Environmental Assessment/Initial Study Temescal Commercial Project Riverside County, California





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

Prepared by RECON Environmental, Inc. 3111 Camino del Rio North, Suite 600 San Diego, CA 92108 P 619.308.9333

RECON Number 8622 August 28, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PROJECT INFORMATION	1
II.	APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS	15
III.	ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	16
IV.	DETERMINATION	16
V.	Environmental Issues Assessment	18
	AESTHETICS	.18
	AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES	.28
	AIR QUALITY	.30
	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	.39
	CULTURAL RESOURCES	.47
	ENERGY	.51
	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	.53
	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	.59
	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	.61
	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	.67
	LAND USE AND PLANNING	.72
	MINERAL RESOURCES	.73
	NOISE	.74
	PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES:	.83
	POPULATION AND HOUSING	.85
	PUBLIC SERVICES	.87
	RECREATION	.89
	TRANSPORTATION	.91
	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	.94
	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	.96
	WILDFIRE	105
	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	110
VI.	Earlier Analyses1	16
Refere	ences1	20

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

FIGURES

1:	Regional Location	2
2:	Project Location on USGS Map	3
3:	Project Location on Aerial Photograph	4
4:	Tentative Tract Map	5
5:	Grading Plan Phase 1	7
6:	Site Plan Phase 1	9
7:	Water Quality Management Plan	10
8:	Site Plan Phase 2 – Conceptual Only	11
9a:	View of Project Site from I-15 Corridor – Existing	19
9b:	View of Project Site from I-15 Corridor – Visual Simulation	20
9c:	View of the Project Site from Temescal Canyon Road and Street A	21
9d:	View of the Project Site from Temescal Canyon Road	24
10:	Existing Biological Resources	41
11:	Construction Noise Contours	76
12:	Daytime Operational Noise Contours	80
13:	Nighttime Operational Noise Contours	81
14:	Utilities Plan	98
15:	Fire Hazard Severity Zone	.107

TABLES

1:	SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds – Mass Daily Thresholds	
2:	Maximum Daily Construction Emissions	
3:	Summary of Project Operational Emissions	
4:	Localized Construction Emissions	35
5:	Localized Operations Emissions	35
6:	Project GHG Emissions	60
7:	Construction Noise Levels at Off-site Receivers	77
8:	On-site Traffic Noise Levels	78
9:	Modeled Noise Levels for On-site Operational Sources	79
10:	Operational Noise Levels at Adjacent Property Lines	82

PHOTOGRAPHS

1:	View of the Project Site from I-15 Corridor	22
2:	Views of Surroundings from Existing Project Site	25
3:	Views of Surroundings from Existing Project Site	25

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

APPENDICES

- A: Temescal Commercial Project General Plan Consistency Analysis, August 2024
- B: Air Quality Analysis, February 2024
- C: Traffic Impact Analysis Report, July 2024
- D: Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis, July 2024
- E: Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment, February 2024
- F: County of Riverside Climate Action Plan Screening Tables, January 2024
- G: Fault Hazard Evaluation, February 2019
- H: Geotechnical Investigation, November 2018
- I: Preliminary Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan, August 2024
- J: Greenhouse Gas Analysis, February 2024
- K: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, August 2024
- L: Soils Management Plan, August 2024
- M: Preliminary Hydrology Report, August 2024
- N: Noise Analysis, February 2024
- O: Fire Protection Plan, August 2024
- P: Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis, May 2024
- Q: Water and Sewer Availability Letters, November 2023
- R: Preliminary Water Demand Memo, December 2023
- S: Preliminary Temescal Commercial Infill Development Sewer Area Study, December 2023
- T: Waste Management Service Provider, November 2023

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): TTM38895; PPT230049; GPA230009; CZ2300031 Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department Address: 4080 Lemon Street 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501 Contact Person: Jose Merlan Telephone Number: 951-955-1206

Applicant's Name: Craig Morris and Mark Freed

Applicant's Address: MCP Industries, Inc. C/O Axxcess Realty Advisors 4350 Von Karman Ave, Suite 200 Newport Beach, CA 92660

Final Hearing Body (DH/PC/BOS): XX Final (Date Adopted by Hearing Body): XX

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Description:

The Temescal Commercial Project (project) is located at 23835 Temescal Canyon Road in unincorporated Riverside County (Figure 1 and Figure 2). As shown in Figure 3, the project site is located off Interstate 15 (I-15) and is bounded by Temescal Canyon Road to the east and Lawson Road to the west. The project site consists of three existing parcels (Assessor's Parcel Numbers [APNs] 283-180-020, 283-180-021, and 283-180-002) totaling 14.29 acres. The project site is currently configured with one fabrication/production building associated with an active clay-pipe manufacturing facility, four material storage buildings, and an office building; an ancillary mobile office structure is also present on-site. Large portions of the current operations are open air storage of raw materials and finished product across large areas of the project site (see Figure 3). The existing structures consist of a large, older steel building and several smaller material storage sheds. The existing clay-pipe manufacturing facility operates under a non-conforming use approval issued by the County of Riverside (County).

The project would demolish the existing structures on-site and construct a 188,000-square-foot (SF) light industrial/commercial, concrete, tilt-up structure on one 10.83-acre parcel (Lot 4, Figure 4) and three retail/restaurant drive-through buildings on 3.52 acres fronting Temescal Canyon Road (proposed Lots 1 through 3, see Figure 4). The light industrial/commercial structure would house a shared manufacturing area for the manufacture of plastic parts (thermoplastic elastomer [TPE]) by ODI Manufacturing LLC (ODI) for the action spots industry (i.e., mountain bikes, bicycle motorcross [BMX] bike, motocross, watercraft, snowmobile, and all-terrain vehicle [ATV]) as well as for the manufacture of clay, glaze, kilns, and pottery wheels for the ceramic art field by Laguna Clay Company LLC (LCC). This building would also include a retail store and museum space (clay-related Museum of the Clay Industry in the Temescal Valley), an artist display and showing area, as well as spaces for classes and instruction on the throwing, firing, and glazing of clay art that would be open to the public. ODI manufacturing areas would store raw materials (TPE plastic pellets) before they are fed into a hopper connected to an injection molding machine that molds the plastic parts (i.e., handlebar grips). Finished goods are placed in stacks before distribution onto trucks. LLC manufacturing areas would include not only the manufacturing process of these clay products (e.g., the mixing and blending of clay and glaze, building brick kilns and manufacturing ceramic pottery wheels), but the design and distribution of finished products to distributors and to be sold on a retail basis. Business operations would be enclosed inside of the new building with limited exterior yard in screened and secured areas.





FIGURE 1 Regional Location





Off-site Improvements

RECON M:\JOBS5\8622\common_gis\fig2.mxd 11/20/2023 bma

FIGURE 2 Project Location on USGS Map

Feet

0





Off-site Improvements

Parcels

0

Feet

()

300



The project proposes the subdivision of the three existing parcels (APNs 283-180-020, 283-180-021, and 283-180-002) to create four new lots to accommodate light industrial and commercial uses on-site (Tentative Tract Map [TTM] #38895, Plot Plan [PPT] #230049). The project is currently zoned Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) under a Commercial Tourist (CT) land use designation which allows a wide range of commercial and retail uses. To facilitate the concrete tilt-up building, a General Plan Amendment ([GPA] #230009) and Rezone (Change of Zone [CZ] #2300031) are proposed to revise the land use to Light Industrial (LI) and the zoning to Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC). The three sheet-graded parcels for future ground leases (Lots 1 through 3) at the Temescal Canyon Road frontage would retain the current land use and zoning.

The project would also construct a public street with associated street infrastructure, a private cul-de-sac, landscaping, surface parking, and bioretention basins. The phased project components are described below.

Phase 1

Phase 1 of the project would demolish the existing parking lot and the existing fabrication/production building (35,000 SF), four material storage buildings (800 SF, 1,800 SF, 4,200 SF, 6,400 SF), and an office building (2,400 SF) on Lot 4 and would rough grade the project parcel (16.31 acres), and use the off-site parcel to the west (Lot 5) as an off-site stockpile area for development of the proposed industrial building (Figure 5). The ancillary mobile office structure currently on-site would be removed. The project would require 261,000 cubic yards (CY) of cut and 261,000 CY of fill across the entire project site. The proposed grading would largely maintain the current raised elevation above Temescal Canyon Road and would step up approximately 45 feet from the retail parcel elevation to the proposed Light Industrial (LI) pad elevation. As part of the grading effort, off-site material storage would occur within portions of the parcels located west of the project site (Lot 5). Approximately 6.03 acres in the northwest corner of these parcels that would be utilized for off-site soils stockpiling would not be impacted by the project.

The project site is currently accessible from the east via Temescal Canyon Road onto the existing Ben Garrett Road. The existing Ben Garrett Road would be relocated to the south of the project site, and then become one of the two new roads to be constructed as part of the project. Proposed public Street A (Ben Garrett Drive) would provide access from Temescal Canyon Road extending west to the intersection to the proposed private Street B (Katherine Way), which would extend north terminating at an offset cul-de-sac. Street A would be developed along the south side of the project site, while Street B would be developed as a cul-de-sac on the east side of the industrial building site. As part of Phase 1, Street A would be constructed as an industrial collector to the southern terminus of Street B and would include operable gates at both Lawson Road and Street B with reflectors and signage to indicate emergency vehicle access only towards Lawson Road. The remainder of Street A west of Street B would be rough graded to the intersection of Lawson Road and would provide all-weather emergency vehicular access. As a condition of these new roadways, roadway improvements would be constructed along Temescal Canyon Road and Street A. These include restriping along roadways, stop control infrastructure at unsignalized intersections, a sidewalk along the project frontage on Temescal Canyon Road (i.e. the west side of Temescal Canyon Road), and crosswalks at the proposed signalized driveway at Street A and Temescal Canyon Road. Sidewalks currently run along the east side of Temescal Canyon Road. Three new driveways would be constructed to provide access to the site, including one driveway along Temescal Canyon Road and two along Street A; the existing driveway along Temescal Canyon Road would remain. Two driveways along Street A would provide access to the light industrial/commercial site while one proposed driveway along Street A, the proposed driveway along Temescal Canyon Road, and the existing driveway along Temescal Canyon Road would provide access to the ground lease parcels.



FIGURE 5 Grading Plan Phase 1 A 188,000 SF light industrial/commercial building is proposed on Lot 4. The new proposed building would include light manufacturing, offices, retail, classrooms, a space for a museum or an artist display and showing area. The retail component, classrooms, and open-use space would be publicly accessible. The operations of the business would be enclosed inside of the new building with limited exterior yard in screened and secured areas. A service yard is proposed west of the building with 16 docking stations for truck loading and unloading on the north. Development on Lot 4 would include surface parking to serve the development along the east, south, and west sides of the building. Approximately 275 stalls would be provided; approximately 50 spaces would be electric vehicle charging capable and 12 spaces equipped with EV charging infrastructure.

Approximately 12 bicycle parking spaces would also be provided on-site. Sidewalks would be constructed along the internal project streets. Two ingress/egresses would provide access to the industrial building on the south side of the parcel along Street A. A wall would be constructed on the northern property line that would be 2 feet in height and would gradually increase to 12 feet, and a 23-foot-wall would be constructed along the eastern boundary of Lot 4 separating the industrial uses from the commercial uses (Figure 6).

The Temescal Valley Water District (TVWD) would require a new water line be constructed down Lawson Road from Temescal Canyon Road to the project frontage on Lawson Road. A new water line would also be extended from Temescal Canyon Road West under Street A to connect in a loop with the new Lawson Road water line. A water line and recycled water line would be installed under Street B to connect to its corresponding lines within Street A. A new sanitary sewer line would be installed under Street under Street A to connect to the existing line within Temescal Canyon Road.

The project would install approximately 138,484 SF of ornamental landscaping (17 percent) as part of the project. Storm water is proposed to be routed to two below-grade storm water capture systems that outfall into drywells to recharge the groundwater. The project proposes the installation of a bioretention basin west of the cul-de-sac of Street B and a bioretention basin at the southeast corner of the intersection of Lawson Road and Street A. A storm capture detention system would be constructed east of the northern cul-de-sac of Street B on the industrial site north of the parking stalls and a secondary system would be constructed on the northern corner of the eastern side of the industrial parcel (Figure 7).

Construction of Phase 1 is anticipated to be completed within 29 months.

Phase 2

Phase 2 would include the ground leases on proposed Lots 1 through 3 (3.52 acres) (Figure 8). At this stage, it is anticipated that three commercial drive-through structures, associated parking, and landscaping would be constructed at a later time. The retail/commercial structures would include a 2,500 SF coffee shop with a drive-through, a 2,900 SF fast casual restaurant, and a 5,000 SF fast-food restaurant with drive-through window (total approximately 10,400 SF). The project would construct approximately 93 parking spaces wrapping around the commercial site across proposed Lots 1 through 3, 20 EV capable spaces and 5 Americans with Disabilities Act compliant spaces would be provided. Approximately 12 bicycle parking spaces would be provided on the eastern portion of the project site. The project site would be accessible via an ingress/egress along Temescal Canyon Road, aligned with the footprint of the existing Ben Garrett Drive and via an ingress/egress along Street A.



FIGURE 6 Site Plan Phase 1





FIGURE 7 Water Quality Management Plan



Four entitlement actions are being processed concurrently in support of the proposed development. The Applicant, MCP Industries, Inc., has submitted a TTM, General Plan Amendment application, a Zone Change application, and a Plot Plan, concurrently, to create four new lots to accommodate light industrial/office and commercial uses on-site. The analysis within this document addresses the actions associated with these entitlement actions, including the proposed demolition of the existing site, the grading of the light industrial/commercial site and ground lease parcels, and the construction of the light-industrial/commercial structure and its associated with the potential future uses of purposes of analyzing and addressing the potential impacts associated with the potential future uses of the ground lease parcels, this document and its associated technical reports also conservatively analyzes the construction and operation of three drive-through restaurants/retail structures.

Tentative Tract Map

The Applicant has applied for a TTM (TTM #38895) to create new legal lots of the three subject parcels as well as two adjacent parcels adjoining the project (see Figure 4). A total of six numbered lots and two lettered lots are created through this mapping action. The TTM seeks to create a parcel to support the continued operation of MCP Industries in the Temescal Valley, while also creating three commercial parcels capable of supporting commercial development consistent with that envisioned in the County of Riverside General Plan (General Plan) and Temescal Canyon Area Plan.

General Plan Amendment

The Applicant has submitted a General Plan Amendment to redesignate Lot 4 (GPA230049) from Commercial Tourist (CT) to Light Industrial (LI). The redesignation of the proposed lot, in conjunction with the Zone Change application, would make the proposed Laguna Clay facility a conforming use under the General Plan. Importantly, this redesignation from Commercial Tourist (CT) to Light Industrial (LI) is not a foundational General Plan Amendment, as both designations are within the Community Development foundational land use. The three remaining ground lease parcels (Lots 1, 2, and 3) would retain the existing Commercial Tourist land use designation.

Zone Change

The Applicant has submitted a Zone Change application to designate the Lot 4 (CZ2300031) (TTM #38895) from Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) to Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC). The three remaining ground lease parcels (Lots 1, 2, and 3) would remain zoned Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S).

Plot Plan

The Applicant has submitted a Plot Plan (PPT230049) for a 188,000-square-foot, concrete, tilt-up building (including Tenant Improvements) to create a new facility for Laguna Clay's operations, and three retail/drive-through restaurant buildings on ground lease parcels. The PPT includes potential ground lease parcels for potential future uses of retail/drive-through restaurants. The proposed grading to support the new Laguna Clay facility largely maintains the current raised elevation above Temescal Canyon Road and steps up approximately 45 feet from the retail parcel elevation, which would be just above the elevation of Temescal Canyon Road.

