencement of construction and continues through
9 the completion of the project. Additionally, future development projects would be required to
10 comply with the CWA, requirements of the Municipal Code, and General Plan policies and actions
11 related to water quality.

12 Additionally, other cumulative projects, such as those listed in Draft EIR Table 4-1 and
13 shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 4-1 are required to implement similar construction and operational water
14 quality control and treatment facilities that would detain runoff and treat it prior to discharge,
15 including obtaining a General Construction Permit. Cumulative projects would also be required to
16 comply with applicable City and County codes, ordinances, and policies related to preventing
17 pollutants from being conveyed off-site. Accordingly, cumulative impacts related to hydrology and
18 water quality would be less than significant. Moreover, the proposed project, in conjunction with
19 other planned and approved projects, would not create cumulatively considerable downstream water
20 quality and hydrology impacts. Similarly, other cumulative projects would be required to follow
21 applicable City and County codes, ordinances, and policies related to drainage to prevent erosion,
22 siltation, flooding from surface runoff, and risk of pollutants from runoff or project inundation.
23 Potable water used in the County is collected from the San Jacinto River Watershed and roughly
24 one-third of the County's water demand is met by groundwater, whose unpredictability and
25 variability means that significant impacts associated with the proposed project's operation over time
26 cannot be ruled out. However, the adverse effects associated with potential demands on groundwater
27 and effects on groundwater recharge would be avoided, reduced, or minimized with adherence to
28 and compliance with federal, State, and local regulations and General Plan policies. Thus, the

1 proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would not interfere
2 substantially with groundwater supply, recharge, or groundwater management to create
3 cumulatively considerable groundwater impacts. (Draft EIR at Pages 4-12 to 4-13).

4 **I. Land Use**

5 **The proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would**
6 **not have a cumulatively significant impact related to land use. (Draft EIR, Page 4-13 – 4-14).**

7 **1. Less than significant impact.**

8 The geographic scope of the cumulative land use analysis is the Riverside County Sphere of
9 Influence, which includes areas within the City of Perris and City of Lake Elsinore city limits. Land
10 use decisions are made at the County and City level; therefore, the County and cities' Spheres of
11 Influence are an appropriate geographic scope. Development within the County is governed by the
12 County of Riverside General Plan and Municipal Code, which ensure logical and orderly
13 development and require discretionary review to ensure that projects do not result in land use
14 impacts caused by inconsistency with the General Plan and other regulations. Development projects
15 in the Riverside County Sphere of Influence would continue to be required to demonstrate
16 consistency with all applicable County General Plan and Municipal Code regulations. This would
17 ensure that these projects comply with applicable planning regulations. The projects listed in Draft
18 EIR Table 4-1 and shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 4-1 that have been previously approved by the
19 County, the City of Perris, and the City of Lake Elsinore have been deemed consistent with all
20 applicable planning documents. For pending projects, the County, the City of Perris, or the City of
21 Lake Elsinore would be required to issue findings demonstrating consistency with the applicable
22 planning documents when they are approved. Accordingly, cumulative impacts related to land use
23 would be less than significant. Moreover, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts
24 would not be cumulatively considerable. As detailed in Draft EIR Section 3.11, Land Use, the
25 proposed project was reviewed for consistency with the County of Riverside General Plan, ELAP,
26 MVAP and the County's Zoning Ordinance. The proposed project was found to be consistent with
27 policies outlined in the County General Plan, ELAP, MVAP and consistent with applicable
28 regulations of the County's Zoning Ordinance. (Draft EIR at Page 4-13).

1 **J. Mineral Resources**

2 **Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts to mineral**
3 **resources and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. As a result, the**
4 **proposed project, in conjunction with other cumulative projects, would not have cumulatively**
5 **considerable impacts on mineral resources. (Draft EIR, Page 4-14).**

6 **1. Less than significant impact.**

7 The planning area does not currently contain any known mineral resources but is within the
8 MRZ-3 designation. Areas with the MRZ-3 designation are described as areas where the available
9 geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist; however, the significance of
10 the deposit is undetermined. Development activities associated with other cumulative projects in the
11 region, including those projects listed in Draft EIR Table 4-1 and shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 4-1,
12 may be located on sites with similar mineral zoning designations and would adhere to policies
13 contained in the General Plan to reduce potential significant impacts related to mineral resources.
14 Accordingly, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR at Page 4-14).

15 **K. Noise**

16 **With mitigation, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulatively**
17 **significant impact related to noise generated from parking lot activities and stationary**
18 **equipment; would not combine with noise from other development projects to cause**
19 **cumulatively significant noise impacts; and would not contribute to a cumulatively significant**
20 **vibration impact. (Draft EIR, Page 4-15).**

21 **1. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

22 **2. Mitigation Measures**

23 Implement MM NOI-27a and MM NOI-27b.

24 Facts in Support of Findings: Noise impacts tend to be localized; therefore, the analysis in
25 Draft EIR Section 3.13, Noise, includes a cumulative analysis of existing, proposed, and anticipated
26 future noise levels near the planning area.

27 Future development in the planning area could result in a relatively high single-event noise
28 exposure potential causing an intermittent noise nuisance that could result in annoyance or sleep

1 disturbances at nearby sensitive receptors. Implementation of mitigation requiring use of best
2 management noise reduction techniques and practices and other site-specific noise reduction
3 measures would ensure that construction noise would not result in sleep disturbances at nearby off-
4 site sensitive receptors or expose persons to excessive noise levels. Cumulative development would
5 be required to comply with the design review regulations directing the siting, design, and insulation
6 of new development and all applicable noise policies in local and regional plans, including the
7 County General Plan and the City of Perris and City of Lake Elsinore's Municipal Code, to ensure
8 that noise impacts are less than significant. In addition, construction noise and vibration are typically
9 localized and temporary in nature. For these reasons, cumulative noise impacts would be less than
10 significant.

11 Moreover, the proposed project's incremental contribution to less than significant
12 cumulative impacts would not be significant. Operational noise generated by the proposed project
13 include noise from parking lot activities and from new exterior mechanical equipment sources, such
14 as mechanical ventilation systems. As detailed in the Draft EIR, Section 3.13, Noise, the proposed
15 project would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in
16 the vicinity of the planning area in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise
17 ordinance. As such, the impact of noise produced by parking lot activities and stationary equipment
18 within the planning area to off-site sensitive receptors would be reduced with implementation of
19 MM NOI-27a to reduce levels of operational noise to a less than significant level. Therefore, the
20 proposed project would not contribute to a cumulatively significant impact related to noise generated
21 from parking lot activities and stationary equipment.

22 Construction and operational noise associated with buildout of the proposed project may
23 cause a temporary substantial increase in noise levels at nearby receptors. The proposed project
24 would implement MM NOI-27a to reduce noise levels to a less than significant level. Other
25 cumulative projects would be required to implement similar mitigation and adhere to the County's
26 or the City of Perris or City of Lake Elsinore's Municipal Code restrictions regarding construction
27 noise. It is highly unlikely that a substantial number of the cumulative projects would be constructed
28 simultaneously and close enough to one another for noise impacts to be compounded. Therefore, it

1 is reasonable to conclude that construction noise from the proposed project would not combine with
2 noise from other development projects to cause cumulatively significant noise impacts.

3 Construction activities associated with buildout of the proposed project would require the
4 use of heavy construction equipment, which could expose sensitive receptors to vibration.
5 Therefore, the proposed project would implement MM NOI-27b to reduce vibration to less than
6 significant levels. Because vibration is a highly localized phenomenon, there is a low possibility for
7 vibration associated with the proposed project to combine with vibration from other projects because
8 of their distances from the proposed project's boundaries. Therefore, the proposed project would
9 not contribute to a cumulatively significant vibration impact. (Draft EIR, Page 4-15).

10 **L. Paleontological Resources**

11 **Because of the low paleontological sensitivity and unique geologic features within the**
12 **cumulative study area and required conformance with existing regulations intended for the**
13 **protection of sensitive paleontological resources, cumulative impacts to paleontological**
14 **resources would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, Page 4-15).**

15 **Less than significant impact.**

16 Paleontological resource impacts tend to be localized because the integrity of any given
17 resource depends on what occurs only in the immediate vicinity around that resource, such as
18 disruption of soils. For this reason, the geographic scope of the cumulative paleontological resource
19 analysis is the areas within 500 feet of the proposed project's boundaries. The planning area and
20 areas within 500 feet of its boundaries are mostly built out and considered an urban environment.
21 The planning area and areas with 500 feet predominantly contain areas of low paleontological
22 sensitivity, as well as areas with undetermined paleontological sensitivity. All development within
23 the County needs to adhere to General Plan Policy OS 19.8 which requires a paleontological
24 resources report to be prepared if the project site has undetermined paleontological sensitivity as
25 shown on General Plan Figure OS-8. In addition to such policy, there are a number of existing State
26 and federal laws that regulate development impacts to paleontological resources, including those
27 outlined under the California Public Resources Code Paleontological Resources Preservation Act.
28 Because of the low paleontological sensitivity and unique geologic features within the cumulative

1 study area and required conformance with existing regulations intended for the protection of
2 sensitive paleontological resources, impacts to paleontological resources would be less than
3 significant. (Draft EIR at Page 4-15).

4 **M. Population and Housing**

5 **Because cumulative projects would comply with all applicable land use plans to provide**
6 **adequate development within a jurisdiction, a significant cumulative impact related to**
7 **population and housing would not occur. Additionally, the proposed project, in conjunction**
8 **with other planned and approved projects, would not have a cumulatively significant impact**
9 **related to population and housing. (Draft EIR, Page 4-16).**

10 **Less than significant impact.**

11 The geographic scope of the cumulative population and housing analysis is the County of
12 Riverside. Population growth is typically measured in relation to the size of the applicable
13 jurisdiction and, thus, the County is the appropriate geographical area. Consistent with State law,
14 the County's General Plan identifies adequate housing to accommodate forecasted numbers of
15 people within the jurisdiction, and displaced development, if any, would be replaced primarily
16 within the County. Other cumulative projects in the County, such as those listed in Draft EIR Table
17 4-1 and shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 4-1, would be reviewed for impacts on population growth and
18 would be required to address any potential impacts with mitigation. Because cumulative projects
19 would comply with all applicable land use plans to provide adequate development within a
20 jurisdiction, a significant cumulative impact related to population and housing would not occur.

21 Moreover, adoption of the proposed project would not result in any policies or physical
22 improvements that would result in direct or indirect or cumulative impacts to regional growth or
23 result in substantial displacement of people or the need to construct additional replacement housing
24 and therefore would not contribute to a cumulative impact. The proposed project contemplates up
25 to 4,000 multi-family residential dwelling units, which would add 12,800 residents to the planning
26 area's population. This would represent a 3.3 percent increase in the existing resident population of
27 unincorporated Riverside County and 0.12 percent increase in population of Riverside County
28 overall. Growth-inducing impacts were found to be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed

1 project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would not have a cumulatively
2 significant impact related to population and housing. (Draft EIR at Page 4-16).

3 **N. Public Services**

4 **The proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would**
5 **not have a cumulatively significant impact related to fire protection and EMS; police**
6 **protection; schools; library facilities; or health services. (Draft EIR, Page 4-17 – 4-18).**

7 **1. Less than significant impact.**

8 All future development would be subject to development fees that would contribute toward
9 provision of public services. Other cumulative projects within the County would be subject to review
10 in order to determine whether development would significantly impact acceptable service ratios,
11 response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection police protection, schools,
12 libraries, municipal services and health services. Therefore, the proposed project, in conjunction
13 with other planned and approved projects, would not have a cumulatively significant impact related
14 to health services. (Draft EIR at Page 4-16 to 4-18).

15 **O. Recreation**

16 **Cumulative impacts related to recreation are less than significant. Additionally, the**
17 **proposed project, in conjunction with other cumulative projects, would not have cumulatively**
18 **considerable impacts on recreation. (Draft EIR, Page 4-18 – 4-19).**

19 **Less than significant impact.**

20 The County provides 9.2 acres of parks and open space per 1,000 residents. Local
21 municipalities, including the City of Perris and the City of Lake Elsinore, are responsible for local
22 parks and recreational facilities. Development activities associated with other cumulative projects
23 in the region, including those projects listed in Draft EIR Table 4-1 and shown in Draft EIR Exhibit
24 4- 1, would adhere to Ordinance No. 659 and be required to provide recreation facilities to reduce
25 potential significant impacts related to recreation. For these reasons, cumulative impacts related to
26 recreation are less than significant. Based on the section analysis, the proposed project would not
27 directly result in potential impacts to recreation as the proposed project would not authorize any
28 immediate development that could affect the need for recreational facilities. Additionally, future

1 development would be required to either provide recreational facilities and open space in accordance
2 with the land use and density proposed or would be required to pay development impact fees
3 pursuant to Ordinance No. 659. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result
4 in any impacts to recreation and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. As a
5 result, the proposed project, in conjunction with other cumulative projects, would not have
6 cumulatively considerable impacts on recreation. (Draft EIR at Page 4-18 to 4-19).

7 **P. Transportation and Traffic**

8 **The proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would**
9 **not have a cumulatively significant impact related to roadway safety, emergency access, public**
10 **transit, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian facilities. (Draft EIR, Page 4-20).**

11 **Less than significant impact.**

12 For transportation-related areas other than VMT (roadway safety, emergency access, public
13 transit, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian facilities), the proposed project would have less than
14 significant impacts and therefore would not have the potential to cumulatively contribute to
15 deficiencies. (Draft EIR at Page 4-20).

16 **1. The project would have significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to**
17 **VMT.**

18 Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid
19 or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA
20 Guidelines, § 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even
21 with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, Page 4-5 – 4-7). Specific economic, legal, social,
22 technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly
23 trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR.
24 (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15091(a)(3)).

25 **2. Mitigation Measures**

26 Implement MM TRANS-37b-1 through -5.

27 The geographic scope of the cumulative transportation analysis is the roadway network
28 within western Riverside County. Projects that exceed VMT threshold(s) are required to mitigate

1 transportation impacts to the extent feasible. VMT reduction strategies for large projects and
2 community plans/specific plans may include altering a project's density, land use mix, site design,
3 and availability of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. All cumulative projects would be
4 required to comply with County and local ordinances and General Plan policies that address
5 potential impacts related to transportation. Nonetheless, for these reasons, cumulative impacts with
6 respect to transportation and traffic would be significant.

7 The proposed project would implement MM TRANS-37b-1 through -5 to reduce VMT
8 impacts. Given the uncertainty in some components of the measures that influence VMT (such as
9 the cost of fuel) combined with the County's inability to influence other measures that would have
10 the largest effect on VMT (such as implementation of a VMT tax or an increase in the fuel tax), the
11 effectiveness of these Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures cannot be guaranteed
12 to reduce impacts and the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. Implementation of
13 mitigation measures would reduce this impact, but not to less than significant levels. As such, the
14 proposed project, in conjunction with other projects, would have a significant and unavoidable
15 impact with respect to VMT. The proposed project's contribution would be cumulatively
16 considerable. (Draft EIR, Page 4-19).

17 **Q. Tribal Resources**

18 **The proposed project would not directly result in potential impacts to cultural**
19 **resources and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to these resources.**
20 **Additionally, the proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects,**
21 **would not have a cumulatively significant impact related to tribal cultural resources. (Draft**
22 **EIR, Page 4-20 – 4-21).**

23 **1. Less than significant impact.**

24 Tribal cultural resource impacts tend to be localized because the integrity of any given
25 resource depends on what occurs only in the immediate vicinity around that resource, such as
26 disruption of soils. For this reason, the geographic scope of the cumulative tribal cultural resource
27 analysis is the areas within 500 feet of the proposed project's boundaries. The planning area and
28 areas within 500 feet of its boundaries are mostly built out and considered an urban environment.

1 An NAHC Sacred Lands File search did not identify any TCRs within the planning area, however
2 a records search conducted at the EIC identified listed prehistoric sites that meet the definition of a
3 tribal cultural resource within the planning area. Additionally, consultation with tribal
4 representatives pursuant to SB 18 and AB 52 noted the high potential for resources to be located
5 within the planning area. The potential for additional undiscovered eligible TCRs to be present
6 within the planning area exists, but varies by location. Cumulative projects would be required to
7 comply with applicable policies and programs and adhere to the rules and regulations in the
8 Municipal Code that protect tribal cultural resources. Cumulative projects would also be required to
9 comply federal, State, and local policies that protect cultural and tribal cultural resources, including
10 the provisions of SB 18 and Assembly Bill (AB) 52. Accordingly, because cumulative development
11 would be required to comply with long-term planning documents, and regulatory agency guidance
12 establishing policies (including, but not limited to, evaluation requirements and inadvertent
13 discovery procedures) that reduce impacts to potential tribal cultural resources, cumulative impacts
14 would be less than significant.

15 While the proposed project does not directly propose any adverse changes to any recorded
16 TCRs, future development allowed under the plan could affect known or previously unidentified
17 resources. Potential cumulative impacts would be mitigated at an individual project level by
18 adherence to applicable local State and federal laws and regulations, as well as City and County
19 laws, regulations, and conditions of approval. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly
20 result in potential impacts to cultural resources and would not contribute to a cumulatively
21 considerable impact to these resources. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with the
22 proposed project, as well as other cumulative projects in the vicinity, including those projects listed
23 in Draft EIR Table 4-1 and shown in Draft EIR Exhibit 4- 1, would result in ground-disturbing
24 activities that may encounter previously undiscovered cultural resources. The implementation of the
25 aforementioned conditions of approval would ensure undiscovered cultural resources are not
26 adversely affected by cumulative project-related construction activities, which would prevent the
27 destruction or degradation of potentially significant cultural resources within the geographic scope.
28 (Draft EIR at Pages 4-20 to 4-21).