Α.	Type of Project:	Site Specific \boxtimes ;	Countywide 🗌;	Community 🗌;	Policy 🗌.
----	------------------	-----------------------------	---------------	--------------	-----------

B. Total Project Area:

Residential Acres: 0 Commercial Acres: 3.52	Lots: 0 Lots: 3 (Lots 1-3)	Units: 0 Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: Total 10,400 Building 1: 5,000 SF Building 2: 2,900 SF Building 3: 2,500 SF	Projected No. of Residents: 0 Est. No. of Employees: 21*
Industrial Acres: 10.8 Other: 10.31 0.21 0.60	Lots: 1 (Lot 4) Lots: 1 (Lot 5) Lots: 1 (Lot B) Lots: 1 (Lot 6)	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: 188,000	Est. No. of Employees: 183*

*Calculated using Table E-5 of Appendix E-2 of the County General Plan (April 2017) under Commercial Tourist (CT) zoning (500 SF/Employee) and Light Industrial (LI) zoning (1,030 SF/employee)

C. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 283-180-002, 283-180-020, 283-180-021

Street References: 23835 Temescal Canyon Road, Riverside County. Temescal Canyon Road to the east and Lawson Road to the west.

D. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description: Section 34, Township 4 South, Range 6 West, San Bernardino Meridian in the County of Riverside, State of California.

Lot 5 (Off-site Soil Stockpile Only):

That portion of the south half of the southeast quarter of Section 34, Township 4 south, Range 6 west, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Riverside, State of California, described as follows:

Beginning at the quarter section corner on the south line of said Section 34; thence north 00°27' east, along the quarter section line, a distance of 658.60 feet, to the true point of beginning; thence continuing along said quarter section line, north 00°27' east, a distance of 658.60 feet, to the north line of the south half of said southeast quarter; thence north 89°46'30" east on the said north line, 674 feet; thence south 00°27' west, parallel with the west line of said southeast quarter, 656.33 feet to the north line of the parcel of land conveyed to Wilbur I. Manrow, by deed recorded June 03, 1957 on book 2097, page 279 of official records; thence south 89°35' west on said north line and the westerly extension thereof, 674 feet to the point of beginning. Excepting therefrom the southerly 15 feet 2 inches of the westerly 500 feet thereof. APN: 283-180-001

Lot 1 through 4 (Industrial/Commercial Development):

The north half of the south half of the southeast quarter of Section 34, Township 4 south, Range 6 west, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Riverside, State of California. Excepting that portion thereof lying east of the westerly line of the land conveyed to the County of Riverside by deed recorded May 22, 1968, as Instrument No. 47970 of official records of Riverside County, California. Also excepting that portion thereof lying east and north of the westerly and southerly line of the land conveyed to Temescal Water Company, a corporation, by deed recorded February 25, 1965, as Instrument No. 21490 of official records of Riverside County, California.

Also excepting that portion thereof described as follows: that portion of the south half of the southeast quarter of Section 34, Township 4 south, Range 6 west, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Riverside, State of California, described as follows: beginning at the quarter section corner on the south line of said Section 34; thence north 00°27' east, along the quarter section line, a distance of 658.60 feet,

to the true point of beginning; thence continuing along said quarter section line, north 00°27' east, a distance of 658.60 feet, to the north line of the south half of said southeast quarter; thence north 89°46'30" east on said north line, 674 feet; thence south 00°27' west, parallel with the west line of said southeast quarter, 656.33 feet to the north line of the parcel of land conveyed to Wilbur I. Manrow, by deed recorded June 03, 1957 in Book 2097, page 279 of official records; thence south 89°35' west on said north line and the westerly extension thereof, 674 feet to the point of beginning. Also excepting that portion conveyed to the State of California by grant deed recorded March 04, 1975, as Instrument No. 25291 of official records. APN: 283-180-002-6; 283-180-020-2; 283-180-021.

E. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings:

The project site is located in the Temescal Canyon Area, which is characterized by distinctive natural features, as well as this region's proximity to Orange and Los Angeles counties. The Santa Ana Mountains and Gavilan Hills create the primary backdrop for this planning area and frame Temescal Canyon, which contains most of the existing and proposed urban development. The Gavilan Hills to the east are characterized by rock outcroppings and sparse low-lying vegetation, while the larger Santa Ana Mountains to the west comprise a large portion of the Cleveland National Forest. Prado Basin, a key focal point in the massive Santa Ana River Watershed, in the northwest corner of the study area, is an oasis of natural habitat at the western gateway to rapidly urbanizing western Riverside County (County of Riverside 2021a). Project site elevations range between 1,064 feet above mean sea level on the east to 1,100 feet above mean sea level on the west.

The project area lies at the north end of Temescal Valley within the Santa Rosa Mountains. Temescal Wash is approximately one mile east of the project site. Currently, the vacant parcels to the west (APNs 283-180-001 and 283-260-020) are to be used as an off-site soil stockpile area for construction of the commercial project. The southeastern corner of parcel APN 283-180-021 is also vacant and has been recently mowed for weed management. The project area has operated as Mission Clay Products since 1968 and is a family-owned and operated clay-pipe manufacturing plant. A line of non-native trees runs north/south along the western boundary of the manufacturing plant. The project site is abutted by vacant land to the north, west, and south, while to the east, a commercial center is present. This commercial center includes the amusement park at Tom's Farms and its associated retail shops and restaurants; north of Tom's Farms is a gas station and fast-food drive-through business. Off-site, to the southwest, is a small residential community composed of single-family houses just north of Lawson Road. Another small residential community is located just beyond the vacant land off-site on the northwest corner north of Lawson Road. East of the commercial center lies I-15. East of the I-15 is open space. West of the project site and Lawson Road, is the residential community of Glen Ivy Hot Springs, including the Glen Ivy Golf Club and Bixby Canyon. South of the project site and Trilogy Parkway is the Glen Ivy Hot Springs. Southeast of the project site is the community of Painted Hills.

F. Other Public Agency Involvement and Required Permits:

The County has primary approval responsibility for the project. As such, the County is the Lead Agency for this initial study and proposed mitigated negative declaration pursuant to State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15050. The County's Planning Commission would consider the Applicant's requested TTM, General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, and Plot Plan application as part of a publicly-noticed hearing and would make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the project. The Board of Supervisors would then consider the recommendation at a publicly noticed hearing and then approve, conditionally approve or deny the project. Should the project be approved, the County would conduct administrative reviews and grant ministerial permits and approvals to implement the project.

Following approval, subsequent discretionary and ministerial approvals associated with the project by other public agencies may include, but are not limited to:

County Encroachment Permit Section

• Issuance of encroachment permits for work completed within the County road right-of-way.

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)

- Issuance of a Construction Activity General Construction Permit
- Compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

• Approvals for construction of drainage infrastructure.

Temescal Valley Water District

• Approvals for construction of water and sewer infrastructure.

Southern California Edison

• Approvals for utility infrastructure, including but not limited to any power pole relocations or undergrounding of lines.

South Coast Air Quality Management District

• Issuance of permit to operate a kiln or other related equipment.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

See Appendix A. The analysis demonstrates the general plan amendment's consistency with the elements and policies of the General Plan.

- B. General Plan Area Plan(s): Temescal Canyon Area Plan
- C. Foundation Component(s): None
- D. Land Use Designation(s): Commercial Tourist (CT) and Light Industrial (LI)
- E. Overlay(s), if any: None
- F. Policy Area(s), if any: Design Theme Policy Area
- G. Adjacent and Surrounding:
 - 1. General Plan Area Plan(s): Glen Ivy Area, Lake Matthews/Woodcrest Area Plan to the east
 - 2. Foundation Component(s): None
 - 3. Land Use Designation(s): Commercial Tourist (CT)
 - 4. Overlay(s), if any: None
 - 5. Policy Area(s), if any: None

H. Adopted Specific Plan Information

- 1. Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any: None
- 2. Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any: None
- I. Existing Zoning: Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S)
- J. Proposed Zoning, if any: Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) and Manufacturing Service Commercial (M-SC)
- K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Glen Ivy Zoning Area.

Adjacent zoning includes Commercial Tourist (CT), Residential Agricultural (R-A-5), Residential Agricultural (R-A-2 ¹/₂).

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

Aesthetics	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Recreation
Agriculture & Forest Resources	Hydrology / Water Quality	Transportation
🗌 Air Quality	🗌 Land Use / Planning	🛛 Tribal Cultural Resources
Biological Resources	Mineral Resources	Utilities / Service Systems
Cultural Resources	□ Noise	🗌 Wildfire
Energy	Paleontological Resources	⊠ Mandatory Findings of
Geology / Soils	Population / Housing	Significance
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Public Services	

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED

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

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

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

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

Signature

Date

For: John Hildebrand *Planning Director*

Printed Name

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

V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

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

AESTHETICS Would the project:			
 Scenic Resources a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located? 		\boxtimes	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?			
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			

Source(s): County of Riverside Temescal Canyon Area Plan Figure 9 "Temescal Canyon Area Plan Scenic Highways" (County of Riverside 2021a), Google Earth Pro (Google Earth Pro 2024), "Temescal Mountains" (Peak Visor 2024), U.S. Census Urbanized Areas – SCAG Region (Southern California Association of Governments 2023), County of Riverside Temescal Canyon Area Plan (County of Riverside 2016)

a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?

Review of County of Riverside Temescal Canyon Area Plan Figure 9 "Temescal Canyon Area Plan Scenic Highways" determined that the project site is located 500 feet west of the I-15 corridor, which is a state eligible scenic highway between the interchange with State Route 91 and the San Diego County line (County of Riverside 2016). The existing project site is visible from the I-15 corridor with the Temescal Mountains in the background as part of the scenic vista (Figure 9a; Photograph 1). It is noted that the base of the Temescal Mountain range is located approximately one mile from the project site with the I-15 corridor located approximately 1.3 miles from the base of the mountain range; Bald Peak is directly visible from the site and I-15 corridor at an elevation of approximately 3,940 feet (PeakVisor 2024). As seen in view of the existing site (see Figure 9a) as compared to the visual simulation prepared by the project architect for the project (Figures 9b and 9c), development of the project would not obstruct views of the mountain range and peak from the I-15 corridor.





 $\label{eq:FIGURE 9b} FIGURE \ 9b$ View of the Project Site from I-15 Corridor - Visual Simulation



FIGURE 9c View of the Project Site from Temescal Canyon Road and Street A



PHOTOGRAPH 1 View of the Project Site from I-15 Corridor (Google Earth 2024)



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

However, it is noted that implementation of the project would result in a change in character of the site from a less dense site with a single metal structure with little design elements, to one in which multiple structures with design elements in the Mission architectural theme would be visible from the I-15. Despite this change, impacts to views of from the I-15 would not be substantial, as the design of this structure, including the use of muted colors and landscaping characterized by the elemental material palette which is similar to the context of the surrounding area, would result in the project blending in to the existing community and not introduce building with a striking contrast to the existing commercial and retail development visible in the foreground of Figure 9a. This would ensure that quality views from the I-15 are not degraded from introduction of these buildings to the site. As seen in the simulations (Figure 9d), the proposed retail/commercial structures to be constructed as part of Phase 2 would be significantly smaller in height and scale than the 50-foot light industrial/commercial structure due to the proposed uses. These retail/commercial structures would be visible in the foreground of the views from I-15 but would also not impact views of the mountain ranges from the I-15 corridor. All structures would adhere to County design regulations which would ensure that the height and scale of the proposed structures would not obstruct, degrade, or otherwise impact the scenic view as seen from the I-15, consistent with Temescal Canyon Area Plan Policy 14.1 (County of Riverside 2016). The structures on-site would be designed in accordance with the design theme area policies of the Temescal Canyon Area Plan, which calls for commercial structures to be architecturally designed in the Mission Style architectural theme. This would be an improvement from the large metal, windowless structure and scattered storage buildings currently occupying the site that is visible from I-15.

Therefore, the project would not have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?

As presented in Photographs 2 and 3, the existing structures on the project site are surrounded by vacant land, and there are no trees, rock outcroppings, or unique landmark features on the project site that would be visible to the public view. As described Section 1a) above, the project would not obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public or degrade quality views from the I-15 corridor. Due to the relative height of the defining mountain range of this area, the consistency of the project's buildings with County design standards, and context sensitive building design and landscaping, the project would not impact surrounding communities' views of the Temescal Mountain range, nor would it introduce a site that is substantially inconsistent with the surrounding character of the community. As noted in Photographs 2 and 3, views of these mountains from the site would exist. Once the project is operational, it would introduce public access to these views from the light industrial/commercial parking lot as users visit the site. As seen in Figure 9b and Figure 9c, which depict views from the main Temescal Canyon Road, the project would present an improvement to existing views of the site and to the scenic vista. The project would introduce Mission-style architecture and landscaping to the site, which is currently occupied by a manufacturing company with scattered storage structures and a large metal warehouse. As noted above in Section 1a), the Mission Style architectural theme of the project's design would serve to blend into the surrounding community and not introduce a development that would contrast substantially from the existing views open to the public.



FIGURE 9d View of the Project Site from Temescal Canyon Road



PHOTOGRAPH 2 Views of Surroundings from Existing Project Site



PHOTOGRAPH 3 Views of Surroundings from Existing Project Site

RECON P:\8622\Env\EA_IS\Photos1-3.docx 02/07/2024

Potentia Significa Impac	ally Less than ant Significant t with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Incorporated	-	

In addition, views of construction equipment and activities on the site would be temporary over the 29-month period and would not be substantially visible to surrounding communities as the project site is located on a plateau not immediately visible to drivers along Temescal Canyon Road nor to the residents west of Lawson Road. Drivers along the I-15 corridor may glimpse occasional views of the project site, but due to distance from the site and the relatively high speeds I-15 users are driving, views would be temporary and limited. Construction equipment would be removed from the site following completion of project activities.

Therefore, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources, obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

According to mapping from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the project site is located in the urbanized area of Riverside-San Bernardino (SCAG 2023). The project includes a General Plan Amendment to redesignate one of the proposed lots (Lot 4) from Commercial Tourist to Light Industrial (LI). The redesignation of the proposed lot, in conjunction with the Zone Change application, would make the existing Laguna Clay facility a conforming use under the General Plan. The light industrial/commercial building would be designed and constructed consistent with the development standards for the Light Industrial (LI) zoning designation. Additionally, as noted under the analysis for (a), the project would not obstruct, degrade, or otherwise impact the scenic view as seen from the I-15, consistent with Temescal Canyon Area Plan Policy 14.1, which protects the scenic highways in the Temescal Canyon Area Plan from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of adjacent properties. The project is in the Design Theme Area of the Temescal Valley Area Plan. The Design Theme Area prescribes several design guidelines (e.g., architectural styles); these policies are intended to build on the theme and character of the area established by the existing retail development west of I-15 at Temescal Canyon Road. The project elevations would be designed in the Mission Style architectural theme (see Figure 9b and Figure 9c), which demonstrates compliance with the policy TCAP 1.1 and TCAP 1.2. As noted in the preceding analyses, the design of this structure, including the use of muted colors similar to the context of the surrounding area, would result in the project blending into the existing community. In addition, proposed landscaping would be consistent with policy TCAP 1.3, which calls for native trees and vegetation to complement the Mission style architectural theme. Therefore, the project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality in an urbanized area, and impacts would be less than significant.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
 Mt. Palomar Observatory a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County 				\boxtimes

Source(s): County of Riverside Temescal Canyon Area Plan Figure 6 "Temescal Canyon Area Plan Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area" (County of Riverside 2021a), Google Earth Pro (Google Earth Pro 2024)

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

Review of the County of Riverside Temescal Canyon Area Plan Figure 6 "Temescal Canyon Area Plan Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area" determined that the project site is not located within the Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area (County of Riverside 2016; Google Earth Pro 2024). The project is thus not subject to County Ordinance Number 655, which is intended to restrict the permitted use of certain light fixtures emitting light into the night sky which could have a detrimental effect on astronomical observation and research from Mt. Palomar Observatory (located approximately 66 miles from the project site). Therefore, the project would not interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through County Ordinance Number 655. **No impact would occur.**

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

3. Other Lighting Issues a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			
b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?		\boxtimes	

Source(s): County of Riverside Ordinance Number 655 (County of Riverside 1988); County of Riverside Ordinance Number 915 (County of Riverside 2012)

a-b) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

The project site is currently configured with a clay-pipe factory and a storage yard surrounded by vacant land. Existing lighting ipg is limited to external warehouse lighting mounted to the structure and pointed downward. The project would introduce new sources of light to the site through the development of commercial structures and parking lots, which would include both internal lighting in buildings, external lighting for the structures, and poles within the parking lot. However, all lighting would be designed per the County's lighting requirements as set forth in County Ordinance Numbers 655 and 915, which provide minimum requirements for outdoor lighting in order to reduce light trespass and to protect the health, property, and well-being of residents (County of Riverside 1988 and 2012). Plans submitted to the County for future implementing permits and approvals (i.e., building permits) would be required to demonstrate compliance with these standards. Accordingly, mandatory compliance with County

Potentially	Less than	Less	No
Significant	Significant	Than	Impact
Impact	with	Significant	
·	Mitigation	Impact	
	Incorporated	•	

Ordinances Numbers 655 and 915 would ensure that the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views or expose residential properties to unacceptable light levels. Therefore, to the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, or expose residential property to unacceptable light levels, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES Would the project:		
4. Agriculture a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?		
b) Conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?		\boxtimes
c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?		\boxtimes
d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?		

Source(s): County of Riverside General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources" (County of Riverside 2015a), County of Riverside Map My County v11.5 Report for APNs 283-180-002, 283-180-020, 283-180-021 (County of Riverside 2024), California Important Farmland Finder (California Department of Conservation 2020)

a-d) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? Conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve? Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")? Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

The California Department of Conservation "California Important Farmland Finder" classifies the project site as "other land" and surrounding properties as a mix of "Farmland of Local Importance" or "Urban and Built-Up Land" (California Department of Conservation 2020). None of the project parcels are zoned for agricultural uses. The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract and is not located within an agricultural preserve. Despite the California Department of Conservation's designations of the surrounding properties, the project site is not located within 300 feet of an agriculturally zoned property; the surrounding properties are zoned Residential Agricultural (R-A-5), Commercial Tourist (CT), and Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S). Therefore, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique

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

Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance farmland to non-agricultural use, conflict with an agricultural preserve or agricultural zoning, or cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property. **No impact would occur.**

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): County of Riverside General Plan Figure OS-3a "Forestry Resources Western Riverside County Parks, Forests, and Recreation Areas" (County of Riverside 2015b), County of Riverside Map My County v11.5 Report for APNs 283-180-002, 283-180-020, 283-180-021 (County of Riverside 2024).

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

The project is not within land designated as forest land as shown on Figure OS-3a of the General Plan Open Space Element. Forest Land is defined as land supporting at least 10 percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber. The County does not include any timberland zoned areas or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Review of General Plan Figure OS-3a "Forestry Resources Western Riverside County Parks, Forests, and Recreation Areas" determined that the project site and surrounding properties are considered forest resources (County of Riverside 2015b). The County of Riverside considers the Cleveland and San Bernardino National Forests the forest resources to be protected and does not include any forest land zoning elsewhere in the County. Therefore, the project would not convert forest land to non-forest uses or conflict with forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production zoning. **No impact would occur**.

Findings of Fact: No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
AIR QUALITY Would the project:				
6. Air Quality Impacts a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?				
c) Expose sensitive receptors, which are located within one (1) mile of the project site, to substantial pollutant concentrations?			\boxtimes	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			\boxtimes	

Source(s): Air Quality Analysis for the Temescal Commercial Project (Appendix B), Transportation Impact Analysis (Appendix C), California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) 2022.1 (CAPCOA 2022), California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines (Bay Area Air Quality Management District 2022), Screening Procedures for Estimating the Air Quality Impact of Stationary Sources (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [U.S. EPA] 1992)

An Air Quality Analysis was completed for the project (see Appendix B) that evaluated the significance of potential air quality impacts that may be generated by the project in accordance with the CEQA, and guidance from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The project was evaluated to determine if it would (1) be inconsistent with the applicable air quality plan, (2) result in cumulative impacts to air quality, (3) impact sensitive receptors, or (4) expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors.

Construction and operation air emissions were calculated using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) 2022.1 (CAPCOA 2022). The CalEEMod program is a tool used to estimate air emissions resulting from land development projects based on California-specific emission factors. The model estimates mass emissions from two basics sources: construction sources and operational sources (i.e., area and mobile sources). Inputs to CalEEMod include such items as the air basin containing the project, land uses, trip generation rates, trip lengths, vehicle fleet mix (percentage of autos, medium truck, etc.), trip destination (i.e., percent of trips from home to work, etc.), duration of construction phases, construction equipment usage, grading areas, season, and ambient temperature, as well as other parameters. Emissions of NO_X, CO, SO_X, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and reactive organic gases (ROG) are calculated. Emission factors are not available for lead and consequently lead emissions are not calculated. The Southern California Air Basin (SoCAB) is currently in attainment of the federal and state lead standards. Furthermore, fuel used in construction equipment and most other vehicles is not leaded.

The SCAQMD has established significance thresholds to assess the regional and localized impacts of project-related air pollutant emissions. These significance thresholds are updated as needed to appropriately represent the most current technical information and attainment status in the SoCAB. The County uses the current SCAQMD thresholds to determine whether a project would have a significant impact. SCAQMD's significance thresholds for impacts to regional air quality are shown in Table 1.

Potentially Less than Less Significant Significant Than Impact Significant with Mitigation Impact

No

Impact

		Incorporated	
Ta			
SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds – Mass Daily Thresholds			
	Emissior	ns (pounds)	
Pollutant	Construction	Operational	
Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx)	100	55	
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	75	55	
Coorse Derticulate Matter (DM)	150	150	

Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	15	55
Coarse Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	150	150
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	55	55
Oxides of Sulfur (SOx)	150	150
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	550	550
Lead (Pb)	3	3
SOURCE: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handboo	ok (SCAQMD 1993); S	CAQMD Air Quality
Significance Thresholds (SCAQMD 2023)		

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

The SoCAB is designated as in attainment or unclassifiable attainment (expected to be meeting the standard despite a lack of monitoring data) for all federal air quality standards except for the 8-hour ozone and PM_{2.5} standards. The SoCAB is also designated as nonattainment for state air quality standards for 8-hour ozone and PM_{2.5}, and additionally is i nonattainment of state PM₁₀ standards. The SCAQMD prepared the 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (2022 AQMP), which represents its contribution to the State Implementation Plan, to outline the SCAQMD's strategy for achieving attainment of federal and state Ambient Air Quality Standards. The 2022 AQMP provides an overview of air quality and sources of air pollution and identifies the pollution control measures needed to meet clean air standards. The growth forecasting for the 2022 AQMP is based in part on the land uses established by local general plans. Thus, if a project is consistent with land use as designated in the local general plan, it can normally be considered consistent with the 2022 AQMP. Projects that propose a different land use than is identified in the local general plan may also be considered consistent with the 2022 AQMP if the proposed land use is less intensive than buildout under the current designation. For projects that propose a land use that is more intensive than the current designation, analysis that is more detailed is required to assess conformance with the 2022 AQMP.

The project site is designated as Commercial Tourist (CT) in the General Plan and is zoned Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S). The project would require a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone for the manufacturing building lot (Lot 4) to change the land use to Light Industrial and change the zone to Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC). The remaining lots would retain the existing land use and zoning designations.

The Commercial Tourist (CT) designation allows for tourist-related commercial uses including hotels, golf courses, and recreation/amusement activities with a floor area ratio ranging from 0.2 to 0.35. Under this designation approximately 94,790 to 165,870 square feet of commercial uses could be constructed. These uses would result in a wide range of trip generation. Institute of Transportation Engineers trip generation rates for a golf course, hotel, and racquet club were obtained from CalEEMod. These land uses would generate up to 2,327 trips per day for a 165,870-square-foot racquet club (14.03 trips per 1,000 square feet). As calculated in the Air Quality Analysis, the manufacturing land use would generate 1,006 daily trips, which is within the range of trips that could be generated by a project that is consistent with the existing land use designation. It can therefore be concluded that emissions generated by the project would be less than emissions generated by the current designation and would not result in regional emissions that exceed the assumptions used in the 2022 AQMP.

Potentiall Significan Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

Another factor used to determine if a project would conflict with implementation of the 2022 AQMP is determining if the project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards (National Ambient Air Quality Standards [NAAQS] and California Ambient Air Quality Standards [CAAQS]) or interim emissions reductions specified in the 2022 AQMP. NAAQS and CAAQS violations would occur if project emissions would exceed regional significance thresholds or Localized Significance Thresholds. As determined by the Air Quality Analysis (see Appendix B), construction and operational emissions from the project would not exceed the regional significance thresholds (see Tables 2 and 3 in subsection (b) below). Additionally, construction and operational emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD LSTs as seen in Table 4 and Table 5, which were developed to analyze localized air quality impacts to sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project (see subsection (c) below). Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the 2022 AQMP or applicable portions of the SIP, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

The SoCAB is designated as in attainment for all federal air quality standards except for the ozone and PM_{10} , and $PM_{2.5}$. The SoCAB is designated as a nonattainment area for federal AAQS for the 8-hour ozone and $PM_{2.5}$ standards, and is in nonattainment area under state PM_{10} standards. Ozone is not emitted directly, but is a result of atmospheric activity on precursors. NO_X and ROG are known as the chief "precursors" of ozone. These compounds react in the presence of sunlight to produce ozone.

Based on SCAQMD cumulative significance methodologies, the emissions-based thresholds shown in Table 4 are used to determine if a project's contribution to regional cumulative emissions is cumulatively considerable. These thresholds were used to assess the significance of the project-specific and cumulative air quality impacts. Air quality impacts are basin-wide, and air quality is affected by all pollutant sources in the SoCAB. As the individual project thresholds are designed to help achieve attainment with cumulative basin-wide standards, they are also appropriate for assessing the project's contribution to cumulative impacts. As discussed, construction and operational emissions associated with the project were calculated using CalEEMod. Calculation methodology is discussed in detail in Appendix B.

Construction-related activities are temporary, short-term sources of emissions. Sources of construction-related emissions include the following: fugitive dust from grading activities; construction equipment exhaust; and construction-related trips by workers, delivery trucks, and material-hauling trucks. Table 2 shows the total projected construction maximum daily emission levels for each criteria pollutant and compares emissions to the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds. The CalEEMod output files for construction emissions are presented in Appendix B, Attachment 1. Maximum daily construction emissions would be less than the daily SCAQMD regional thresholds for all criteria pollutants.
Potentially	Less than	Less
Significant	Significant	Than
Impact	with	Significant
	Mitigation	Impact
	Incorporated	

No Impact

	T	able 2				
Maximun	n Daily C	onstructi	on Emiss	sions		
		Emi	issions (p	ounds p	er day)	
Phase	ROG	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM10	PM _{2.5}
Demolition	3	26	22	<1	4	2
Site Preparation	3	32	31	<1	9	5
Grading	3	34	31	<1	6	3
Building Construction	2	12	20	<1	2	1
Paving	2	7	11	<1	<1	<1
Architectural Coatings	53	1	2	<1	<1	<1
Maximum Daily Emissions ¹	53	34	31	<1	9	5
SCAQMD Significance Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No
¹ Emissions were rounded to the r	nearest w	hole num	ber. Emis	sions re	ported as	s <1
indicate that emissions were calc	ulated to	be less th	an () 5 nc	und ner	dav	

Table 3 presents the total operational emissions that would be generated by the project. Mobile source emissions would originate from traffic generated by the project. Energy source emissions would result from the use of natural gas. Area source emissions would result from the use of consumer products, as well as applying architectural coatings and landscaping activities. Mobile source operational emissions are based on the trip rate, trip length, and vehicle mix. Project trip generation was obtained from the Scoping Agreement for the Traffic Impact Study which utilizes trip rates from the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition. CalEEMod output files are presented in Appendix B, Attachment 1. As shown in Table 3, project-generated emissions are projected to be less than the SCAQMD's significance thresholds for all criteria pollutants.

Table 3 Summary of Project Operational Emissions (pounds per day)									
Emissions									
Source ROG NO _X CO SO _X PM ₁₀ PM _{2.5}									
Mobile Sources	18	20	207	1	46	12			
Area Sources	a Sources 6 <1 9 <1 <1 <1								
Energy Sources	<1	2	2	<1	<1	<1			
Total	Total 24 22 218 1 47 12								
SCAQMD Significance Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55			
Exceeds Threshold? No No No No No									
NOTE: Totals may vary due to independent	rounding.				•				

As shown in Tables 2 and 3 above, emissions of ozone precursors (ROG and NO_X), PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} during construction and operation of the project would not exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds of significance. These thresholds are designed to provide limits below which project emissions from an individual project would not significantly affect regional air quality or the timely attainment of the NAAQS and CAAQS. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions of ozone, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

c) Expose sensitive receptors, which are located within one (1) mile of the project site, to substantial pollutant concentrations?

A sensitive receptor is a person in the population who is more susceptible to health effects due to exposure to an air contaminant than is the population at large. Examples of sensitive receptor locations in the community include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, churches, athletic facilities, retirement homes, and long-term health care facilities. The nearest sensitive receptors are the residential uses located as close as 25 feet from the western and southern boundaries of the off-site material storage area.

Localized Significance Thresholds

The SCAQMD's Final Localized Significance Threshold (LST) Methodology was developed as a tool to assist lead agencies to analyze localized air quality impacts to sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project. The LST Methodology outlines how to analyze localized impacts from common pollutants of concern including NO₂, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Localized air quality impacts would occur if pollutant concentrations at sensitive receptors exceeded applicable NAAQS or CAAQS. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard at the nearest residence or sensitive receptor. The SCAQMD states that lead agencies can use the LSTs as another indicator of significance in its air quality impact analyses. The significance of localized emissions impacts depends on whether ambient levels in the vicinity of any given project are above or below state standards. In the case of CO and NO₂, if ambient levels are below the standards, a project is considered to have a significant impact if project emissions result in an exceedance of one or more of these standards. If ambient levels already exceed a state or federal standard, then project emissions are considered significant if they increase ambient concentrations by a measurable amount. This would apply to PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, both of which are non-attainment pollutants.

The maximum on-site daily construction emissions for CO, NO_X, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} are compared to the applicable screening thresholds based on construction site acreage disturbed per day and the distance to the closest sensitive receptor. The nearest sensitive receptors are the residential uses located as close as 25 feet from the western and southern boundaries of the off-site material storage area. SCAQMD's guidance indicates that projects with sensitive receptors located closer than 25 meters should use the LSTs for receptors located at 25 meters. Based on the CalEEMod Users Guide, the project is anticipated to disturb approximately 3.5 acres per day during the site preparation phase and 5.0 acres per day during the grading phase (see Table 8 of Appendix B). The maximum daily localized emissions from project construction and LSTs are presented in Table 4. As shown in Table 4, the maximum localized construction emissions would not exceed any of the SCAQMD recommended localized screening thresholds.

	Table 4					
Localized	Constructio	n Emissions				
		Pollutant (pou	nds per day)			
Operations	NOx	CO	PM10	PM _{2.5}		
Site Prep	aration (3.5 ad	res per day)				
Maximum On-Site Daily Emission	31.64	30.18	9.03	5.20		
LST Threshold ¹	273.1	1,521.8	9.8	6.1		
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No		
Grad	ing (5.0 acres	per day)				
Maximum On-Site Daily Emission	29.68	28.31	4.83	2.56		
LST Threshold ²	371	1,965	13	8		
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No		
¹ Site preparation emissions are assessed against the threshold for 3.5-acre project sites with sensitive receptors within 25 meters of the project site boundary.						
² Grading emissions are assessed aga	inst the thresho ect site bound:	old for 3.5-acre	project sites	with sensitive		

Project operations impacts were also assessed using SCAQMD LSTs. Table 5 presents the maximum on-site emissions and applicable LSTs. As a conservative assessment, on-site emissions were evaluated against the most restrictive LSTs for a 1-acre project site with a sensitive receptor located 25 meters from the project boundary. As shown in Table 5, the maximum localized operational emissions would not exceed any of the SCAQMD recommended localized screening thresholds.

	Table 5						
Localized C	perations Er	nissions					
		Pollutant (pour	nds per day)				
Operations NO _X CO PM ₁₀ PM _{2.5}							
Area Sources	0.07	8.63	0.02	0.01			
Energy Sources	2.49	2.09	0.19	0.19			
Maximum On-Site Emissions 2.56 10.72 0.21 0.20							
Operations LST Threshold ¹	162	750	1	1			
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No			
NOTE: Totals may vary due to independent	rounding.						
¹ Emissions are assessed against the thresh	old for 1-acre	project sites wit	th sensitive re	ceptors			
within 25 meters of the project site boundar	у.						