1 **R. Utilities and Service Systems**

2 **Project-level impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, the proposed**
3 **project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant. Accordingly, the**
4 **proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would not have**
5 **a cumulatively significant impact related to water supply, wastewater, storm drainage, or solid**
6 **waste. (Draft EIR, Page 4-21 – 4-23).**

7 **1. Less than significant impact.**

8 Other cumulative projects would also be required to demonstrate that they would be served
9 with potable water service as a standard requirement of the development review process, and these
10 projects may be required to implement water conservation measures to the extent they are required.
11 The adequacy of wastewater facilities to serve specific development proposals would be determined
12 through the County’s development review process where necessary infrastructure improvements
13 would be required as conditions of approval. In addition, future development would be subject to
14 various standards for sewer use, construction, and industrial wastewater discharge. Other cumulative
15 projects would be required to demonstrate that sewer service is available to ensure that adequate
16 sanitation can be provided. Other cumulative projects in the San Jacinto River Watershed would be
17 required to provide drainage facilities that collect and detain runoff such that off-site releases are
18 controlled and do not create flooding. Other cumulative projects would also be required to
19 implement pollution prevention measures during construction and at operation. All cumulative
20 projects would be required to comply with City/County ordinances and General Plan policies, as
21 well as other regulations that minimize stormwater runoff, such as the CWA. Other cumulative
22 projects would generate construction and operational solid waste and, depending on the volumes
23 and end uses, would implement recycling and waste reduction measures. (Draft EIR at Pages 4-21
24 to 4-23).

25 **S. Wildfire**

26 **Cumulative impacts with respect to wildfire hazards would be less than significant.**
27 **Moreover, the proposed project’s incremental contribution to cumulative wildfire hazard**
28 **impacts would not be significant. Therefore, the proposed project, in conjunction with other**

1 **planned and approved projects, would not have a cumulatively significant impact related to**
2 **wildfire. (Draft EIR, Page 4-23 – 4-24).**

3 **Less than significant impact.**

4 Cumulative projects, such as those listed in Draft EIR Table 4-1 and shown in Draft EIR
5 Exhibit 4-1, would also be located within and adjacent to fire hazard severity zones. As such, all
6 projects would be required to comply with State and local regulations and protocols, the California
7 Fire Code, and the Uniform Building Code to reduce potential impacts in the event of a wildfire. In
8 addition, all cumulative projects would be covered under existing emergency response plans
9 established by the County, including the County’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. For these reasons,
10 cumulative impacts with respect to wildfire hazards would be less than significant. Moreover, the
11 proposed project’s incremental contribution to cumulative wildfire hazard impacts would not be
12 significant. According to the RCFD Strategic Plan, 11 fire stations are located within and near the
13 planning area. While the proposed project would allow future development adjacent to and within
14 fire hazard zones, future development would comply with the County’s Building and Safety
15 Department regulations and protocols, the County’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the California
16 Fire Code, and the Uniform Building Code. (Draft EIR at Page 4-23 to 4-24).

17 **T. Air Quality**

18 **The project would have cumulative impacts related to air quality. (Draft EIR, Page 4-**
19 **5 – 4-7).**

20 **1. Significant Impact with Mitigation**

21 Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid
22 or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA
23 Guidelines, § 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even
24 with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, Page 4-5 – 4-7). Specific economic, legal, social,
25 technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly
26 trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR.
27 (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15091(a)(3)).

28 **2. Mitigation Measures**

1 Implement MM AIR-6a-1 through MM AIR-6a-16

2 Cumulative projects would result in new air emissions during construction and/or during
3 project operations. The SoCAB is currently in nonattainment of the State standards for Ozone,
4 PM10, and PM2.5 and the federal standards for Ozone and PM2.5. Therefore, there is an existing
5 cumulatively significant air quality impact with respect to these pollutants.

6 As discussed in Impact AIR-6a, the proposed project would generate regional or localized
7 construction or operational emissions that would exceed SCAQMD thresholds of significance and
8 would therefore have a potentially significant cumulative impact on air quality in the region. State
9 CEQA Guidelines Section 15206(b) states that a proposed project is of statewide, regional, or area-
10 wide significance if the project is a residential development of more than 500 dwelling units or a
11 commercial office building of 250,000 square feet or more or that employs 1,000 or more
12 employees. Based on this criteria, the proposed project is of statewide, regional, or area-wide
13 significance. Additionally, the proposed project has the potential to significantly alter the
14 demographic projections beyond what is accounted for in the current AQMP. Since the proposed
15 project would include a GPA, the proposed project would not be consistent with the growth
16 assumptions within the current AQMP.

17 Implementation of the proposed project would represent a substantial increase in emissions
18 compared to existing conditions. Implementation of Mitigation Measures (MM) AIR-6a-1 through
19 MM AIR-6a-15 would be required to reduce regional and localized emissions to the extent feasible.
20 However, the estimated construction emissions and long-term emissions generated under full
21 buildout of the proposed project would exceed the SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds and
22 would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations in the SoCAB. In addition,
23 implementation of the proposed project would contribute to exceedances of the current population
24 and employment estimates for the planning area. Therefore, the proposed project would be
25 considered inconsistent with the AQMP, resulting in a significant impact in this regard.

26 Components of and improvements proposed under the proposed project would contribute to
27 minimize criteria air pollutant emissions from transportation and energy use. However, given the
28 potential increase in growth and associated increase in criteria air pollutant emissions, the project

1 would continue to be inconsistent with the assumptions in the AQMP. Existing Riverside County
2 General Plan policies and mitigation measures required as a part of the most recent General Plan
3 Update EIR would help minimize construction emissions from projects in the planning area. To
4 further reduce the impacts of future development projects envisioned under the proposed project,
5 MM AIR-6a-1 through MM AIR-6a-7 are required. These mitigation measures will reduce
6 emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxide (NOX), PM10, and PM2.5 to the
7 extent feasible; however, due to the size of the proposed project and the potential for overlapping
8 construction activities, future development projects could still potentially exceed the SCAQMD
9 regional thresholds, even with the implementation of mitigation. Therefore, project-related
10 construction activities would result in significant regional air quality impacts. Additionally, due to
11 the magnitude of the proposed growth, operation of the land uses accommodated under the proposed
12 project at buildout would generate air pollutant emissions that exceed SCAQMD's regional
13 significance thresholds for VOC, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 at full buildout. Emissions of VOC
14 and NOX that exceed the SCAQMD regional threshold would cumulatively contribute to the O3
15 nonattainment designation of the SoCAB. Emissions of NOX that exceed SCAQMD's regional
16 significance thresholds would cumulatively contribute to the O3 and particulate matter
17 nonattainment designations of the SoCAB.

18 Emissions of direct PM10 and PM2.5 would contribute to the PM2.5 nonattainment
19 designations. Therefore, the project would result in a potentially significant impact because it would
20 significantly contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. No mitigation measures
21 are available that would reduce cumulative impacts below SCAQMD's thresholds. Therefore,
22 despite adherence to the applicable mitigation measures, Impact AIR-6b would remain significant
23 and unavoidable. As such, the proposed project, in conjunction with other projects, would have a
24 significant and unavoidable impact with respect to SCAQMD regional thresholds during
25 construction and operation. The proposed project's contribution would be cumulatively
26 considerable.

27 As discussed in Impact AIR-6c, construction and operation of future developments
28 envisioned under the proposed project could expose sensitive receptors to significant quantities of

1 criteria and TACs even with the implementation of mitigation. Compliance with existing regulatory
2 programs, existing General Plan policies and mitigation measures, and MM AIR-6a-1 through MM
3 AIR-6a-16 will serve to reduce the impacts of the proposed project to the extent feasible. However,
4 even with the implementation of mitigation, the impacts of the proposed project remain significant
5 and unavoidable. As such, the proposed project, in conjunction with other projects, would have a
6 significant and unavoidable impact with respect to exposing sensitive receptors to criteria and TACs.
7 The proposed project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable (Draft EIR, Page 4-5 – 4-
8 7).

9 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following impacts
10 potentially resulting from the adoption of the EIR cannot be fully mitigated and would be only
11 partially avoided or lessened in consideration of existing regulations, standard conditions, or project
12 design features, which are not considered unique mitigation, and/or mitigation measures which are
13 separately specified in Attachment A (Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, incorporated
14 by reference into this document). Accordingly, and as further explained below, the County makes
15 the following findings as to each of the following impacts as allowed by State CEQA Guidelines
16 section 15091(a): "Changes or alterations [that might further reduce Project impacts] are within the
17 responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the [County]. Such changes have
18 been adopted by such other agency"; or "Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other
19 considerations, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final
20 EIR." Therefore, a statement of overriding considerations consistent with State CEQA Guidelines
21 sections 15092(b)(2)(B) and 15093 is required and included herein.

22 **A. Air Quality**

23 **Impact AIR-6(a): The project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the**
24 **applicable air quality plan with implementation of mitigation. (Draft EIR, Page 3.3-37).**

25 **1. Significant impact with mitigation**

26 Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid
27 or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA
28 Guidelines, § 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even

1 with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, Page 3.3-44). Specific economic, legal, social,
2 technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly
3 trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR.
4 (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15091(a)(3)).

5 **2. Mitigation Measures**

6 Measures required to reduce the impact of construction-related emissions from future
7 development projects included in the planning area include MM AIR-6a-1–MM AIR-6a-7.

8 MM AIR-6a-1 To identify potential implementing development project-specific impacts
9 resulting from construction activities, proposed development projects that are subject to CEQA shall
10 have construction-related air quality impacts analyzed using the latest available CalEEMod model,
11 or other analytical method determined in conjunction with the SCAQMD. The results of the
12 construction-related air quality impacts analysis shall be included in the development project’s
13 CEQA documentation. To address potential localized impacts, the air quality analysis may
14 incorporate SCAQMD’s Localized Significance Threshold analysis or other appropriate analyses as
15 determined in conjunction with SCAQMD. If such analyses identify potentially significant regional
16 or local air quality impacts, the City shall require the incorporation of appropriate mitigation to
17 reduce such impacts.

18 MM AIR-6a-2 As part of a standard building permit submittal, prior to the issuance of
19 building or grading permits, the project applicant shall provide the County of Riverside with
20 documentation demonstrating that project construction will use “super-compliant” low-volatile
21 organic compound (VOC) Architectural Coatings, as defined by SCAQMD, with VOC content of
22 10 grams per liter (g/L) or less.

23 MM AIR-6a-3 Each individual implementing development project shall apply paints using
24 either high volume low pressure (HVLP) spray equipment with a minimum transfer efficiency of at
25 least 65 percent or other application techniques with equivalent or higher transfer efficiency.

26 MM AIR-6a-4 As part of a standard grading permit submittal, the project applicant shall
27 submit documentation to the County of Riverside that demonstrates that all off-road construction
28 equipment in excess of 50 horsepower is equipped with engines meeting the United States

1 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier IV Final off-road engine emission standards or
2 cleaner. The construction contractor shall maintain records concerning its efforts to comply with
3 this requirement during construction, including equipment lists. Off-road equipment descriptions
4 and information may include but are not limited to equipment type, equipment manufacturer,
5 equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower,
6 and engine serial number. The project applicant and/or construction contractor shall submit the
7 construction operations plan and records of compliance to the County of Riverside.

8 If engines that comply with Tier IV Final off-road emission standards are not commercially
9 available, then the construction contractor shall use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment
10 (e.g., Tier IV Interim) available. For purposes of this mitigation measure, “commercially available”
11 shall mean the availability of Tier IV Final engines taking into consideration factors such as (i)
12 critical-path timing of construction; and (ii) geographic proximity to the project site of equipment.
13 The contractor can maintain records for equipment that is not commercially available by providing
14 letters from at least two rental companies for each piece of off-road equipment where the Tier IV
15 Final engine is not available.

16 MM AIR-6a-5 Building and grading permits shall include a restriction that limits idling of
17 construction equipment on-site to no more than five minutes.

18 MM AIR-6a-6 Electricity from power poles shall be used instead of temporary diesel or
19 gasoline-powered generators to reduce associated emissions. Approval will be required by the
20 County of Riverside prior to issuance of grading permits.

21 MM AIR-6a-7 Prior to issuance of any grading permits, the developer shall provide a traffic
22 control plan to the County of Riverside that describes in detail the location of equipment staging
23 areas, stockpiling/storage areas, construction parking areas, safe detours around the project
24 construction site, as well as provide temporary traffic control (e.g., flag person) during construction-
25 related truck hauling activities. The traffic control plan is intended to minimize traffic congestion
26 and delays that increase idling and acceleration emissions. The applicant shall maintain one copy
27 on-site in the construction trailer to the satisfaction of the County of Riverside.

28 Measures designed to reduce the impact of operational emissions from future projects

1 included in the planning area, especially from light industrial uses including stationary sources and
2 warehouses, include MM AIR-6a-8–MM AIR-6a-15.

3 MM AIR-6a-8 To identify potential implementing development project-specific impacts
4 resulting from operational activities, proposed development projects that are subject to CEQA shall
5 have long-term operational-related air quality impacts analyzed using the latest available California
6 Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) model, or other analytical method determined by the
7 County of Riverside as lead agency in conjunction with the SCAQMD. The results of the
8 operational-related air quality impacts analysis shall be included in the development project’s
9 CEQA documentation. To address potential localized impacts, the air quality analysis may
10 incorporate SCAQMD’s Localized Significance Threshold analysis, CO Hot Spot analysis, or other
11 appropriate analyses as determined by the County of Riverside in conjunction with SCAQMD. If
12 such analyses identify potentially significant regional or local air quality impacts, the County shall
13 require the incorporation of appropriate mitigation to reduce such impacts.

14 MM AIR-6a-9 To identify potential implementing development project-specific impacts
15 resulting from the use of diesel trucks, proposed implementing development projects that include
16 an excess of 10 dock doors for a single building, a minimum of 100 truck trips per day, 40 truck
17 trips with Transport Refrigeration Units (TRUs) per day, or TRU operations exceeding 300 hours
18 per week, and that are subject to CEQA and are located adjacent to sensitive land uses; shall have a
19 facility-specific Health Risk Assessment performed to assess the diesel particulate matter impacts
20 from mobile source traffic generated by that implementing development project. The results of the
21 Health Risk Assessment shall be included in the CEQA documentation for each implementing
22 development project.

23 MM AIR-6a-10 In order to promote alternative fuels, and help support “clean” truck
24 fleets, the developer/successor-in-interest shall provide building occupants and businesses with
25 information related to SCAQMD’s Carl Moyer Program, or other State programs that restrict
26 operations to “clean” trucks, such as 2007 or newer model year or 2010 compliant vehicles and
27 information including, but not limited to, the health effect of diesel particulates, benefits of reduced
28 idling time, California Air Resource Board (ARB) regulations, and importance of not parking in

1 residential areas. If trucks older than 2007 model year will be used at a facility with three or more
2 dock-high doors, the developer/ successor-in-interest shall require, within one year of signing a
3 lease, future tenants to apply in good-faith for funding for diesel truck replacement/retrofit through
4 grant programs such as the Carl Moyer, Prop 1B, Voucher Incentive Program (VIP), Hybrid and
5 Zero-Emission Truck And Bus Voucher Incentive Project (HVIP), and Surplus Off-Road Opt-In for
6 NOX (SOON) funding programs, as identified on SCAQMD's website (<http://www.aqmd.gov>).
7 Tenants will be required to use those funds, if awarded.

8 MM AIR-6a-11 Prior to the approval of each implementing development project, the
9 Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) shall be contacted to determine whether the RTA has plans for the
10 future provision of bus routing within any street that is adjacent to the implementing development
11 project that would require bus stops at the project access points. If the RTA has future plans for the
12 establishment of a bus route that will serve the implementing development project, road
13 improvements adjacent to the project site shall be designed to accommodate future bus turnouts at
14 locations established through consultation with the RTA. RTA shall be responsible for the
15 construction and maintenance of the bus stop facilities. The area set aside for bus turnouts shall
16 conform to RTA design standards, including the design of the contact between sidewalks and curb
17 and gutter at bus stops and the use of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant paths to
18 the major building entrances in the project.

19 MM AIR-6a-12 In order to reduce energy consumption from the individual
20 implementing development projects, applicable plans (e.g., electrical plans, improvement maps)
21 submitted to the County shall include the installation of energy-efficient street lighting throughout
22 the project site. These plans shall be reviewed and approved by the applicable County Department
23 prior to conveyance of applicable streets.

24 MM AIR-6a-13 Each implementing development project shall be encouraged to
25 implement, at a minimum, an increase in each building's energy efficiency 15 percent beyond Title
26 24, and reduce indoor water use by 25 percent. All requirements will be documented through a
27 checklist to be submitted to the County of Riverside prior to issuance of building permits for the
28 implementing development project with building plans and calculations.

1 MM AIR-6a-14 Prior to issuance of building permits for non-single-family residential
2 and mixed-use residential development projects in the planning area, the project applicant shall
3 indicate on the building plans that the following features have been incorporated into the design of
4 the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the County of Riverside
5 prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

6 • Electric vehicle charging shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.8.2
7 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen).

8 • Bicycle parking shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.9 (Residential
9 Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.

10 MM AIR-6a-15 Prior to the issuance of building permits for nonresidential
11 development projects in the planning area, project applicants shall indicate on the building plans
12 that the following features have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper
13 installation of these features shall be verified by the County of Riverside prior to the issuance of a
14 Certificate of Occupancy.

15 • For buildings with more than 10 tenant occupants, changing/shower facilities shall
16 be provided as specified in Section A5.106.4.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the
17 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen).

18 • Preferential parking for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles shall
19 be provided as specified in Section A5.106.5.1 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the
20 CALGreen Code.