Diesel Particulate Matter – Construction

Construction of the project would result in short-term diesel exhaust emissions from on-site heavy-duty equipment. Other construction-related sources of DPM include material delivery trucks and construction worker vehicles; however, these sources are minimal relative to construction equipment. Not all construction worker vehicles would be diesel-fueled and most DPM emissions associated with material delivery trucks and construction worker vehicles would occur off-site.

For purposes of analyzing construction-related toxic air contaminant emissions and their impact on sensitive receptors, the maximum annual PM_{10} emissions from equipment exhaust were used to develop an average daily emission rate. The exhaust emissions were calculated by CalEEMod, and the maximum annual DPM concentration was calculated using AERSCREEN. AERSCREEN calculates a worst-case maximum 1-hour concentration at a specific distance and specific angle from the source. The maximum 1-hour concentration is then converted to an annual concentration using a 0.08 conversion factor (U.S. EPA 1992).

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

Once the dispersed concentrations of diesel particulates are estimated in the surrounding air, they are used to evaluate estimated exposure to people. Exposure is evaluated by calculating the dose in milligrams per kilogram body weight per day (mg/kg/d). For residential exposure, the breathing rates are determined for specific age groups, so inhalation dose (Dose-air) is calculated for each of these age groups: third trimester of pregnancy, 0<2, 2<9, 2<16, 16<30 and 16–70 years. The equation for dose through inhalation (Dose-air) is as follows:

Dose-air = $(C_{air} \times DBR \times A \times EF \times 10^{-6})$; Where:

Dose-air	=	Chronic daily intake, mg/kg/d
Cair	=	Ground-level concentration of toxic air contaminants to which the receptor is
		exposed, micrograms/cubic meter
DBR	=	Daily breathing rate, normalized to body weight (liters per kilogram body weight
		per day (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment [OEHHA] 2015)
А	=	Inhalation absorption factor (OEHHA recommended factor of 1)
EF	=	Exposure frequency, days/year (OEHHA recommended factor of 0.96 for
		resident and 0.68 for workers)

Cancer risk is calculated by multiplying the daily inhalation or oral dose, by a cancer potency factor, the age sensitivity factor, the frequency of time spent at home and the exposure duration divided by averaging time, to yield the excess cancer risk. The excess cancer risk is calculated separately for each age grouping and then summed to yield cancer risk for any given location. The worst-case cancer risk is calculated as follows:

Excess Cancer Risk = Dose-air × CPF × ASF × ED/AT × FAH; Where:

Dose-air	=	Chronic daily intake, mg/kg body weight per day
CPF	=	Cancer potency factor (mg/kg/d)
ASF	=	Age sensitivity factor
ED	=	Exposure duration (years)
AT	=	Averaging time for lifetime cancer risk (years)
FAH	=	Fraction of time at home

Non-cancer risks are defined as chronic or acute. With respect to DPM only chronic risks are calculated and are determined by the hazard index. To calculate hazard index, DPM concentration is divided by its chronic Reference Exposure Levels. Where the total equals or exceeds one, a health hazard is presumed to exist.

In this analysis, non-carcinogenic impacts are evaluated for chronic exposure inhalation exposure. Estimates of health impacts from non-carcinogenic concentrations are expressed as a hazard quotient (HQ) for individual substances, such as diesel particulate. An HQ of one or less indicates that adverse health effects are not expected to result from exposure to emissions of that substance. Reference Exposure Levels are defined as the concentration at which no adverse health effects are anticipated. Generally, the inhalation pathway is the largest contributor to the total dose. The HQ is calculated with the flowing equation:

HQ = Ground-Level Concentration $(\mu g/m^3)/Reference$ Exposure Level $(\mu g/m^3)$

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

It should also be noted that all construction equipment is subject to the CARB In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation. This regulation, which applies to all off-road diesel vehicles 25 horsepower or greater, limits unnecessary idling to five minutes, requires all construction fleets to be labeled and reported to CARB, bans Tier 0 equipment and phases out Tier 1 and 2 equipment (thereby replacing fleets with cleaner equipment), and requires that fleets comply with Best Available Control Technology requirements.

Based on the CalEEMod calculations for the project, construction is anticipated to last approximately 29 months, and the project would result in on-site maximum annual emissions of 0.094 ton of PM_{10} exhaust. This maximum annual emissions rate was modeled over the entire construction period, and therefore is a conservative assessment. Based on AERSCREEN modeling results, the maximum 1-hour ground-level DPM concentration from construction activities would be 0.04404 micrograms per cubic meter (μ g/m³). This was converted to an annual average concentration of 0.00352 μ g/m³ using a conversion factor of 0.08 (U.S. EPA 1992). The resulting annual concentration was used in the equations discussed above. Using this methodology, it was calculated that the excess cancer risk would be 1.26 in a million. DPM generated by project construction is not expected to create conditions where the probability is greater than 10 in 1 million of contracting cancer. Additionally, the HQ would be 0.0007, which is less than one. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations associated with diesel particulate matter during construction that could result in excess cancer risks, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Diesel Particulate Matter - Freeway

The CARB handbook indicates that siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway or urban roads with 100,000 or more vehicles per day should be avoided when possible. The project does not include a sensitive land use. Additionally, the project site is located more than 500 feet from I-15. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations associated with diesel particulate matter during operation, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Carbon Monoxide Hot Spots

A CO hot spot is an area of localized CO pollution that is caused by severe vehicle congestion on major roadways, typically near congested intersections where idling and queuing occurs. Due to increased requirements for cleaner vehicles, equipment, and fuels, CO levels in the state have dropped substantially. All air basins are attainment or maintenance areas for CO. Therefore, more recent screening procedures based on more current methodologies have been developed. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District developed a screening threshold in 2011, which states that any project involving an intersection experiencing 31,600 vehicles per hour or more will require detailed analysis. In addition, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District developed a screening 44,000 vehicles per hour would require detailed analysis. This analysis conservatively assesses potential CO hot spots using the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District screening threshold of 31,600 vehicles per hour.

The project would generate 3,932 daily trips, 471 AM peak hour trips and 383 PM peak hour trips. Peak hour turning volumes were calculated at 10 intersections in the vicinity of the project site as a part of the Traffic Impact Analysis. Morning peak hour volumes are projected to be 4,811 or less and afternoon peak hour volumes are projected to be 3,273 or less (see Appendix C). The hourly turning volumes at nearby intersections are projected to be well less than 31,600 vehicles per hour. Therefore, the project

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

would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations associated with a CO hot spot, and impacts would be **less than significant.**

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

The potential for an odor impact is dependent on a number of variables, including the nature of the odor source, distance between the receptor and odor source, and local meteorological conditions. During construction, construction equipment may generate some nuisance odors. Sensitive receptors near the project site include residential uses; however, exposure to odors associated with project construction would be short term and temporary in nature. Further, per CARB's Airborne Toxic Control Measures 13 (California Code of Regulations Chapter 10 Section 2485), the applicant shall not allow idling time to exceed 5 minutes unless more time is required per engine manufacturers' specifications or for safety reasons. Therefore, project construction would not generate odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people, and impacts would be less than significant.

The following list provides some common types of facilities that are known producers of objectionable odors (Bay Area Air Quality Management District 2022). This list of facilities is not meant to be all-inclusive.

- Wastewater Treatment Plant
- Wastewater Pumping Facilities
- Sanitary Landfill
- Transfer Station
- Composting Facility
- Petroleum Refinery
- Asphalt Batch Plant
- Chemical Manufacturing
- Fiberglass Manufacturing
- Painting/Coating Operations
- Rendering Plant
- Coffee Roaster
- Food Processing Facility
- Confined Animal Facility/Feed Lot/Dairy
- Green Waste and Recycling Operations
- Metal Smelting Plants

The project does not include any of these uses that are typically associated with odor complaints. The project does not propose any uses or activities that would result in potentially significant operational-source odor impacts. The operations of the business would be enclosed inside the new building. Additionally, SCAQMD Rule 402 acts to prevent occurrences of odor nuisances. Therefore,

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
project operation would not generate odors adversely affecting impacts would be less than significant.	ng a substa	intial numbe	r of people	, and
Findings of Fact: Less than Significant				
Mitigation: No mitigation is required.				
Monitoring: No monitoring is required.				
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
 Wildlife & Vegetation a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan? 				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Wildlife Service?				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				

Source(s): Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Consistency Analysis for the Temescal Commercial Project (Appendix D), Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Area Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (WRCRCA) (2006)

The project site currently includes vegetation communities to the west, along the drainage running northwest to the project site and along portions of the eastern parcels adjacent to Temescal Canyon Road. Vegetation along the eastern project parcels is proposed to be removed.

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

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?

A Consistency Analysis with the Western Riverside County MSHCP (see Appendix D) was completed to demonstrate the compliance of the project with respect to biological aspects of the MSHCP. More specifically, the project was evaluated in respect to Section 6.1.2 (Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools), Section 6.1.3 (Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species), Section 6.1.4 (Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface), and Section 6.3.2 (Additional Survey Needs and Procedures) of the MSHCP. As such, the biological impacts of the project were assessed in accordance with the MSHCP. Mitigation is required for impacts that are considered significant pursuant to CEQA and based on applicable policies set forth in MSHCP Sections 6.1.2, 6.1.3, and 6.3.2.

The project would be consistent with the protection of riparian/riverine habitat and riparian birds as defined in MSHCP Section 6.1.2 because the project site does not support riparian vegetation, and riparian avian species are not expected to occur on the project site. Therefore, no further surveys or mitigation would be required. Although there are no riparian resources on-site, the project site supports one unvegetated, ephemeral drainage that traverses the northwest portion of the materials storage site parcel which is considered a Riverine feature pursuant to the MSCP (Figure 10). This Riverine feature would be protected during the construction phase of this project by the implementation of standard best management practice (BMP), as required by MSHCP Volume 1, Appendix C. As detailed in the Consistency Analysis (Appendix D), measure 10 (biological construction monitoring) requires that a qualified project biologist monitor construction activities for the duration of the project to ensure that practicable measures are being employed to avoid incidental disturbance of habitat and species of concern outside the project footprint. In addition, measure 14 requires silt fencing and other appropriate BMPs at the limits of grading to protect this feature from impacts. Implementation of these BMP measures would reduce impacts to the Riverine feature.

No project-specific impacts to vernal pools and fairy shrimp are anticipated and no mitigation would be required. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the protection of vernal pools as defined in MSHCP Section 6.1.2, and no further surveys or mitigation would be required.

The survey area is located within a MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area (NEPSSA) with a requirement for evaluating the following nine species: Munz's onion, San Diego ambrosia, slender-horned spineflower, many-stemmed dudleya, spreading navarretia, California orcutt grass, San Miguel savory, Hammitt's clay-cress, and Wright's trichocoronis. A habitat suitability assessment was conducted for these species within the project site boundary in 2019, 2022, and 2023 according to the habitat suitability assessment procedure described in Volume I, Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP. A description of each species and the results of the habitat suitability assessment are described below, as noted in the Consistency Analysis (Appendix D):

Munz's onion (Allium munzii). This perennial bulbiferous herb is known to occur within mesic exposures or seasonally moist microsites in grassy openings in coastal sage scrub, chaparral, juniper woodland, valley and foothill grasslands in clay soils or pyroxenite outcrops. The blooming period for this species is May to July. Within the MHSCP Plan Area, this species is associated with clay and cobbly clay soils which include the following series: Altamont, Auld, Bosanko, Claypit, and Porterville. This species does not currently occur on-site and is not expected to occur as the survey area lacks suitable mesic coastal sage scrub, chaparral, juniper woodland, and grassland habitat in clay soils or pyroxenite outcrops. Additionally, the survey area is not mapped within Altamont, Auld, Bosanko, Claypit, and Porterville soils.





Vegetation Community

Riversidean Sage Scrub

----- Estimated Drainage

Disturbed Riversidian Sage Scrub

Residential/Urban/Exotic

FIGURE 10 Existing Biological Resources

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

San Diego ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila***).** This perennial rhizomatous herb is known to occur in sparse non-native grassland or ruderal habitat in association with river terraces, vernal pools, and alkali playas. The blooming period for this species is not listed in the MHSCP; however, Jepson eFlora lists the blooming period as April-July. Within the MSHCP Plan Area, this species is only known from three locations in the Riverside Lowlands Bioregion: in the vicinity of Alberhill, Nichols Road, and Skunk Hollow. This species was not detected on-site during biological surveys, and there are no records of its occurrence in the vicinity. It is not expected to occur on-site as the disturbed vegetation is not associated with river terraces, vernal pools, or alkali playas. Additionally, this species is a perennial herb that would likely have been apparent at the time the habitat assessment was conducted.

Slender-horned spineflower (Dodecahema leptoceras). This annual herb is predominantly found within sandy soils in association with mature alluvial scrub, floodplains, stream terraces, washes, and sandy beaches in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. Areas supporting the slender-horned spineflower include the Arroyo Seco and Kolb Creeks, Indian Wash along Temescal Canyon, central Bautista Creek, Vail Lake and the upper San Jacinto River near Valle Vista and Hemet. The blooming period for this species is April to June. This species was not detected on-site and is not expected to occur as the survey area lacks the mature alluvial scrub required for this species. The nearest record of this species is in Indian Wash, approximately 3 miles southeast of the survey area.

Many-stemmed dudleya (*Dudleya multicaulis*). This perennial herb is associated with clay soils in barren, rocky places and ridgelines and thinly vegetated openings in chaparral, coastal sage scrub, and grasslands underlain by clay soils. The blooming period for this species is March to June. Within the MSHCP Plan Area, this species is associated with clay and cobbly clay soils of the following series: Altamont, Auld, Bosanko, Claypit, and Porterville. This species was not detected on-site and is not expected to occur due to lack of suitable clay or cobbly clay soils. Additionally, the survey area is not mapped within Altamont, Auld, Bosanko, Claypit, and Porterville soils.

Spreading navarretia (*Navarretia fossalis***).** This species is known to occur within vernal pools and areas historically supporting vernal pools, with saline-alkaline soils. The blooming period for this species is May to June. Within the MSHCP Plan Area, this species is primarily restricted to the alkali floodplains of the San Jacinto River, Mystic Lake, and Salt Creek in association with Willows, Domino and Traver soils. This species was not detected on-site and is not expected to occur due to lack of suitable vernal pool or historic vernal pool habitat with saline-alkaline soils to support this species. Additionally, the survey area is not mapped within Willows, Domino, and Traver soils.

California Orcutt grass (*Orcuttia californica***).** This annual herb is known to occur in vernal pool habitats with alkaline soils or southern basaltic claypan. The blooming period for this species is April to June. Within the MSHCP Plan Area, this species is restricted to the southern basaltic claypan vernal pools at the Santa Rosa Plateau and alkaline vernal pools at Skunk Hollow and at Salt Creek west of Hemet. This species was not observed and is not expected to occur on-site as the survey area lacks vernal pools with claypan or alkaline soils and is not located within the vicinity of these known locations.

San Miguel savory (*Clinopodium* [=*Satureja*] *chandleri***).** This perennial herb is primarily restricted to rocky, gabbroic, and metavolcanic substrates in coastal sage scrub, chaparral, cismontane woodland, riparian woodland, and valley and foothill grasslands (between 394 and 3,297 feet). The blooming period for this species is March to May. Within the MSHCP Plan Area, this species population occurs within the Santa Rosa Plateau and the Santa Ana Mountains. This species was not observed and is not expected to occur on-site as the survey area lacks suitable habitats and rocky, gabbroic soils, and is not located within the vicinity of these known locations.

Potentiall Significan Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

Hammitt's clay-cress (Sibaropsis hammittii). This annual herb is known to occur within coastal sage scrub, chaparral, and peninsular juniper woodland on clay soils between 984 and 3,280 feet in the Santa Ana Mountains and Riverside Lowlands bioregions. The blooming period for this species is March to April. This species was not observed on-site and is not expected to occur as the survey area lacks suitable clay soils. Additionally, the survey area is not located within the vicinity of the Santa Ana Mountains and Riverside Lowlands bioregions.