21 • Facilities shall be installed to support future electric vehicle charging at each
22 nonresidential building with 30 or more parking spaces. Installation shall be consistent with Section
23 A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.

24 The proposed project would conflict with implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan
25 (2022 AQMP for the South Coast Air Basin [SoCAB]). The proposed project would generate
26 regional or localized construction or operational emissions that would exceed SCAQMD thresholds
27 of significance. Additionally, the proposed project has the potential to significantly alter the
28 demographic projections beyond what is accounted for in the current AQMP. Since the proposed

1 project would include a General Plan Amendment, the proposed project would not be consistent
2 with the growth assumptions within the current AQMP. Components of and improvements proposed
3 under the proposed project would contribute to minimize criteria air pollutant emissions from
4 transportation and energy use. However, given the potential increase in growth and associated
5 increase in criteria air pollutant emissions, the project would continue to be potentially inconsistent
6 with the assumptions in the AQMP. Implementation of MM AIR-6a-1 through MM AIR-6a-15
7 would be required to reduce regional and localized emissions to the extent feasible. However, the
8 estimated construction emissions and long-term emissions generated under full buildout of the
9 proposed project are estimated to continue to exceed the SCAQMD's regional significance
10 thresholds after the implementation of mitigation and would cumulatively contribute to the
11 nonattainment designations in the SoCAB. In addition, implementation of the proposed project
12 would contribute to exceedances of the current population and employment estimates for the
13 planning area. Therefore, the proposed project would be considered inconsistent with the AQMP,
14 resulting in a significant impact in this regard. Therefore, Impact AIR-6a would remain significant
15 and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, Page 5-1 – 5-2.)

16 **Impact AIR-6(b): The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net**
17 **increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an**
18 **applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which**
19 **exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors) with implementation of mitigation.**
20 **(Draft EIR, Page 3.3-44).**

21 1. Significant Impact With Mitigation

22 Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid
23 or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA
24 Guidelines, § 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even
25 with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, Page 3.3-48). Specific economic, legal, social,
26 technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly
27 trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR.
28 (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15091(a)(3)).

1 **2. Mitigation Measures**

2 Implement MM AIR-6a-1 through MM AIR-6a-15.

3 The proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria
4 pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient
5 air quality standard. Operation of the proposed project at buildout would generate air pollutant
6 emissions that exceed SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for volatile organic compound
7 (VOC), nitrogen oxide (NOX), CO, PM10, and PM2.5 at full buildout. Emissions of VOC and NOX
8 that exceed the SCAQMD regional threshold would cumulatively contribute to the O3
9 nonattainment designation of the SoCAB. Emissions of NOX that exceed SCAQMD’s regional
10 significance thresholds would cumulatively contribute to the O3 and particulate matter
11 nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Emissions of direct PM10 and PM2.5 would contribute
12 to the PM2.5 nonattainment designations. Therefore, the project would result in a potentially
13 significant impact because it would significantly contribute to the nonattainment designations of the
14 SoCAB. Combined with the Riverside County General Plan policies and the implementation of
15 existing mitigation measures developed as part of the Final EIR for the General Plan, the
16 implementation of MM AIR-6a-1 through MM AIR-6a-7 would reduce criteria air pollutant
17 emissions from construction-related activities to the extent feasible. However, specific construction
18 time frames and equipment for individual site-specific projects are not available and there is a
19 potential for multiple developments to be constructed at any one time, resulting in potentially
20 significant cumulative construction-related emissions. Buildout in accordance with the proposed
21 project would generate long-term emissions that would exceed SCAQMD’s regional significance
22 thresholds and cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. To reduce
23 emissions from the operation of future projects envisioned in the proposed project, MM AIR-6a-8
24 through MM AIR-6a-15 are required to reduce emissions to the extent feasible, in combination with
25 the existing General Plan policies and associated mitigation. However, due to the magnitude of
26 emissions generated by residential, office, commercial, and light industrial land uses proposed as
27 part of the project, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce cumulative impacts below
28 SCAQMD’s thresholds. Therefore, despite adherence to the applicable mitigation measures, Impact

1 AIR-6b would remain significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, Page 5-2.)

2 **Impact AIR-6(c): The project would expose sensitive receptors, which are located**
3 **within one (1) mile of the project site, to substantial pollutant concentrations with**
4 **implementation of mitigation. (Draft EIR, Page 3.3-48).**

5 **1. Significant Impact With Mitigation**

6 Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid
7 or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA
8 Guidelines, § 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even
9 with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, Page 3.3-58). Specific economic, legal, social,
10 technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly
11 trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR.
12 (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15091(a)(3)).

13 **2. Mitigation Measures**

14 Compliance with MM AIR-6a-1 through MM AIR-6a-15 listed above, and MM AIR-6a-16.

15 MM AIR-6a-16 All future residents of the planning area shall be provided with
16 information that describes the potential risk from living near a freeway and that the incorporation of
17 an advanced air filtration system has been provided to reduce that risk. The information shall also
18 indicate that the residents have the option to open windows for circulation, however that by opening
19 windows, they reduce or eliminate the effectiveness of the air filtration system within their unit for
20 as long as the unit is open to unfiltered air.

21 The proposed project would expose sensitive receptors, which are located within 1 mile of
22 the project site, to substantial pollutant concentrations. Known sensitive receptors located within 1
23 mile of the planning area include numerous residences, childcare centers, parks, and nine public
24 schools. Construction equipment exhaust combined with fugitive particulate matter emissions have
25 the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of criteria air pollutant
26 emissions and result in a significant impact. Furthermore, the proposed project would permit
27 commercial and light industrial land uses, which could potentially generate substantial quantities of
28 criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants (TACs) from land uses such as stationary sources

1 and warehouses once the proposed project is operational. These emissions could potentially impact
2 nearby sensitive receptors. To accurately analyze the potential impacts of potential future
3 development projects, MM AIR-1 is required. Compliance with this mitigation measure will ensure
4 that specific project-level construction impacts are analyzed and further mitigation measures are
5 considered, as appropriate. Even after complying with regulations, existing policies and mitigation
6 measures, as well as new mitigation measures, the impacts cannot be guaranteed to be reduced to
7 below applicable agency thresholds, resulting in a potentially significant impact from construction
8 toxic air pollutants to sensitive receptors. Additionally, development of the commercial land uses
9 that are allowed under the proposed project may result in stationary sources of TAC emissions.
10 Mitigation measures included as part of EIR No. 521 would further serve to reduce the impacts of
11 operational emissions on sensitive receptors within the General Plan area. Required General Plan
12 mitigation includes EIR No. 441 MM 2.51A, MM 4.51B, and MM 4.5.1C, and EIR No. 521 MM
13 4.6.B-N1, MM 4.6.B-N2, MM 4.6.BN3, MM 4.6.D-N1, and MM 4.6.D-N2. To accurately analyze
14 the potential impacts of potential future development projects that include trucking emissions, MM
15 AIR-6a-8 and MM AIR-6a-9 are required. Compliance with MM AIR-6a-8 and MM AIR-6a-9 will
16 ensure that localized and regional project-level emissions are analyzed and further mitigation
17 measures are considered, as appropriate. Additionally, the proposed project would locate new
18 sensitive receptors (residents) that could be subject to existing sources of TACs within the project
19 boundary. Therefore, MM AIR-6a-16 has been included to relay information to the residents in
20 order for them to make their own informed decisions. Because the construction and operation of
21 future developments envisioned under the proposed project could expose sensitive receptors to
22 significant quantities of criteria and TACs even with the implementation of mitigation, the impacts
23 of the proposed project remain significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, Page 5-2 – 5-3.)

24 **B. Transportation and Traffic**

25 **Impact TRANS-37b: The project would conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA**
26 **Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b). (Draft EIR, Page 3.18-13).**

27 **1. Significant Impact With Mitigation**

28 Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid

1 or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (State CEQA
2 Guidelines, § 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even
3 with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, Page 3.18-15). Specific economic, legal, social,
4 technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly
5 trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR.
6 (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15091(a)(3)).

7 **2. Mitigation Measures**

8 MM TRANS-37b-1 Future implementing projects shall provide more options for shorter
9 trips by locating residential uses within walking distance to retail, office, and service-oriented uses.

10 MM TRANS-37b-2 Future implementing projects shall provide pedestrian and bicycle
11 network improvements within the development connecting complementary uses (i.e., residential,
12 employment and retail) internally and to existing off-site facilities.

13 MM TRANS-37b-3 Where applicable, future implementing projects shall ensure that
14 design of key intersections and roadways encourage the use of walking, biking and transit.

15 MM TRANS-37b-4 Future implementing projects shall collaborate with the Riverside
16 Transit Authority (RTA) to determine the feasibility of providing new or re-route existing transit
17 services to the Project.

18 MM TRANS-37b-5 In addition, the following TDM strategies may be applicable at the
19 implementing project-level:

- 20 • Reduce Parking Supply for Retail Uses
- 21 • Transit Rerouting and Transit Stops
- 22 • Implementation of Local Shuttle Service
- 23 • Mandatory Travel Behavior Change Program; Promotions and Marketing
- 24 • Promotions and Marketing
- 25 • Emergency Ride Home (ERH) Program
- 26 • School Carpool Program
- 27 • Bike Share
- 28 • Implement/Improve On-street Bicycle Facility

- Traffic Calming Improvements
- Pedestrian Network Improvements

The proposed project would affect the VMT in the County. Because the proposed project would increase population and employment, VMT would increase. As discussed above, the County adopted thresholds of significance that evaluate the project-generated VMT and the proposed project's effect on VMT in the baseline and cumulative conditions. If any of these thresholds is exceeded, the proposed project is considered to have significant transportation impacts. Draft EIR Table 3.18-3 presents the VMT calculations for the proposed project's residential and employment-based component as compared to the County's adopted impact threshold for each respective land use. As shown in the table, the proposed project would result in an increase in project-generated VMT from No Project baseline conditions, which is considered a significant impact for all VMT metrics presented.

The proposed project's residential land uses would exceed the County's adopted impact threshold under all Existing Plus Project scenarios. For Existing Plus Project, approximately 7.0 percent mitigation is required to reduce project-generated VMT per capita to a level of less than significant. For Cumulative Plus Project, the proposed project would reduce VMT per capita as compared to the Cumulative No Project scenario.

Traffic generated by the proposed project's employment-based land uses (not including retail) was found to exceed the threshold under all scenarios. For Existing Plus Project, approximately 17.6 percent mitigation would be required. For Cumulative Plus Project, the proposed project was found to reduce VMT per-employee as compared to the Cumulative No Project scenario.

Local-serving retail under 50,000 square feet per store, per adopted County traffic analysis guidelines, is presumed to not have a significant impact. Regional-serving retail would need to be evaluated as detailed development proposals become available in the future. Retail buildings greater than 50,000 square feet may result in a significant VMT impact.

Projects that exceed VMT threshold(s) are required to mitigate transportation impacts to the

1 extent feasible. Mitigation Measure (MMs) TRANS-37b-1 through MM TRANS-37b-5 would be
2 required to reduce impacts related to increase in VMT. MMs TRANS-37b-1 through MM TRANS-
3 37b-3 would reduce potential VMT by encouraging non-motorized transportation and increasing
4 pedestrian and bicycle network. Research demonstrates that the promotion of additional pedestrian
5 and bicycle facilities, especially near activity centers, would reduce additional VMT. Numerous
6 studies have found statistically significant correlations between objective measures of sidewalk
7 presence, extent, or quality and transport walking.

8 MM TRANS-37b-4 would encourage the use of existing mass transit to further reduce
9 additional VMT. MM TRANS-37b-5 also includes project-specific mitigation that would further
10 encourage a reduction in VMT. For example, the inclusion of local shuttle service and school
11 carpool programs at the project level would decrease single occupancy vehicle trips. However, given
12 the uncertainty in some components of the measures that influence VMT (such as the cost of fuel)
13 combined with the County's inability to influence other measures that would have the largest effect
14 on VMT (such as implementation of a VMT mitigation bank/fee or an increase in the fuel tax), the
15 effectiveness of these mitigation measures cannot be fully quantified or guaranteed to reduce
16 impacts. Therefore, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. (Draft EIR, Page 3.18-13
17 – 15).

18 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has, pursuant to State CEQA
19 Guidelines section 15093, balanced the "economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits" of the
20 Project, against the unavoidable adverse environmental effects described herein, and has determined that
21 each and every one of the following benefits individually outweigh and render acceptable each and every
22 one of those environmental effects.

23 CEQA requires that a Lead Agency balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable
24 environmental risk in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits outweigh the unavoidable
25 adverse effects, those effects may be considered "acceptable" pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section
26 15093(a). CEQA requires that a Lead Agency support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a
27 project acceptable when significant impacts are infeasible to mitigate. Those reasons must be based on
28 substantial evidence in the EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record pursuant to State CEQA

1 Guidelines Section 15093(b). The Lead Agency’s written reasons are referred to as a Statement of
2 Overriding Considerations.

3 As explained in the above Findings of Fact, most of the project’s impacts on the environment would
4 either be insignificant or, through the incorporation of mitigation measures as conditions of approval of the
5 project, can be reduced to less than significant. However, as set forth in Section 1.7 above, impacts to Air
6 Quality (conflicts with the applicable Air Quality Plan, cumulative air quality impacts, and exposure of
7 sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations) and Transportation (conflicts with circulation
8 system program, plan, ordinance, or policy) will remain significant and unavoidable, even with
9 implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Further, as set forth in Section 1.8 above, there are no
10 feasible project alternatives that would both mitigate or avoid those environmental impacts and meet the
11 project objectives.

12 Accordingly, as set forth below, the County hereby declares that the following benefits provided to
13 the public through the approval and implementation of the project outweigh the identified significant
14 adverse environmental impacts of the project that cannot be mitigated. The County finds that each of the
15 project benefits separately and individually outweighs all of the unavoidable adverse environmental effects
16 identified in the EIR and therefore finds those impacts to be acceptable.

17 The Lead Agency hereby declares that pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the
18 County has balanced the benefits of the project against any unavoidable environmental impacts in
19 determining whether to approve the project. Pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines, if the benefits of the
20 proposed project outweigh the proposed project’s unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, those
21 impacts may be considered “acceptable.”

22 Having reduced the adverse significant environmental effects of the project to the extent feasible by
23 adopting the mitigation measures contained in the EIR, the MMRP, and this Resolution, having considered
24 the entire administrative record on the project, and having weighed the benefits of the project against its
25 unavoidable adverse impacts after mitigation, the Board of Supervisors has determined that each of the
26 following social, economic, and environmental benefits of the project separately and individually outweigh
27 the potential unavoidable adverse impact and render those potential adverse environmental impacts
28 acceptable based upon the following overriding considerations:

1 A. The proposed project will stimulate economic development, provide housing opportunities,
2 facilitate the development of infrastructure, and address environmental justice issues.

3 B. The proposed project presents an opportunity to guide the orderly transition of development
4 within the unincorporated County along the Highway 74 corridor.

5 C. Buildout of the proposed project would maintain and enhance Riverside County’s fiscal viability,
6 economic diversity, and environmental integrity; promote better land use development and project design;
7 support economic vitality by maximizing the availability of employment opportunities; promote livable and
8 resilient neighborhoods that provide housing, goods and services, open space, and multi-model
9 transportation options within proximity to each other and that reduce reliance on the automobile; promote
10 healthy, safe neighborhoods; promote the health and welfare of the community; and maintain the rural and
11 open space character of Riverside County while preserving and maintaining the environment.

12 D. The proposed project would promote land use compatibility by designating land uses and
13 clustering development, which would improve connectivity, reduce hazards to the public, encourage
14 economic development, and reduce reliance on the automobile.

15 E. The proposed project would provide new transit opportunities such as pedestrian and bicycle
16 connections and bus or shuttle connections that increase connections to adjacent and nearby communities
17 and cities, businesses, parks, and open space areas.

18 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the State CEQA Guidelines
19 section 15126(g) requires an EIR to discuss how a proposed project could directly or indirectly lead to
20 economic, population, or housing growth. A project may be growth inducing if it removes obstacles to
21 growth, taxes, community service facilities, or encourages other activities which cause significant
22 environmental effect. The discussion is as follows:

23 State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(e) requires a discussion of the ways in which a
24 proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional
25 housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Typical growth-inducing
26 factors might be the extension of urban services or transportation infrastructure to a previously
27 unserved or underserved area, or the removal of major barriers to development.

28 Implementation of the proposed project would continue the plan for growth within Riverside

1 County in a manner consistent with the County's General Plan criteria for appropriate built
2 environments that promote economic development. In addition, project implementation would not
3 result in substantially different or increased impacts than those identified in the General Plan EIR.
4 The population of unincorporated Riverside County in 2019 was 382,077 based on Department of
5 Finance (DOF) information. The DOF estimates that the population increased by 0.79 percent from
6 2019 to 2020. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) forecasts growth in
7 population in unincorporated Riverside County to reach 525,600 by 2045, with a projected 180,900
8 households. Growth projections for Riverside County in 2045 are 3,252,000 persons and 1,086,000
9 households. Future development that would occur following project implementation would be based
10 on market conditions and other future considerations. At such time as a development application is
11 submitted for review by the County, the County would assess each proposed development and the
12 site-specific environmental impacts associated with new housing through project-level CEQA
13 analysis when their design and specific locations are known. Assuming all parcels designated for
14 residential become developed, buildout of the proposed project would accommodate nearly 4,000
15 new multi-family residential units. Based on a person per household ratio of 3.20, if all
16 approximately 4,000 dwelling units were constructed, a population increase of up to 12,800
17 residents could be anticipated in the planning area. This would represent a 3.3 percent increase in
18 the existing resident population of unincorporated Riverside County and a 0.12 percent increase in
19 population of Riverside County overall.