Wright's trichocoronis (*Trichocoronis wrightii* var. *wrightii***).** This annual herb is primarily restricted to the alkali floodplains of the San Jacinto River in association with Willows, Domino, and Traver soils. The blooming period for this species is May to September. Within the MSHCP Plan Area, this species occurs in alkali playa, alkali annual grassland, and alkali vernal pool habitats. This species was not observed on-site and is not expected to occur as the survey area lacks alkali floodplains and is not located within the vicinity of the San Jacinto River. Additionally, the survey area is not mapped within Willows, Domino, and Traver soils.

As no impacts to plant species are anticipated, no mitigation is required. Therefore, the project is consistent with requirements for the protection of narrow endemic plant species in Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP.

The project is not located within or adjacent to a MSHCP Criteria Area, Criteria Cell, Public/ Quasi-Public lands, or Conservation Area. Therefore, mitigation measures for indirect effects, as addressed in the Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines, are not required and the project would be in compliance with Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP.

The survey area is located within the MSHCP survey area for the burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*). As such, habitat assessments were completed to assess the current conditions on-site and suitability for burrowing owl. Multiple burrows were detected within the project site, although no sign of burrowing owl use was noted. The burrowing owl is a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) species of special concern and a covered species under the MSHCP. Although no burrowing owls or occupied burrows were observed on-site, suitable habitat and many suitable burrows were identified during the MSHCP protocol level surveys completed for the survey area and the species is considered to have a moderate potential to occur on-site. As a result, a pre-construction take avoidance survey for this species would be required within 30 days prior to disturbance within all suitable habitat located inside the burrowing owl survey area as detailed in mitigation measure **BIO-1**. As a result, the project would be consistent with MSHCP Section 6.3.2. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the requirements for burrowing owl contained in the Additional Survey Needs and Procedures in Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP, and no additional surveys or mitigation are required.

The project site does not fall within the MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, MSHCP survey areas for amphibian species, or MSHCP survey areas for mammal species; thus, site-specific surveys for Criteria Area plant species, amphibians, and mammals are not required as per Volume I, Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP. To remain in compliance with MSHCP Section 7.5.3., the project would avoid grading and construction activities during the bird breeding season dates of February 1 to September 15. The project also commits to implementing the standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) as required in MSHCP Volume I, Appendix C, as applicable.

In addition, as suitable habitat for potential sensitive bird species are present on-site, to remain in compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code 3503 and 3503.5, a pre-construction survey would be necessary to confirm the presence or absence of breeding birds

Potential Significa Impact	y Less than t Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

within the grasses and trees existing on-site prior to vegetation removal, implemented through mitigation measure **BIO-2**. If nests or breeding activities are located in the survey area, then an appropriate buffer area around the nesting site shall be maintained until the young have fledged. If no nesting birds are detected during the pre-construction survey, no mitigation would be required.

Therefore, the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan, and impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation:

BIO-1 Burrowing Owl Surveys. A pre-construction take avoidance survey for this species would be required within 30 days prior to disturbance within all suitable habitat located inside the burrowing owl survey area. This pre-construction survey shall be conducted following the protocol established by the WRCRCA Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Area (2006). Take of active nests shall be avoided. If burrowing owls are detected, the WRCRCA and CDFW shall be notified within 48 hours and a burrowing owl relocation plan for active or passive relocation would be developed for review and approval by WRCRCA and CDFW.

BIO-2 Migratory and Nesting Birds. To remain in compliance with Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code 3503 and 3503.5, no direct impacts shall occur to any nesting birds, their eggs, chicks, or nests during the breeding season as mentioned above. If vegetation removal activities must occur during the bird breeding season of February 1 to September 15, then a pre-construction survey would be necessary to confirm the presence or absence of breeding birds within the grasses and trees existing on-site. If nests or breeding activities are located on the survey area, then an appropriate buffer area around the nesting site shall be maintained until the young have fledged. If no nesting birds are detected during the pre-construction survey, no buffer would be required.

Monitoring:

Surveys to be conducted by a qualified biologist in coordination with the County Biologist.

b-c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)? Has a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Wildlife Service?

The project has been designed to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources to the maximum extent feasible. One sensitive wildlife species, orange-throated whiptail (*Aspidoscelis hyperythra*), was observed within the survey area; and there is moderate potential for coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*), red-diamond rattlesnake (*Crotalus ruber*), Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*), burrowing owl, California horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris actia*), and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus bennettii*), to nest/occur on-site due to suitable habitats. The wildlife species observed on-site are typical of native scrub habitats and disturbed and urban areas in western Riverside County. As the project does not include any riparian resources, it does not support suitable habitat for riparian birds. Impacts

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

to these sensitive biological resources were assessed through the project's potential impacts to suitable habitats. Project implementation would impact a total of 26.20 acres of vegetation communities within the project site which includes Riversidean Sage Scrub, disturbed Riversidean Sage Scrub, and residential/urban/exotic land cover types. This impact would require payment of Local Development Mitigation Fees as required by the MSHCP no later than issuance of building permit. Mitigation is required for impacts that are considered significant pursuant to CEQA based on Section 4.3.1 of the MSHCP. Payment towards the MSHCP through the Local Development Mitigation Fee would help to offset the impacts to 26 acres of land as this would provide funding that is required to implement the MSHCP and help maintain the protection of contiguous open spaces that serve the community. Local Development Mitigation Fee payments directly fund the requirements of the MSHCP, which include habitat acquisition of new lands, management and monitoring, and program administration.

The MSHCP consistency analysis completed for the project determined that there would not be a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12) or on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species (including species listed as threatened or endangered) in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on an endangered or threatened species or on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species, and impacts would be **less than significant.**

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Wildlife movement corridors are defined as areas that connect suitable wildlife habitat areas in a region otherwise fragmented by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. Natural features such as canyon drainages, ridgelines, or areas with vegetation cover provide corridors for wildlife travel. Wildlife movement corridors are important because they provide access to mates, food, and water; allow the dispersal of individuals away from high population density areas; and facilitate the exchange of genetic traits between populations. Although the undeveloped lands within the project site may provide a significant wildlife movement corridor. Additionally, the survey area as a whole does not constitute a significant wildlife movement corridor. Additionally, the survey area is not located within an identified wildlife corridor or linkage area (i.e., not in the Criteria Area) within the MSHCP. An ephemeral drainage occurs on and adjacent to the project site but due to its ephemeral nature, it does not serve as a wildlife corridor or nursery site for migratory fish; no impacts to this feature are anticipated from implementation of the project. Therefore, with the project would not interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife nursery sites, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

According to the Western Riverside County MSHCP Consistency Analysis (see Appendix D), Riparian/Riverine Areas are defined as "lands which contain habitat dominated by trees, shrubs, persistent emergent, or emergent mosses and lichens, which occur close to, or which depend upon soil moisture from a nearby fresh water source; or areas with freshwater flow during all or a portion of the year." In addition, riverine areas (i.e., streams) include areas that "do not contain riparian vegetation, but that have water flow for all or a portion of the year and contain biological functions and values that contribute to downstream habitat values for covered species in the MSHCP Conservation Area. There are no riparian resources on-site, but the project site supports one unvegetated, ephemeral drainage that traverses the northwest portion of the project site. The drainage channel crosses the survey area in a northeasterly direction and empties into a culvert off-site, which flows beneath I-15, then into an aboveground eucalyptus-lined drainage to the east of I-15, and eventually empties into Temescal Wash approximately 0.65 mile northeast of the project site. Therefore, the drainage is considered a riverine area pursuant to the MSHCP. However, the drainage would not be impacted by the project as it is located on the materials storage parcel which would be managed through BMPs to prevent erosion of stockpiled soils or pollutants into the drainage. Impacts from equipment storage, fueling, and staging areas would also be avoided through the implementation of standard construction measures. No sensitive riverine wildlife species or other sensitive riparian plant or wildlife species were detected on-site. Therefore, with the project would not have adverse effects on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFW or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and impacts would be less than significant.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

f) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No vernal pools or depressions characteristic of vernal pool habitat and no evidence of ponding areas such as cracked soils, tire ruts, or wetland or vernal pool plant species were observed within or immediately adjacent to the project site. No riparian habitats were detected on-site, and the project would not impact the unvegetated, ephemeral drainage that traverses the northwest portion of the materials storage site, as described above under (e). Therefore, the project would not have an adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, and coastal). **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

As described in the analysis in Section 7a) above, the project would not conflict with the Western Riverside County MSHCP. The only local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources within the project area is the County's Oak Tree Management Guidelines.

During site assessments, it was determined that no oak woodlands occur on-site, and the single small oak tree located on-site is approximately five years old and in good health. The diameter of the tree at 4.5 feet above ground is 3 inches and the tree is approximately 6 feet tall, which meets the definition of a native tree under the County Oak Tree Management Guidelines As the tree would be removed from the site, a significant impact would occur due to conflict with the County's Oak Tree Management Guidelines. However, the project would replace this tree with new trees in compliance with the County's Oak Tree Management Guidelines at a 2:1 ratio and mitigate for these impacts associated with its removal.

Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measure **BIO-3**, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources and **a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated** would occur.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation:

BIO-3 Oak Tree Replacement. The removal of the single native oak tree on-site shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio in accordance with the County's Oak Tree Management Guidelines. The project's landscape plans shall include at least two oak trees to mitigate for the one native tree that will be impacted as a result of the project implementation. The two replacement oak trees shall be no smaller than one gallon.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:			
8. Historic Resources			\square
a) Alter or destroy a historic site?			
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, pursuant to California		\boxtimes	
Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?			

Source(s): Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Temescal Commercial Project (Appendix E), Butterfield Overland Trail Project Temescal Valley Alignment Analysis (County of Riverside 2015c), Correspondence with Gaby Adame and Mark Freed via Email Regarding Historic Trail RE: Temescal MCP project follow up Comprehensive Trails Plan (Riverside County, November 6, 2023)

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

a) Alter or destroy a historic site?

The records search results from California Historical Resources Information System, Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California, Riverside, prepared for the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment (see Appendix E) did not identify historic structures or sites on the project site or within one mile of the project site. Therefore, the project would not alter or destroy a historic site. **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?

The General Plan identifies a segment of the historic alignment of the Butterfield Overland Stage route within the right-of-way of Temescal Canyon Road that abuts the eastern boundary of the project site. Additionally, Section 5 of the Butterfield Overland Trail Project Temescal Valley Alignment Analysis (County of Riverside 2015c) identifies this segment of the trail as a recreational trail. However, the historic alignment of the Butterfield Overland Stage route is not within the proposed disturbance footprint. A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment was completed for the project site (see Appendix E). The site investigation completed as part of this assessment recorded one historic-era resource, which consists of three storage buildings that are associated with the existing clay-pipe manufacturing facility. The resource was not recommended to be designated as a significant resource under the CEQA thresholds or County criteria. Additionally, the resource was recommended not eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources or the County's list of historical landmarks. The three buildings are not associated with a significant event in history and therefore do not qualify under Criterion A. They do not qualify under Criterion B as being associated with a significant person. Although the three buildings are associated with clay pipe industry, the Garrett family who has operated the clay-pipe manufacturing facility since 1968 did not make a significant contribution to the development of the clay products manufacturing industry nor the development of Riverside County. The Garrett family, along with numerous other companies including Pacific Clay Products Company (established in 1910), have been making vitrified clay sewer pipes and other clay products within the Temescal Valley since the early 1900s. The buildings do not qualify under Criterion C because they do not possess distinctive qualities of a specific period or method of construction. The buildings are commonplace of industrial style structures with high ceilings, large open floor plans, lack of ornamentation on the building facade, and the use of metal. Although the metal roof and siding appear in fair condition, there is a high likelihood that various metal sheet siding panels and the roof have been replaced numerous times throughout the years. The buildings do not qualify under Criterion D because they are not likely to yield additional information important to Riverside County, state of California, or the nation's history. Therefore, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a known historical resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5, and impacts would be less than significant.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Monitoring: No monitoring is required.				

9. Archaeological Resources			\square
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site?			
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to		\boxtimes	
California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?			
c) Disturb any human remains, including those		\boxtimes	
interred outside of formal cemeteries?	 	*	

Source(s): Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Temescal Commercial Project (see Appendix E)

Findings of Fact:

a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site?

A record search was conducted of the archaeological databases maintained at the EIC at University of California, Riverside (see Appendix E). The files at the EIC failed to identify any prehistoric archaeological sites recorded within the project area. Therefore, the project would not alter or destroy an archaeological site. **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?

The EIC records search identified two previously recorded resources, isolated prehistoric artifacts within the project area. After reviewing each site form from the records search, it was decided that the resources have been mistakenly mapped and are not within the project area. As part of the site investigation for the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment, no significant or potentially significant prehistoric or historic archaeological resources were observed during the survey of the area of potential effect (APE). Therefore, the project would not adversely affect known archaeological resources. In addition, it is acknowledged that the project site has been disturbed by construction of various structures/buildings, pad grading, agricultural activities, periodic discing, and vegetation mowing maintenance over the years. Given past disturbances, the possibility of buried intact significant prehistoric or historic cultural resources being present within the project APE is considered low.

However, the local consulting Tribe(s) have requested construction monitoring during the Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) consultation with the County (see Appendix E, Attachment 2), due to concerns that unknown artifacts may be unearthed during construction, which would be considered a significant impact. See also the discussion under Tribal Cultural Resources for a summary of AB 52 consultation results. At the time of this writing, tribal consultation is still being conducted and will be concluded prior to project approval. Although no known tribal cultural resources are present on the site, the potential for discovery during ground disturbance remains. It is anticipated that typical County Conditions/Mitigation

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

would be required – Project Archaeologist, Monitoring Plan, and a Tribal Monitoring Agreement would be required. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the developer/permit applicant shall enter into agreement(s) with the consulting Tribe(s) for the appropriate number of Native American Monitor(s).

In conjunction with the Archaeological Monitor(s), the Native American Monitor(s) shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to provide Cultural Sensitivity Training for all construction personnel. In addition, an adequate number of Native American Monitor(s) shall be on-site during all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of soils in each portion of the project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading, and trenching. In conjunction with the Archaeological Monitor(s), the Native American Monitor(s) have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect, or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and potential recovery of cultural resources. Activities will be documented in Tribal Monitoring Notes which will be required to be submitted to the County Archaeologist prior to grading final inspection. The developer/permit applicant shall submit a fully executed copy of the agreement(s) to the County Archaeologist to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Archaeologist shall clear this condition.

If during ground disturbance activities, unanticipated cultural resources are discovered, the following procedures shall be followed as a condition of approval: All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resource shall be halted and the Project archaeologist shall call the County Archaeologist immediately upon discovery of the cultural resource. A meeting shall be convened between the developer, the project archaeologist, the Native American tribal representative, and the County Archaeologist to discuss the significance of the find. At the meeting with the aforementioned parties, a decision is to be made, with the concurrence of the County Archaeologist, as to the appropriate treatment (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resource. Resource evaluations shall be limited to nondestructive analysis. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until the appropriate treatment has been accomplished.

In addition, pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if human remains are encountered, no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 (b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and their disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted by the Coroner within the period specified by law (24 hours). Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the "Most Likely Descendant." The Most Likely Descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation with the property owner concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

Implementation of the above conditions of approval would reduce impacts associated with inadvertent discovery to a level **less than significant**. These conditions would establish an evaluation protocol in the event of an inadvertent discovery, would ensure compliance with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 (b), and a ground disturbance monitoring program.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

<u>Monitoring</u>: Construction monitoring by Archaeological Monitor(s) and Native American Monitor(s) during all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of soils in each portion of the project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading, and trenching.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

The site survey did not yield evidence of human remains nor did the records search indicate the presence of any known burial grounds or cemeteries. However, the potential for inadvertent discovery remains, which would be considered a significant impact. Implementation of the conditions of approval detailed above pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 would reduce this impact to a level **less than significant**. Adherence to the requirements of the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act and the federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act and the remains are found to be Native American, the human remains and cultural items be treated with respect and dignity.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

<u>Monitoring</u>: Construction monitoring by Archaeological Monitor(s) and Native American Monitor(s) during all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of soils in each portion of the project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading, and trenching.