20 In addition to residential units, direct growth from the proposed project is projected to
21 include new commercial and industrial land use designations, which would result in the potential
22 for increased employment opportunities in the project area. The proposed project includes policies
23 and programs that promote cohesive and compatible development and planned growth. It does not
24 approve or entitle any specific development. Future development would also occur incrementally.
25 As a result, project implementation would create minimal indirect growth, and project buildout
26 would be consistent with the County's projections.

27 The proposed project would also not significantly or adversely affect the permanent
28 job/housing balance. The proposed project would allow for creation of nonresidential development

1 and jobs and would accommodate nearly 4,000 new multi-family residential units and up to 12,800
2 new residents. Because growth projections for the County are expected to increase significantly by
3 2045, housing included under the proposed project would help the County achieve a more even
4 jobs/housing balance by provided much-needed housing and new land use designations.

5 Although the planning area is already developed, new infrastructure would likely be part of
6 implementation of the proposed project to accommodate the new development. This, in turn, could result
7 in growth-inducing impacts that could increase demand for housing. However, the proposed project does
8 not include infrastructure development and any potential infrastructure development to accommodate future
9 projects would occur on a project-by-project basis to ensure that future development would be adequately
10 served. As such, the proposed Master Plan would not result in indirect population growth through providing
11 an extension of infrastructure or services, or through the removal of a barrier to growth. Impacts would be
12 less than significant. (Draft EIR, Page 6-4 – 6-5).

13 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered the following
14 alternatives identified in light of the environmental impacts which cannot be avoided or substantially
15 lessened and has rejected those alternatives as failing to meet most of the Project’s objectives, as failing to
16 reduce or avoid the Project’s significant impacts or as infeasible for the reasons hereinafter stated:

17 **A. Comparative impact assessment of alternatives to the project**

18 In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, the EIR contained a comparative
19 impact assessment of alternatives to the project. The primary purpose of this analysis is to provide decision-
20 makers and interested agencies, organizations and individuals with information about a reasonable range of
21 potentially feasible project alternatives, which could avoid or reduce any of the project’s significant adverse
22 environmental effects. Important considerations for this alternatives analyses are noted below:

23 An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project;

24 An EIR should identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but rejected as
25 infeasible during the scoping process;

26 Reasons for rejecting an alternative include: failure to meet most of the basic project objectives
27 identified in Section 2.4 of the Draft EIR; infeasibility; and inability to avoid significant environmental
28 effects.

1 CEQA does not require that an analysis of alternate sites always be included in an EIR. Pursuant to
2 State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2), in making the decision to include or exclude analysis
3 of an alternate site, the “key question and first step in analysis is whether any of the significant
4 effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another
5 location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the
6 project need to be considered for inclusion in the EIR.”

7 There were no suitable alternative sites for the project. Therefore, alternative locations were
8 not considered in the alternatives analysis.

9 A maximum density reduction was considered in order to reduce air quality impacts to less
10 than significant levels. As described in Section 3-.3, Air Quality, the overlap of potential
11 construction and operations and the unknown nature of specific development projects present the
12 possibility of a significant and unavoidable air quality impact. To result in less than significant air
13 quality impacts, an alternative would require an extreme reduction in particulate matter less than 10
14 microns in diameter (PM10) emissions during construction and operation from a maximum 753.7
15 pounds/day to a maximum of four pounds/day, or a reduction of 99.47 percent. Such an alternative
16 would require a correspondingly extreme reduction in residential and nonresidential development
17 densities. This alternative would not be financially feasible and would not accomplish any of the
18 project objectives and was therefore rejected from further consideration.

19 **B. Alternative 1: No Project Alternative.**

20 Under this alternative, land use changes as per the proposed project would not occur. The Highway
21 74 Community Plan (proposed project) would not be implemented, and the existing land use activities
22 within the planning area would continue for the foreseeable future until they are developed or redeveloped
23 according to their General Plan land use designations. This alternative assumes the breakdown of land use
24 acreages listed in the Existing General Plan Land Use Designation table (Draft EIR Table 2-1). No changes
25 in buildout potential would occur.

26 Overall, none of the mitigation measures required for the proposed project would be implemented
27 under the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would not result in any significant changes to
28

1 agriculture and forest resources; therefore, it would have no impacts with respect to these resources.
2 However, it would not offer any of the benefits of the proposed project and would not meet any of the
3 project objectives.

4 Because the No Project Alternative would have a less intensive buildout than the proposed project,
5 the No Project Alternative would have lower impacts than the proposed project's impacts related to air
6 quality, biological resources, energy, GHG emissions, land use and planning, population and housing, and
7 utilities and service systems.

8 The proposed project provides a framework for development that would enhance the Highway 74
9 corridor by promoting cohesive development that would not be realized under the No Project Alternative.
10 Because the planning area would retain the existing land use designations and zoning classifications, the
11 No Project Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives and development would continue to be
12 scattered and disconnected. The No Project Alternative would not encourage consolidation of parcels to
13 promote better land use development and project design; increase connections to adjacent and nearby
14 communities and cities, businesses, parks and open space areas, increase and facilitate access from Highway
15 74 to residential, commercial, and industrial sites; encourage development to include convenient pedestrian
16 and bicycle connections, bus, and shuttle connections; promote the health and welfare of the community;
17 or implement any of the other project objectives.

18 The No Project Alternative would not meet all of the project objectives because this alternative
19 would not include new policies and programs that provide direction for issues related to land use, mobility,
20 air quality, housing, affordability, safety, environmental justice, and community services, in addition to
21 addressing new requirements of State law. As the new policies and programs in the proposed project reflect
22 the current goals and vision expressed by residents, businesses, decision-makers, and other stakeholders,
23 through an extensive public review process, neither the first nor second objective of the proposed project
24 would be met under the No Project Alternative. As the General Plan Amendments and the new policies and
25 programs in the proposed project address issues and concerns identified by involved residents, businesses,
26 decision-makers, and other stakeholders, and provide a framework for cohesive development, the third
27 objective of the proposed project would not be met under the No Project Alternative.

28 **C. Alternative 2: Reduced Density Alternative.**

1 Description: The purpose of this alternative is to reduce impacts from the proposed project
2 related to the number of residential units and the intensity of commercial and industrial
3 development. Under this alternative, the total number of residential dwelling units anticipated is
4 assumed to be reduced from 3,587 to 2,691 representing a reduction of 896 units, or approximately
5 25 percent. The amount of commercial and industrial development would also be reduced by 25
6 percent, from 4,328,270 to 3,246,203 (a reduction of 1,082,067 square feet).

7 The Reduced Density Alternative would lessen the severity of the proposed project's impacts
8 associated with air quality, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, public services, recreation, and
9 utilities and service systems. This alternative would increase the severity of the proposed project's
10 impacts associated with population and housing and transportation. This alternative would have
11 similar impacts to the proposed project associated with aesthetics, light, and glare; agriculture and
12 forest resources; biological resources; cultural resources; geology, soils, and seismicity; hazards and
13 hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use; mineral resources; paleontological
14 resources, tribal cultural resources, and wildfire.

15 The Reduced Density Alternative would advance most of the project objectives, but to a
16 lesser degree than the proposed project because of the reduction in new dwelling units and
17 nonresidential development. This includes objectives related to increasing connections and
18 providing new transit opportunities, reducing reliance on septic systems, and maximizing the density
19 of residential uses.

20 **D. Environmentally Superior Alternative**

21 Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a
22 proposed project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in
23 an EIR.

24 Each of the three project alternatives would lessen the environmental impacts relative to the
25 proposed project to a certain degree (as described above and further in the EIR). If the No Project is the
26 environmentally superior alternative—which is the case here, as it avoids all project impacts but fails to
27 satisfy any of the project objectives—the EIR must also identify another environmentally superior
28

1 alternative among the remaining alternatives. Overall, based on these Findings, the Reduced Density
2 Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative because it would result in less
3 development overall than the Increased Industrial Use Alternative, even though it fails to fully implement
4 project objectives and is therefore infeasible.