ENERGY Would the project:			
10. Energy Impacts a) Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?		\boxtimes	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a State or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?		\boxtimes	

Source(s): County of Riverside General Plan, Riverside County Climate Action Plan (CAP) (County of Riverside 2019a), County of Riverside Climate Action Plan Screening Tables (Appendix F)

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

The project would replace the existing 100,320 SF warehouse and 9,750 SF structure on-site with a 180,000 SF commercial building and three retail/restaurant drive-through buildings. This would increase the project site's demand for energy.

Construction

During construction, energy use would occur in two general categories: fuel use from vehicles used by workers commuting to and from the construction site, and fuel use by vehicles and other equipment associated with construction activities. Heavy-duty construction equipment is usually diesel powered. Consistent with federal requirements, all equipment was assumed to meet CARB Tier 3 In-Use

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

Off-Road Diesel Engine Standards. There are no known conditions as part of the project that would require nonstandard equipment or construction practices that would increase fuel-energy consumption above typical rates. Therefore, project construction would not result in result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Operation

Operational energy use would be associated with transportation-related fuel use and building-related energy use. New construction is required to meet mandatory energy standards in accordance with the version of the Title 24 Energy Code that is in effect at the time building permits are received. The 2022 Energy Code increases on-site renewable energy generation from solar, increases electric load flexibility to support grid reliability, reduces emissions from newly constructed buildings, reduces air pollution for improved public health, and encourages adoption of environmentally beneficial efficient electric technologies. New construction and major renovations must demonstrate their compliance with the current Energy Code through submission and approval of a Title 24 Compliance Report to the local building permit review authority and the California Energy Commission. The 2022 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) institutes mandatory minimum environmental performance standards for all ground-up new construction of non-residential and residential structures. The 2022 CALGreen includes all non-residential mandatory measures, including but not limited to requirements for bicycle parking, parking for clean air vehicles, electric vehicle charging stations, lighting, water conservation, waste reduction, and building maintenance. Therefore, operation of the project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and impacts would be less than significant.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a State or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Per the County's CAP, energy-related emissions, including residential and non-residential electricity use and natural gas combustion, accounted for 14.5 percent and 9.6 percent of the total community emissions, respectively. The CAP includes reduction measures which are designed to meet the 2030 and 2050 reduction targets for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and accounts for all new development being compliant under Title 24 and CALGreen. The project would implement energy-saving features and operational programs, consistent with the reduction measures set forth in the County's CAP. As detailed in the CAP Screening Thresholds, the County would implement the reduction measures for all new development during CEQA review through the use of the County GHG Screening Tables document based upon the CAP Update (see Appendix F). In addition, the project would be solar ready, consistent with CAP measure R2-CE1 Clean Energy, which requires new buildings totaling more than 100,000 gross square feet of commercial to provide onsite solar to offset at least 20 percent of the energy demand of the project. The project's electrical single line would include two tie-ins to the switch gear for the installation of a future solar photovoltaic system., the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and impacts would be **less than significant.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Findings of Fact: Less than Significant				
Mitigation: No mitigation is required.				
Monitoring: No monitoring is required.				
GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project directly or indirect	ctly:			
11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones			\boxtimes	
a) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area				

Source(s): Fault Hazard Evaluation Report (Appendix G)

a) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

Per the Fault Hazard Evaluation Report (see Appendix G) completed for the project, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; however, it is located directly adjacent to a parcel located within the zone. As noted in the Fault Hazard Evaluation Report (see Appendix G), a geologic investigation performed by Pioneer Consultants for the adjacent tract approximately located a segment of the Glen Ivy North fault trace on the western edge of this site; this led to the establishment of a fault setback zone 25 feet northeasterly, of the right-of-way line for Lawson Road. Per the site investigation for the project site, no evidence of faulting or fissuring was observed in the fault trenches excavated by CTE, South, Inc. on-site and the potential for damage from displacement or fault movement beneath the proposed site is considered low. Therefore, impacts from ground rupture of a known earthquake fault are **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): County of Riverside General Plan Safety Element Figure 2 "Liquefaction Zones" (County of Riverside 2021b), Fault Hazard Evaluation Report (see Appendix G)

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

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

General Plan Safety Element Figure 2 does not identify the project site as being within a mapped liquefaction zone (County of Riverside 2021b). Per the Fault Hazard Evaluation Report (see Appendix G), based on the absence of groundwater within the top fifty feet of the site soil profile, the potential for liquefaction of site soils is considered very low. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

13. G	round-shaking Zone		\square	
a)	Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?			

Source(s): Fault Hazard Evaluation Report (see Appendix G), Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix H)

a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

As described in Section 10(a) above, the project site is located adjacent to a known fault trace and per the Fault Hazard Evaluation Report and Geotechnical Investigation (see Appendices G and Appendix H), due to the proximity of the project site to the Glen Ivy North Fault and the general seismicity of the region, ground shaking due to seismic activity on local and distant faults would be a significant geologic hazard at the project site. With implementation of the recommendations of the geotechnical investigation into design, such as the installation of crack control joints and reinforcements, hazards associated with seismic ground shaking would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): Fault Hazard Evaluation Report (see Appendix G), Geotechnical Investigation (see Appendix H)

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

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

No features typically associated with land sliding were noted during the site investigation nor were records of land sliding found during reference review, per the Geotechnical Investigation (see Appendices G and Appendix H). Therefore, impacts related to landslide risk would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): Geotechnical Investigation (see Appendix H)

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

The Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the project (see Appendix H) determined that the soils within the upper six to eight feet of the ground surface of the project site are potentially collapsible. Fill encountered at the project site is generally considered to be compressible under the proposed loading conditions. Surficial soils were also found to be locally disturbed and weathered. Therefore, it is recommended that the fill, disturbed soils, and collapsible soils be over-excavated, processed, and compacted. Adherence to these recommendations would ensure that impacts related to soils becoming unstable and resulting in ground subsidence would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

16. Other Geologic Hazards		
a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche,		
mudflow or volcanic hazard?		

Source(s): Geotechnical Investigation (see Appendix H)

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

Per the Geotechnical Investigation (see Appendix H), due to project site elevation and distance from the Pacific Ocean, the project site is not considered to be subject to damage from tsunamis. Based on the absence of large bodies of water in the area, damage from seiche (oscillatory waves in standing

 \square

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e subject to seich	Incorporated	volcanic ha	zard
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Less than Significant Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Less than Less Significant Significant Than Impact with Significant Mitigation Impact Incorporated

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

17. Slopes		\square	
a) Change topography or ground surface relief			
features?			
b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher		\square	
than 10 feet?			
c) Result in grading that affects or negates			
subsurface sewage disposal systems?			

Source(s): Geotechnical Investigation (see Appendix H)

a-b) Change topography or ground surface relief features? Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?

Project construction would require that remedial grading reach a depth of 8 or more feet below the existing grade or finish grade whichever is deeper. The Geotechnical Investigation included the recommendation that permanent slopes should be no steeper than 2:1 and temporary sloped excavations should be cut at a 1:1 or flatter. If temporary slopes are to be maintained during the rainy season, berms are recommended along the tops of slopes to divert runoff water from entering the excavation and eroding the slope faces. Therefore, the project would not create a change in topography or ground surface relief features or slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet, and impacts would be **less than significant.**

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The project does not propose the use of subsurface sewage disposal systems or septic tanks. A non-operational septic tank with a leach field that is currently present on-site would be removed. Therefore, project grading would not affect or negate a subsurface sewage disposal system. **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Monitoring: No monitoring is required.				
18. Soils a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			\boxtimes	
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code (2022), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			\boxtimes	
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				

Source(s): Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (Appendix I), Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix H), Grading (County of Riverside 2024)

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

Prior to ground disturbance, the issuance of a grading permit from the County Building and Safety Department would require the implementation of BMPs as recommended in the Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (see Appendix I), an erosion control plan, and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction. Implementation of these BMPs during ground disturbance would prevent substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Permanent BMPs in the form of landscaping and the maintenance of existing drainage patterns would reduce erosion potential on-site during operations. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code (2022), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

The Geotechnical Investigation (see Appendix H) prepared for the project determined that near-surface materials at the site are anticipated to exhibit a very low expansion potential. The geotechnical investigation includes earthwork recommendations to over-excavate, process, and compact the surface artificial fill. Additional evaluation of soil expansion potential would be conducted during grading and upon completion of rough grading and building pad construction. Adherence to this recommendation would ensure that impacts related to expansive soils would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

The project does not propose the use of subsurface sewage disposal systems or septic tanks. A non-operational septic tank with a leach field that is currently present on-site would be removed, and the project would connect to existing wastewater infrastructure. **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): General Plan Safety Element (County of Riverside 2021b)

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

The project site is not located within a wind erosion susceptibility area as designated by the General Plan Safety Element (County of Riverside 2021b). Ground disturbance during project construction would increase the potential for wind erosion by loosening soils and generating soil stockpiles. However, through implementation of County Ordinance 457 and Board of Supervisors Policy F-6, the County prohibits grading without permits, levies penalties for illegal grading, and requires the restoration of illegally graded land to prevent off-site drainage and slope erosion. As part of the conditions for issuance of grading permit, the project would be required to implement BMPs and appropriate mitigation to erosion. The project would implement SCAQMD Rule 402 (Nuisance) and Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), as noted above under the Air Quality Section, which would reduce construction erosion impacts. SCAQMD Rule 402 requires dust suppression techniques to be implemented to prevent dust and soil erosion from creating a nuisance off-site. SCAQMD Rule 403 requires control measures to reduce fugitive dust from active operations, storage piles, or disturbed surfaces, with a goal to omit visibility beyond the property line or avoid exceedance of 20 percent opacity. Compliance with these federal, regional, and local requirements would reduce the potential for on-site and off-site erosion effects to accepted levels during project construction. Once construction is complete, surfaces would be paved or developed with landscaping, which would reduce the potential for wind erosion. Therefore, the project would not be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blow sand, either on- or off-site, and impacts would be less than significant.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): Climate Action Plan (County of Riverside 2019a), Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis (Appendix J)

<u>Methodology</u>: A Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis completed for the project (see Appendix J) evaluated the significance of potential GHG emissions impacts that may be generated by the project in accordance with CEQA and guidance from the County and the SCAQMD. The analysis evaluated the significance of potential impacts in terms of (1) the project's contribution of GHGs to cumulative statewide emissions and (2) whether the project would conflict with local and/or state regulations, plans, and policies adopted to reduce GHG emissions. GHG emissions would be generated during construction and operation of the project.

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

The 2019 Climate Action Plan (CAP) Update was approved on December 17, 2019 (County of Riverside, 2019a). The 2019 CAP Update refines the County's efforts to meet greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction strategies, specifically for the years 2035 and 2050. The 2019 CAP Update builds upon the GHG reduction strategies in the 2015 Climate Action Plan. The purpose of the CAP Update is to provide auidance on how to analyze GHG emissions and determine significance during the CEQA review of proposed development projects within the County. To address the state's requirement to reduce GHG emissions, the County prepared its 2019 CAP Update with the goal of reducing GHG emissions within the County by 49 percent below 2008 levels by the year 2030. The County's target is consistent with the AB 32 target and ensures that the County would be providing GHG reductions locally that would complement state efforts to reduce GHG emissions. The County's target is also consistent with the Senate Bill (SB) 32 target that expands on AB 32 to reduce GHG emissions to 40 percent below the 1990 levels by 2030. The County's 2019 CAP Update was approved on December 17, 2019. The 2019 CAP Update refines the County's efforts to meet GHG reduction strategies, specifically for the years 2035 and 2050. The 2019 CAP Update builds upon the GHG reduction strategies in the 2015 CAP. Analysis of GHG emissions and potential climate change impacts from new development is required under CEQA. The CAP is a plan for the reduction of GHG emissions in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(h)(3) and 15130(b), a project's incremental contribution to GHG emissions may be determined not to be cumulatively considerable if it complies with the requirements of the CAP. The 2019 CAP Update identifies a two-step approach in evaluating GHG emissions. First, a screening threshold of 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO₂E) per year is used to determine if additional analysis is required. Projects that exceed 3,000 MT CO₂E per year would be required to utilize the Screening Tables or prepare a project-specific technical analysis to quantify and mitigate project emissions. Projects that garner at least 100 points from the Screening Tables (equivalent to an approximate 49 percent reduction in GHG emissions) are determined to be consistent with the reduction quantities anticipated in the 2019 CAP Update.

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

As such, projects that achieve a total of 100 points or more are considered to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact on GHG emissions. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(a) states that a lead agency shall make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project. Therefore, GHG emissions as estimated by CalEEMod are provided for informational purposes and are compared to the SCAQMD screening level thresholds.

As calculated in the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis (see Appendix J), the project would exceed the 3,000 MT CO₂E per year screening threshold (Table 6). Therefore, the project is required to demonstrate compliance with the County's CAP Screening Tables and achieve a minimum of 100 points as identified in the CAP (see Appendix F). The project would achieve 100 points through compliance with Reduction Measure R2-T4: Electrify the Fleet. The project would implement measure T4.B.1: Electric Vehicle Recharging by providing 38 parking spaces in two areas with circuit and capacity in parking areas for installation of vehicle charging stations (2 points per area for 4 points) and installing 12 electric vehicle charging stations (8 points per station for 96 points). In addition, the project would be solar ready, consistent with CAP measure R2-CE1 Clean Energy, which requires new buildings totaling more than 100,000 gross square feet of commercial to provide onsite solar to offset at least 20 percent of the energy demand of the project. The project's electrical single line would include two tie-ins to the switch gear for the installation of a future solar photovoltaic system. Consequently, the project would be consistent with the CAP's requirement to achieve at least 100 points. The County shall verify incorporation of the identified Screening Table Measures within the project building plans and site designs prior to the issuance of building permit(s) and/or site plans (as applicable). The County shall verify implementation of the identified Screening Table Measures prior to the issuance of Certificate(s) of Occupancy. Therefore, the project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, and impacts would be less than significant.

Table 6 Project GHG Emissions						
Source	Manufacturing GHG Emissions MT CO ₂ E	Retail GHG Emissions MT CO₂E	Total Project GHG Emissions MT CO ₂ E ¹			
Mobile	1,872	3,231	5,104			
Energy	714	121	835			
Area ²	4	<1	4			
Water/Wastewater	108	8	115			
Solid Waste	73	37	110			
Refrigerants	8	3	11			
Construction (Amortized over 30 years) ²	41	2	44			
Total	2,820	3,402	6,222			

¹Totals may vary due to independent rounding.

²CalEEMod does not separate area sources and construction sources by land use; therefore, 95 percent of the emissions from these sources were attributed to the manufacturing use and 5 percent were attributed to the retail use based on the proportion of overall square footage.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

As discussed under 20a) above, the project would be consistent with the County's 2019 CAP, which is a qualified GHG reduction plan that is consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan and emission reduction targets per SB 32. Because the project would be consistent with the CAP, it would not conflict with the Scoping Plan or SB 32. Furthermore, project emissions would decline beyond the project buildout year as a result of continued implementation of federal, state, and local reduction measures, such as increased federal and state vehicle efficiency standards and Southern California Edison's increased renewable sources of energy in accordance with Renewable Portfolio Standards goals. Based on currently available models and regulatory forecasting, project emissions would continue to decline through at least 2050. Given the reasonably anticipated decline in project emissions, once fully constructed and operational, the project is in line with the GHG reductions needed to achieve the 2050 GHG emission reduction targets identified by Executive Order S-3-05. In addition to being consistent with the CAP, the project was evaluated for consistency with the Sustainable Communities Strategies contained in Connect SoCal. As discussed in Table 9 of the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis (see Appendix J), the project would be consistent with applicable Connect SoCal strategies, particularly by constructing a high-density residential use adjacent to existing transit. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of GHGs, and impacts would be less than significant.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project	ect:		
21. Hazards and Hazardous Materials a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		\boxtimes	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?		\boxtimes	
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter (1/4) mile of an existing or proposed school?			
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			

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

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

Project construction would require the transport, temporary storage, and use of asphalt, solvents, cleaners, paint, oils, and fuel for equipment. However, these materials are not acutely hazardous, and use of these common hazardous materials in small quantities would not represent a significant hazard to the public or environment. The Soils Management Plan (SMP) (Appendix L) details specific procedures that would be used for identifying, testing, handling, and disposing of existing soils containing elevated levels of regulated constituents if such soil is encountered during site redevelopment activities. Implementing the procedures in the SMP would ensure that soil from any previously unidentified area of potentially contaminated soil or any subsurface structure containing potential chemical contaminants is managed and disposed of in a manner that is protective of human health and the environment and is compliant with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

The commercial structure would house a manufacturer of TPE-based action sport parts and a manufacturer of clay products, a clay product related museum and retail space, and spaces for clayrelated classes. The manufacturers do not store or utilize hazardous materials in their raw materials or operations. Similarly, operation of the three retail/restaurant drive-through would include the use and storage of cleaning supplies. However, these materials are not acutely hazardous and would not be used in quantities that would pose a threat to the public. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Activities that may cause soil disturbance and uncover potential contaminated soils include building demolition; site grading; grubbing; removal of soil; removing/installing underground utilities and utility pipeline repair activities; planting trees/landscaping; excavating elevator shaft pits; installing foundations, underground shelters, garages, retention ponds, or basements; and performing other construction activities.

According to historical documentation, three underground storage tanks (USTs) were removed from the project site in 1993 under the oversight of the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (RCDEH), resulting in the removal of approximately 1,800 cubic yards of petroleum-impacted soil. The property has been used for commercial and industrial uses since at least 1947, including the present-day clay pipe manufacturing facility since circa 1960, which utilizes large kilns and hydraulic oil powered machinery. The impacted soils removed during the remediation process were reportedly placed in several stockpiles in the northeastern portion of the site. Based on documentation reviewed, the RCDEH issued closure of the UST case in 1996 and allowed the impacted soil to remain on the site in the stockpiles. The Phase 1 ESA Report (Appendix K) also acknowledged that the concentrations petroleum concentrations in a majority of the soil samples of these stockpiled soils were determined to be below the acceptable limit for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) in parts per million and regulatory

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

closure was provided to the subject property on June 5, 1996. After regulatory closure, the stockpiled soil was treated as nonhazardous and spread on the property. While there is a potential that petroleum products may exist in the near surface soils, due to the time period in which these soils would have been spread and the low concentration of petroleum products in the soil, the Phase 1 ESA investigation concluded that these products would have degraded to a level that would have reduced the potential for exposure to residual petroleum products.

Due to these conditions, the project is subject to obtaining clearance from Riverside County Department of Environmental Health, Environmental Cleanup Program (RCDEH-ECP) prior to any site disturbance/grading/development. A Phase II subsurface investigation workplan was prepared at the request of RCDEH to determine the potential risks associated with disturbance of these stockpiled soils and would be required to be implemented prior to ground disturbance associated with the project. The Phase II ESA workplan has been submitted and approved by RCDEH-ECP for investigation of the site. If the investigation results in additional work to remediate the site, any remediation would be required to be approved prior to any project disturbance or development. If the investigation results in remediation, this remediation must be completed prior to disturbance or project development. Remediation would be conducted under oversight of RCDEH-ECP and/or the appropriate regulatory agency. A SMP approved by RCDEH-ECP must be in place during grading operations; a SMP was prepared for the project (see Appendix L). If any contaminants are discovered, they would be investigated and mitigated/remediated under oversight of the RCDEH-ECP and/or the appropriate regulatory agency. The SMP (see Appendix L) was prepared with the Phase II subsurface investigation workplan in mind and provides protocols for the proper management of unknown impacts to soil or subsurface features potentially encountered at the project site during grading and below grade construction. Encounters of these contaminated soils may also occur during the removal of the existing structures (i.e., hydraulic equipment removals and oil water separators) during demolition. The SMP (see Appendix L) details specific procedures that would be used for identifying, testing, handling, and disposing of soil containing elevated levels of regulated constituents if such soil is encountered during site redevelopment activities. Implementing the procedures in the SMP as a condition of project approval would ensure that soil from any previously-unidentified area of potentially contaminated soil or any subsurface structure containing potential chemical contaminants-is managed in a manner that is protective of human health and the environment and is compliant with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

The main human health concern during redevelopment activities at the project site is the direct exposure to TPH and volatile organic compound-impacted soil by construction workers through ingestion, inhalation, and/or dermal contact. Activities that involve the handling of impacted soil, such as any improvements that involve excavation/grading work, may result in exposure to hydrocarbon or volatile organic compound-impacted soil or soil vapors. Inhalation of airborne dust is another route for exposure to contaminants. Therefore, procedures to minimize dust generation and migration during excavation/grading activities would be required to reduce exposure. Additionally, vapor monitoring should be performed using a handheld photoionization detector if evidence of impacted soil is encountered to evaluate whether additional safety measures are required such as use of a respirator or pressurized equipment cabs to limit inhalation of chemicals of concern.

In addition, the Phase 1 ESA Report (see Appendix K) also identified a septic system as a recognized environmental condition (REC) on-site. A REC refers to the presence, or likely presence, of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: due to release to the environment; under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. The septic system is located to the north exterior of the

P S	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant with	Less Than Significant	No Impact
	impuot	Mitigation	Impact	
		Incorporated		

existing warehouse structure and former connection from the warehouse discharged domestic wastewater directly to the subsurface of the property to this septic system. The Phase 1 ESA acknowledged that this septic system was likely installed at the time of original construction of the existing warehouse structure and may have contaminated soils underneath the site, which has the potential to be impacted by ground disturbance as part of the proposed structure. The Phase 1 ESA Report recommended that a limited subsurface investigation should be conducted near the septic system outfall of the north exterior of the maintenance shop to determine the presence or absence of soil, soil vapor, and/or groundwater contamination due to the historical use of the subject property. In the event of contamination, proper remediation would be implemented to avoid impacts related to the release of hazardous substances into the environment during ground disturbance.

The Phase 1 ESA Report (see Appendix K) also identified environmental concerns on the site in the form of hydraulic oil, sealer drip, and dyed diesel staining and minor leaking of various oils and diesel aboveground storage tank stored at the project site. Hydraulic oil contains heavy-end hydrocarbons, commonly referred to as TPH as oil (TPHo), which may include polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and/or semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs). An additional environmental concern that was noted was the potential for asbestos containing materials and/or lead-based paints to be present due to the age of the subject property buildings to be demolished. The Phase 1 ESA Report (see Appendix K) recommended secondary containment for these aboveground storage tanks, remediating the hydraulic oil leak, and implementing the County Operations and Maintenance Program to safely manage the suspect asbestos containing materials and lead-based paints on-site prior to demolition.

Therefore, with implementation of these protocols as conditions of approval, the project would not reasonably introduce a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment from disturbance of soils on the proposed site.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?

The project site is located adjacent to Temescal Canyon Road which provides access to I-15 as an emergency evacuation route. The project would improve access to the site through the construction of Street A which would connect Temescal Canyon Road to Lawson Road. The design of Street A includes an all-weather section providing emergency access between Street B and Lawson Road. Proposed roadways have been designed consistent with applicable federal and local standards and would provide access for emergency vehicles and have been reviewed with the Fire Department. Therefore, the project would not impair or physically interfere with evacuation procedures in the event of an emergency. Therefore, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Potentiall Significar Impact	y Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter (1/4) mile of an existing or proposed school?

The project site is not located within 0.25 mile of an existing school. Morgan Academy is located approximately 2.2 miles north of the project site and Temescal Valley Elementary is located approximately 2.4 miles north of the project site. Therefore, the project would not hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

The project site is not located on a site listed on the Cortese List pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, there would be no impacts. The Phase 1 ESA Report (see Appendix K) prepared for the project identified a septic system as a REC on-site. An REC refers to the presence, or likely presence, of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: due to release to the environment; under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. The septic system is located to the north exterior of the existing warehouse structure and former connection from the warehouse discharged domestic wastewater directly to the subsurface of the property to this septic system. The Phase 1 ESA acknowledged that this septic system was likely installed at the time of original construction of the existing warehouse structure and may have contaminated soils underneath the site which has the potential to be impacted by ground disturbance as part of the proposed structure. The Phase 1 ESA Report recommended that a limited subsurface investigation should be conducted near the septic system outfall of the north exterior of the maintenance shop to determine the presence or absence of soil, soil vapor, and/or groundwater contamination due to the historical use of the subject property. In the event of contamination, proper remediation would be implemented to avoid impacts related to the release of hazardous substances into the environment during ground disturbance.

The Phase 1 ESA Report also acknowledged the presence of a controlled REC, which refers to a REC resulting from a past release of hazardous substances or petroleum products that has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority, with hazardous substances or petroleum products allowed to remain in place subject to the implementation of required controls. The site investigation noted three USTs, all of which were excavated and removed from the site with oversight from the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health in 1993. Soil samples beneath the former locations of the USTs revealed concentrations of petroleum. However, concentrations in a majority of the soil samples were determined to be below the acceptable limit for total petroleum hydrocarbons in parts per million and regulatory closure was provided to the subject property on

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

June 5, 1996. After regulatory closure, the stockpiled soil was treated as nonhazardous and spread on the property. While there is a potential that petroleum products may exist in the near surface soils, due to the time period in which these soils would have been spread and the low concentration of petroleum products in the soil, the Phase 1 ESA Investigation concluded that these products would have degraded to a level that would have reduced the potential for exposure to residual petroleum products.

The Phase 1 ESA also identified environmental concerns on the site in the form of hydraulic oil, sealer drip, and dyed diesel staining and minor leaking of various oils and diesel aboveground storage tank stored at the project site. An additional environmental concern that was noted was the potential for asbestos containing materials and/or lead-based paints to be present due to the age of the subject property buildings to be demolished. The Phase 1 ESA recommended secondary containment for these aboveground storage tanks, remediating the hydraulic oil leak, and implementing the County Operations and Maintenance Program to safely manage the suspect asbestos containing materials and lead-based paints on-site prior to demolition.

Adherence to the recommendations presented in the Phase 1 ESA would ensure impacts related to hazards materials would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

22. Airports a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master		\boxtimes
_Plan?		
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use		
Commission?		
c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two (2) miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		
d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		\boxtimes

Source(s): County of Riverside Map My County v11.5 Report for APNs 283-180-002, 283-180-020, 283-180-021 (County of Riverside 2024), New Compatibility Plan (Airport Land Use Commission 2024a)

a-d) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan? Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission? For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two (2) miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Potentiall Significar Impact	v Less than t Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

The project site is not located within the boundaries of an airport compatibility area or an airport influence area and is not subject to an Airport Master Plan (County of Riverside Airport Land Use Commission 2024). Corona Municipal Airport is located approximately 13 miles north of the project site, while the Riverside Municipal Airport is located approximately 19 miles northeast of the project site, and the Perris Valley Airport is located approximately 21 miles southeast of the project site. There are no private airstrips or heliports within the vicinity of the project site. **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:			
23. Water Quality Impacts a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces?			
d) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?		\boxtimes	
e) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- site or off-site?		\boxtimes	
f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			
g) Impede or redirect flood flows?		\boxtimes	
h) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk the release of pollutants due to project inundation?			\square
 i) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? 		\square	

Source(s): General Plan Safety Element Figure 4 "Flood Hazard Zones," General Plan Safety Element Figure 5 "Dam Hazard Inundation" (County of Riverside 2021b), Preliminary Hydrology Report (Appendix M), Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) (see Appendix I), Geotechnical Investigation (see Appendix H), Water Quality Control Plan for the Santa Ana River Basin (State Water Resources Control Board 2024), SGMA Portal (California Department of Water Resources 2024), Groundwater Sustainability Plan Bedford-Coldwater Basin (Bedford Coldwater Groundwater Sustainability Authority 2021)

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

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

As construction activities would disturb one or more acres, pursuant to the requirements of the Santa Ana RWQCB and County Ordinance Number 754, prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project would be required to obtain coverage under the State of California NPDES General Construction Storm Water Permit. The NPDES permit is required for all projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, soil stockpiling, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the Santa Ana RWQCB's Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program. Compliance with the NPDES permit and the Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program involves the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP for construction-related activities, including grading. The SWPPP would specify the BMPs that the project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern, including silt/sediment, are prevented, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property. Examples of BMPs that could be used during project construction include, but are not restricted to, sandbag barriers, geotextiles, storm drain inlet protection, sediment traps, rip-rap, and soil stabilizers/hydroseeding. The SWPPP would include BMPs designed to prevent erosion and protect the quality of stormwater runoff during construction. Construction BMPs would help retain stormwater and any constituents, pollutants, and sediment contained therein, on the project site, which, in turn, would help prevent water quality impacts to downstream receiving waters during project construction.

According to the Preliminary WQMP (see Appendix I) and Preliminary Hydrology Report (see Appendix M) prepared for the project, the proposed development would maintain the existing drainage patterns post-development. Drainage from the southeast corner of the project site would continue to drain to the northeast corner of the site in post-development conditions. Low flows within Street A would discharge into a modular wetland system while high flows would discharge into a proposed storm drain line, which connects to an existing storm drain in Temescal Canyon Road. On-site flows on the commercial/industrial portion of the site would be captured via a proposed on-site storm drain and would enter a perforated corrugated metal pipe system for water quality volume capture for infiltration and discharge offsite to the northeast. Runoff along Street B would be captured and infiltrate the ground adjacent to the proposed cul-de-sac with outflow off-site to the northeast. No substantial natural infiltration would occur as part of post-development conditions; however, any captured flows would be treated by these systems prior to infiltration and therefore, would not impact groundwater quality. Landscaping on the project site would also capture surface runoff and prevent drainage from discharging into the natural drainage on the northwestern portion of the project site. Therefore, with mandatory compliance with the SWPPP to implement proposed BMPs, the project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality, and impacts would be less than significant.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.
Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

The project does not propose any groundwater wells. As described in Section 38(b) below, TVWD would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements/resources and no new or expanded entitlements are needed. As noted in the Preliminary WQMP (see Appendix I), the project would increase the amount of impervious surface on the project site through the development of paved parking lots and new roadways. However, the existing site is composed of artificial fill underlain by old alluvial fan deposits comprised of interbedded layers of silty and clayey sand, which have low infiltration rates, and are not conducive to groundwater recharge. Furthermore, groundwater recharge would continue in other undeveloped regions of the groundwater basin. Therefore, the project would not decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces?

As described in Section 23a) above, the project would maintain the existing drainage patterns post-construction and would not impact the course of the natural drainage north of the site. Therefore, the project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or impact the course of a stream or river, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

<u>Mitigation</u>: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

d) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?

Construction of the project would be subject to local and state requirements for erosion control and grading. Post-development, the project would include paved parking lots and new roadways that would potentially increase runoff volumes that would lead to increased erosion but would also include landscaping and low impact development stormwater BMPs to mitigate for potential erosion from surface runoff. The modular wetland system to be installed for stormwater capture and treatment. Therefore, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site, and impacts would be **less than significant.**

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

e) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site?

The project site is located in Zone X in an area of minimal flood hazard which is outside of the 100-year flood plain area per Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) (Map Number 06065C1390G; see Appendix M). The project would result in the increase of impervious surfaces through the development of paved parking lots and new roadways; however, with the installation of low impact development stormwater BMPs, landscaping, and the maintenance of existing drainage conditions, the project would not increase surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site (see Appendix M). Therefore, the project would not substantially increase surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

The proposed installation of the two off-site underground detention basins as part of the project would detain the increased flows resulting from development and would prevent the exceedance of the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems downstream. Therefore, the project would not contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

<u>Mitigation</u>: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

g) Impede or redirect flood flows?

As described in Section 23(e) above, the project site is located in Zone X in an area of minimal flood hazard which is outside of the 100-year flood plain area per FEMA FIRM mapping (see Appendix M). Additionally, installation of low impact development stormwater BMPs, landscaping, and the maintenance of existing drainage conditions would avoid flooding. Therefore, the project would not impede or redirect flows, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

h) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk the release of pollutants due to project inundation?