5 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Final EIR also discusses,
6 pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines sections 15126(c) and 15126.2(c), significant irreversible
7 environmental changes and provides in the DEIR Chapter 6, *Topical Issues*, the following findings:

8 According to Sections 15126(c) and 15126.2(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Lead Agency
9 must address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would occur should the project be
10 implemented. Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if any of
11 the following would occur:

12 The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;

13 The primary and secondary impacts of the project would generally commit future generations to
14 similar uses;

15 The project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential
16 environmental accidents; or

17 The proposed consumption of resources are not justified.

18 Construction of the proposed project would include the consumption of resources that are not
19 replenishable or which may renew so slowly to be considered nonrenewable. These resources would include
20 the following: certain types of lumber and other forest products; aggregate materials used in concrete and
21 asphalt such as sand, gravel, and stone; metals such as steel, copper, and lead; petrochemical construction
22 materials such as plastics; and water. Fossil fuels such as gasoline and oil would also be consumed in the
23 use of construction vehicles and equipment. Consumption of building materials and energy is common to
24 most other development in the region, and commitments of resources are not unique or unusual to the
25 proposed project. Development would not be expected to involve an unusual commitment of nonrenewable
26 resources, nor be expected to consume any resources in a wasteful manner. Energy demands associated
27 with construction of the proposed project are discussed in greater detail in the Draft EIR, Section 3.5,
28 Energy, which concluded that construction-related impacts related to electricity and fuel consumption

1 would be less than significant. At operation, the proposed project would include the consumption of energy
2 as part of building operations and transportation activities (vehicle trips associated with the proposed
3 project). Fossil fuels would represent the primary energy source during operation of the project, and the
4 existing, finite supplies of these nonrenewable resources would be incrementally reduced. As discussed in
5 Section 3.5, Energy, the future development would be designed and constructed in accordance with the
6 City's latest adopted energy efficiency standards, which are based on the State's Title 24 energy efficiency
7 standards. There are also mitigation measures that aim to reduce VMT and fuel consumption demand,
8 including promoting and supporting carpools and rideshare. Thus, although the proposed project would
9 result in an irretrievable commitment of nonrenewable resources at operation, the resources would not be
10 consumed inefficiently, unnecessarily, or wastefully.

11 Implementation of the proposed project represents an essentially irreversible commitment of land
12 uses that would change the existing uses on-site to higher density development. The restoration of the site
13 to pre-developed conditions after development would not be feasible given the level of capital investment
14 and degree of disturbance needed to develop the properties in the first place. Therefore, future generations
15 would be committed to similar uses and the irreversible long-term environmental changes discussed below.

16 The irreversible long-term environmental changes associated with the proposed project would
17 include a change in the visual character of the site. Additional irreversible environmental changes are
18 associated with the increase in local and regional vehicular traffic, and the resultant increase in air
19 pollutants, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise generated by this traffic. The proposed project would also
20 irreversibly increase the commitment of energy resources, potable water supply, wastewater treatment, solid
21 waste disposal, and public services, such as providing police and fire services, to support the proposed
22 project through its lifetime. However, features have been incorporated into the project and mitigation
23 measures are proposed in this EIR that would minimize or avoid the significant effects of the environmental
24 changes associated with project to the maximum degree feasible.

25 The proposed project does not include any uses in which irreversible damage could result from
26 potential environmental accidents associated with the proposed project. The proposed project would not
27 introduce highly hazardous land uses or activities such that there would be a potential for irreversible
28 damage from incidents such as a release of hazardous materials, explosion or other potentially catastrophic

1 event. As discussed in Section 3.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the proposed uses would not require
2 the use of large quantities of hazardous materials. Small quantities of hazardous materials would be used
3 on-site, including cleaning solvents (e.g., degreasers, paint thinners, and aerosol propellants), paints (both
4 latex- and oil-based), acids and bases (such as many cleaners), disinfectants, and fertilizers. However,
5 compliance with existing regulations regarding the storage, handling, usage, and disposal of hazardous
6 materials would reduce the potential for irreversible damage from environmental accidents to less than
7 significant levels. (Draft EIR, Page 6-5 – 6-6).

8 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the custodians of the documents
9 upon which this decision is based are the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and the County Planning
10 Department and that such documents are located at 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, California.

11 This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6.

12 Various documents, information, testimony, reports, studies, analyses, and other materials (both oral
13 and written) constitute the record upon which the County bases these Findings and the basis for the County's
14 approval and/or adoption contained herein. These Findings cite specific pieces of evidence, but none of the
15 County's findings are based solely on those cited pieces of evidence. Rather, these Findings are based upon
16 the entire record, and the Lead Agency intends to rely upon all supporting evidence in the record for each
17 of its conclusions contained herein.

18 The documents in the record include all items referenced in Public Resources Code Section
19 21167.6(e):

- 20 (i) All project application materials.
- 21 (ii) The EIR (including the Draft EIR, the Final EIR, and all appendices attached thereto).
- 22 (iii) All staff reports and related documents prepared by the Lead Agency and/or consultants with
23 respect to the Lead Agency's compliance with the substantive and procedural requirements of this division
24 and with respect to the action on the project.
- 25 (iv) All staff reports and related documents prepared by the Lead Agency and written testimony
26 or documents submitted by any person relevant to any findings or Statement of Overriding Considerations
27 adopted by the Lead Agency pursuant to this division.
- 28 (v) All documentary and oral evidence received and reviewed at public hearings, public

1 meetings, study sessions, and workshops on the EIR, and any transcript or minutes of the proceedings at
2 which any advisory body or decision-making body heard testimony on, or considered the EIR.

3 (vi) All notices issued by the Lead Agency to comply with this division or with any other law
4 governing the processing and approval of the project.

5 (vii) All written comments received in response to, or in connection with, the EIR, including
6 comments on the Draft EIR.

7 (viii) All written evidence or correspondence submitted to, or transferred from, the Lead Agency
8 with respect to compliance with this division or with respect to the project.

9 (ix) Any proposed decisions or findings submitted to the decision-makers by lead agency
10 staff, or the project proponent, project opponents, or other interested agencies, organizations and/or
11 individuals.

12 (x) The documentation of the final decision, including the EIR and all documents, in addition to
13 those referenced in paragraph (c), cited or relied on in the findings or in a Statement of Overriding
14 Considerations adopted pursuant to this division.

15 (xi) For documentary and informational purposes, all locally-adopted land use plans and
16 ordinances, including, without limitation, general plans, specific plans and ordinances, master plans
17 together with environmental review documents, findings, mitigation monitoring programs, and other
18 documentation relevant to planned growth in the area.

19 (xii) Any other written materials relevant to the lead agency's compliance with this division or to
20 its decision on the merits of the project, including any drafts of any environmental document or portions
21 thereof, which have been released for public review, and copies of studies or other documents relied upon
22 in any environmental document prepared for the project and either made available to the public during the
23 public review period or included in the lead agency's files on the project, and all internal agency
24 communications, including staff notes and memoranda related to the project or to compliance with this
25 division.

26 (xiii) The full written record before any inferior administrative decision-making body whose
27 decision was appealed to a superior administrative decision-making body prior to the filing of litigation.

28 (xiv) Any additional items not included above if otherwise required by law.

1 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that that this additional information
2 does not constitute significant new information, nor does it require recirculation of the EIR. The
3 additional information merely clarifies or amplifies an adequate EIR. The additional information merely
4 clarifies or amplifies an adequate EIR.

5 During the public review period after the Draft EIR was published, the Lead Agency received
6 certain additional information. Lead Agency staff and consultants involved in preparing the various
7 studies, reports and analyses included in the Draft EIR have also presented additional information since
8 the publication of the Draft EIR. Some of this information was contained in comments submitted on the
9 Draft EIR, and in responses to those comments contained in the Final EIR. Other information was
10 presented at or before public meetings/hearings on the EIR. The EIR incorporates additions, clarifications,
11 modifications, and other changes, in response to comments and as determined appropriate by lead agency
12 staff and required under CEQA.

13 The Lead Agency has considered all relevant information including the opinions and comments of
14 interested agencies, organizations and individuals. The Lead Agency finds that the additional information
15 does not show that any of the following situations requiring recirculation identified in CEQA Guideline
16 Section 15088.5 have occurred:

17 1. A new significant environmental impact that would result from the project (or any alternative)
18 or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

19 2. A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation
20 measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

21 3. A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others
22 previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project (or an
23 alternative), but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.

24 4. The Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that
25 meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

26 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and considered
27 the EIR in evaluating General Plan Amendment No. 1205 (GPA 1205), and that the EIR is an accurate and
28 objective statement that complies with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and reflects the

1 County's independent judgment, and that the EIR is incorporated by this reference.

2 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **ADOPTS** the statement of
3 overriding consideration, **CERTIFIES** the EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2019059042) and **ADOPTS** the
4 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan attached as Attachment "A" hereto. To the extent that there are
5 any inconsistencies between the mitigation measures as set forth in the EIR, and those set forth in the
6 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, whichever mitigation measure is deemed more protective
7 of the environment shall control.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 County's independent judgment, and that the EIR is incorporated by this reference.

2 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it **ADOPTS** the statement of
3 overriding consideration, **CERTIFIES** the EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2019059042) and **ADOPTS** the
4 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan attached as Attachment "A" hereto. To the extent that there are
5 any inconsistencies between the mitigation measures as set forth in the EIR, and those set forth in the
6 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, whichever mitigation measure is deemed more protective
7 of the environment shall control.

8
9 **ROLL CALL:**

10 Ayes: Jeffries, Washington, Spiegel, Perez, and Gutierrez
11 Nays: None
12 Absent: None

13 The foregoing is certified to be a true copy of a resolution duly adopted by said Board of Supervisors on
14 the date therein set forth.

15 KIMBERLY A. RECTOR, Clerk of said Board

16 By: 
17 Deputy

18
19 12.12.2023 3.58
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28