As noted in the Geotechnical Investigation (see Appendix H), due to project site elevation and distance from the Pacific Ocean, the site is not considered to be subject to damage from tsunamis. Based on the absence of large bodies of water in the area, seiche (oscillatory waves in standing bodies of water) damage is also not expected. The project site is also located in a FEMA FIRM mapped area of minimal flood hazard and therefore would be unlikely to be inundated and result in the release of pollutants. Therefore, the project would not risk the release of pollutants from flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, and no impacts would occur.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

i) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

The project site is located within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana RWQCB. Water quality information for the Santa Ana River watershed is contained in the Santa Ana Region Basin Plan, which establishes water quality standards for the ground and surface waters of the region. Per the Preliminary WQMP (see Appendix I), receiving waters for the project site's drainage are the Canyon Lake (Railroad Canyon Reservoir, approximately 16.5 miles from the project site), Lake Elsinore (approximately 21.9 miles from the site), and Bedford Canyon Creek (adjacent to the site). The WQMP notes that Lake Elsinore has 303(d) listed impairments approved by the U.S. EPA. The Preliminary WQMP for the project incorporates BMPs that would remove waterborne pollutants from stormwater flows to prevent impacts to these receiving waters. The WQMP requires post-construction maintenance and operational measures to ensure ongoing effectiveness. Compliance with the WQMP would be required as a condition of Project approval. Therefore, the project's operation would not obstruct implementation of the Santa Ana Region Basin Plan. The project Applicant, successors in interest, and construction contractors would be required to comply with the project-specific WQMP as a condition of approval.

The project site is located within the Bedford Coldwater groundwater subbasin and is therefore subject to the Bedford Coldwater Groundwater Sustainability Authority's Groundwater Sustainability Plan for the Bedford-Coldwater Basin (California Department of Water Resources 2024; Bedford Coldwater Groundwater Sustainability Authority 2021). The City of Corona, Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District, and TVWD entered into a Joint Powers Agreement on March 29, 2017, for the formation of a Joint Powers Authority to apply to become a Groundwater Sustainability Agency for the Bedford-Coldwater Sub-basin of the Elsinore Basin. Each of Joint Powers Authority's members agencies overlies a portion of the sub-basin and exercises water management, water supply or land use authority within a portion of the sub-basin. The Groundwater Sustainability Plan defines thresholds for maintaining sustainability, outlines groundwater monitoring protocols, best management practices, management actions and projects designed to improve monitoring capabilities and/or to protect and enhance groundwater conditions. The project would not directly extract groundwater nor would it impact groundwater recharge as the project would install bioretention basins and pipe systems that would allow for infiltration of stormwater flows after treatment. In addition, the project's proposed stormwater drainage system would convey water runoff into the public storm drain system which flows to downstream water bodies where percolation into the groundwater table occurs. Therefore, the project

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

would not conflict or obstruct implementation of a groundwater management plan or implementation of a groundwater sustainability plan, and impacts would be **less than significant.**

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:			
24. Land Usea) Physically divide an established community?		\boxtimes	
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			

a) Physically divide an established community?

The project proposes the redevelopment of an existing commercial/industrial site with a light industrial building and commercial drive through structures on an infill site. The project site is located on a parcel along Temescal Canyon Road and would improve access to the project site through the construction of Street A, and also allow for an EVA connection between Street B and Lawson Road. These roadways would not divide an established community in a way that would create a barrier or a division of uses in the area. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to redesignate the Lot 4 from Commercial Tourist (CT) to Light Industrial (LI) and to rezone the Lot 4 from Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) to Manufacturing- Service Commercial (M-SC). Lots 1 through 3 would remain designated with its adopted land use designation and zoning. As documented in the General Plan Consistency Analysis completed for the project (see Appendix A), the project would be consistent with all applicable general plan policies. As described in Section 7a) above, the Consistency Analysis with the Western Riverside County MSHCP (see Appendix D) determined that the project would not conflict with any applicable plan policies. As described in Section 9a) above and Section 39b), the project would mitigate all impacts related to cultural resources and tribal cultural resources to a level less than significant. As described in Section 20a) above, the project would be consistent with the County's adopted CAP. As described throughout this Initial Study, all other impacts not requiring mitigation would be less than significant or would have no impact.

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

Therefore, the project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:		
25. Mineral Resourcesa) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?		
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?		\boxtimes
c) Potentially expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines?		\square

Source(s): County of Riverside General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element Figure OS-6 "Mineral Resources Area" (County of Riverside 2015a)

a-c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State? Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? Potentially expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines?

The project site is not located on a proposed, existing, or abandoned quarry or mine. The site is located entirely in an area designated as Mineral Resource Zone 3 (Significance of mineral deposits undetermined) based on the County's General Plan Figure OS-6 "Mineral Resources Area" (County of Riverside 2015c). Land classified as Mineral Resource Zone 3 is not considered a significant mineral resource. The project site is not delineated as an existing mineral resource recovery site. It is noted that active mining operations are located approximately 1.4 miles south of the project site; however, construction and operation of the project would not impact these operations or expose people or properties to hazards from these mines. Therefore, there would be **no impacts** related to mineral resources.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
NOISE Would the project result in:				
26. Airport Noise a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two (2) miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
b) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes

Source(s): County of Riverside Airport Influence Areas Map (County of Riverside 2016), New Compatibility Plan (County of Riverside Airport Land Use Commission 2024)

a-b) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two (2) miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

The project is not located within an airport land use plan and is therefore not within an airport noise contour boundary, nor is the project site located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport (County of Riverside 2016; County of Riverside Airport Land Use Commission 2024). Corona Municipal Airport is located approximately 13 miles from the project site, Riverside Municipal Airport is located approximately 13 miles from the Perris Valley Airport is located approximately 21 miles from the project site. There are no private airstrips or heliports within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the project would expose people working on the project site to excessive noise levels associated with a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip, or heliport. **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

27. Noise Effects by the Project a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agoncies?			
other agencies?			
b) Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or			
ground-borne noise levels?			

Source(s): General Plan Noise Element, Table N-1 ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure") (County of Riverside 2015d), Noise Analysis (Appendix N)

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

A Noise Analysis (see Appendix N) was completed for the project to assess potential noise and vibration impacts associated with construction and operation of the project. As part of this assessment, noise levels due to vehicle traffic were calculated and evaluated against County noise and land use compatibility guidelines. In addition to compatibility, this report evaluates the potential for noise to impact adjacent receivers from on-site sources and construction activity, and impacts related to ground-borne vibration.

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

The Noise Analysis (see Appendix N) assessed noise impacts in the context of the County's noise compatibility standards as included in the Noise Element of the General Plan to control and abate environmental noise, and to protect the citizens of the County from excessive exposure to noise and in the context of County Code of Ordinances.

Construction Noise

The County regulates noise in accordance with Chapter 9.52, Noise Regulations of the Code of Ordinances Section 9.52.020[I] states that sound emanating from private construction projects located within a quarter mile from an inhabited dwelling is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 9.52, if construction occurs between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. during the months of June through September, and between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. during the months of October through May. The Code of Ordinances does not establish a quantitative construction noise level limit. For the purposes of this analysis, the Federal Transit Administration-recommended threshold of 80 A-weighted decibel (dB) one-hour equivalent noise level [dB(A) L_{eq}] at noise sensitive residential land uses was used.

Project construction noise would be generated by diesel engine-driven construction equipment used for site preparation and grading, building construction, loading, unloading, and placing materials and paving. Diesel engine-driven trucks also would bring materials to the site and remove the soils from excavation. The nearest residential uses are located as close as 25 feet northwest and southwest of the project site adjacent to the off-site material storage area. Retail uses are located to the east. Undeveloped land is located to the north, west, and south. Construction noise levels were modeled at the adjacent receivers assuming the simultaneous use of an excavator, grader, and scraper, which would generate a combined sound power level of 117.4 dB(A) L_{pw} . This noise level was modeled as an area source covering the entire project site and the off-site material storage area. Table 7 summarizes the construction noise levels modeled at these adjacent land uses. Figure 11 shows the construction noise contours.





Project Boundary Off-Site Material Storage Area

Receivers \bigcirc

COnst	iuctic	יוות	1013
	60 dE	3(A)	L_{eq}
	65 dE	3(A)	L_{eq}
	70 dE	3(A)	L_{eq}
	75 dE	3(A)	L_{eq}





FIGURE 11 **Construction Noise Contours**

Potentially	Less than	Less
Significant	Significant	Than
Impact	with	Significar
	Mitigation	Impact
	Incorporated	-

Less	No
Than	Impact
ignificant	

	Table 7				
Construction Noise Levels at Off-site Receivers					
Receiver	Land Use	Construction Noise Level [dB(A) Leq]			
1	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	63			
2	Undeveloped/Tourist Commercial	63			
3	Undeveloped/Tourist Commercial	62			
4	Retail Commercial	58			
5	Retail Commercial	57			
6	Undeveloped/Tourist Commercial	63			
7	Undeveloped/Tourist Commercial	64			
8	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	65			
9	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	65			
10	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	63			
11	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	66			
12	Estate Density Residential	61			
13	Estate Density Residential	50			
14	Estate Density Residential	54			
15	Estate Density Residential	59			
16	Estate Density Residential	61			
17	Estate Density Residential	61			
18	Estate Density Residential	63			
19	Estate Density Residential	63			
20	Estate Density Residential	63			
SOURCE: Ap	ppendix N				
$dB(A) L_{eq} = A$	-weighted decibels equivalent noise level				

As shown, construction noise levels are not anticipated to exceed the Federal Transit Administration's recommended threshold of 80 dB(A) Lea. Noise levels at the adjacent existing residential uses would be less than 60 dB(A) Leg. Construction activities would only occur during the times allowable by the Code of Ordinances (6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. during the months of June through September, and between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. during the months of October through May). Although the existing nearby residences would be exposed to construction noise levels that could be heard above ambient conditions, the exposure would be temporary and would only occur during the daytime hours. Therefore, construction noise would not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of limits established in the Code of Ordinances, and impacts would be less than significant.

Traffic Noise

On-site Noise Compatibility

The project site is exposed to vehicle traffic noise from I-15 and Temescal Canvon Road. The County's General Plan Noise Element specifies the maximum allowable exterior noise levels for new developments impacted by transportation noise sources. Industrial and manufacturing uses are "clearly compatible" with noise levels up to 75 community noise equivalent level (CNEL), "normally compatible" with noise levels from 70 to 80 CNEL, and "clearly incompatible" with noise levels above 75 CNEL. There are no land use compatibility standards for fast food restaurants since these are not noise sensitive land uses. Vehicle traffic noise level contours across the project site were calculated using SoundPLAN. These noise contours and modeled receiver locations are shown in Figure 12. The results are summarized in Table 8. As shown, on-site vehicle traffic noise levels would be 70 CNEL or less and

Potentiall Significar Impact	y Less than t Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

would be considered "clearly compatible." Therefore, on-site vehicle traffic noise levels would be **less** than significant.

Table 8 On-site Traffic Noise Levels					
Receiver Location Vehicle Traffic Noise Level					
1	Coffee Shop	70			
2	Fast Casual Restaurant	65			
3	Fast Food Restaurant	69			
4	Industrial/Manufacturing Building	68			
5	Industrial/Manufacturing Building	69			
6	Industrial/Manufacturing Building	70			
CNEL = com	CNEL = community noise equivalent level				

Off-site Vehicle Traffic Noise

The project would increase traffic volumes on local roadways. However, the project would not substantially alter the vehicle classifications mix on local or regional roadways, nor would the project alter the speed on an existing roadway or create a new roadway. Thus, the primary factor affecting offsite noise levels would be increased traffic volumes. In general, the more a new noise exceeds the previously existing ambient noise level, the less acceptable the new noise will typically be judged. The Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) developed guidance to be used for the assessment of project-generated increases in noise levels that consider the ambient noise level. The FICON guidance provides an established source of criteria to assess the impacts of substantial temporary or permanent increase in baseline ambient noise levels. Based on the FICON criteria, the amount to which a given noise level increase is considered acceptable is reduced when the without project (baseline) noise levels are already shown to exceed certain land-use specific exterior noise level criteria. The specific levels are based on typical responses to noise level increases of 5 dB(A) or readily perceptible, 3 dB(A) or barely perceptible, and 1.5 dB(A) depending on the underlying without project noise levels for noise-sensitive uses. These levels of increases and their perceived acceptance are consistent with guidance provided by both the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the California Department of Transportation.

Based on this guidance, long-term traffic noise that affects sensitive land uses would be considered substantial and constitute a significant noise impact if the project would:

- Increase noise levels by 5 dB or more where the no project noise level is less than 60 CNEL;
- Increase noise levels by 3 dB or more where the no project noise level is 60 CNEL to 65 CNEL; or
- Increase noise levels by 1.5 dB or more where the no project noise level is greater than 65 CNEL.

Temescal Canyon Road volumes without and with the project were calculated as part of the traffic impact analysis prepared for the project. The existing noise level at 50 feet from Temescal Canyon Road exceeds 70 CNEL, therefore, a significant ambient noise increase would occur if the project results in an increase of 1.5 dB or more. As calculated using the FHWA RD-77-108 traffic noise prediction model, the project-related increase in traffic volumes would result in a noise level increase of 0.5 dB over the existing condition (Appendix N). This would not be an audible change in noise levels. Therefore, operational roadway noise would not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels for off-site noise sensitive land uses, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

Operational Noise

On-site Generated Noise

The primary noise sources on-site would be heating, ventilation, and air conditioning and ventilation (HVAC) equipment, trucks accessing the project site, loading docks located on the north side of the proposed building, and drive-through speakers. Noise levels due to these sources were modeled to determine if they have the potential to produce noise in excess of County limits established in the Code of Ordinances. Modeled noise levels are summarized in Table 9 and are discussed in detail in Appendix N.

Table 9						
Modeled Noise Levels for On-site Operational Sources						
Modeled Noise Level [dB(A) L _{pw}]						
Noise Source	Daytime	Nighttime				
Manufacturing Building Ventilation	08.8	05.8				
(180,000 ground floor square feet)	90:0	95.0				
Manufacturing Building Office 1 HVAC	88.2	85.2				
(8,000 square feet)	00.2	05.2				
Manufacturing Building Office 2 HVAC	82.0	70.0				
(3,000 square feet)	02.0	19.0				
Restaurant 1 HVAC	90.6	87.6				
(5,000 square feet)	90:0	01.0				
Restaurant 2 HVAC	88.2	85.2				
(2,900 square feet)	00.2	05.2				
Restaurant 3 HVAC	85.0	82.0				
(2,500 square feet)	85:0	02.0				
Loading Dock	81.3					
Truck Arrival/Departure	89.4					
Drive-Through Speakers	75.9	71.9				
SOURCE: Appendix N						

dB(A) L_{pw}= A-weighted decibels sound power level; HVAC = heating, ventilation, and air conditioning

As calculated in this analysis, operational noise levels are not anticipated to exceed the applicable limits as specified in Section 9.52.030 of the Code of Ordinances.

Noise levels were modeled at a series of 23 receivers located at the adjacent uses. Modeled receivers and daytime and nighttime operational noise contours are shown in Figures 12 and 13, respectively. Future projected noise levels are summarized in Table 10.



------ 50 dB(A) L_{eq} ------ 55 dB(A) L_{eq} ------ 60 dB(A) L_{eq}

FIGURE 12 Daytime Operational Noise Contours

RECON M:\UOBS5\8622\common_gis\CEQA_Initial_Study\fig12_CEQA.mxd 07/18/2024 bma

Loading Dock

Trucks

 \diamond

Buildings



----- 50 dB(A) L_{eq}

----- 55 dB(A) L_{eq}

----- 60 dB(A) L_{eq}

FIGURE 13 Nighttime Operational Noise Contours

RECON M:\/JOBS5\8622\common_gis\CEQA_Initial_Study\fig13_CEQA.mxd 07/18/2024 bma

Buildings

Potentially	L
Significant	S
Impact	
	Ν

ess than Significant Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

No Impact

Less

Than

Impact

Table 10						
Operational Noise Levels at Adjacent Property Lines						
[dB(A) L _{eq}]						
		Applicable Limit	Operational Noise Level			
Receiver	Land Use	Daytime/Nighttime	Daytime/Nighttime			
1	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	55/45	47/41			
2	Undeveloped/Tourist Commercial	55/45	47/38			
3	Undeveloped/Tourist Commercial	55/45	45/40			
4	Retail Commercial	65/55	44/41			
5	Retail Commercial	65/55	43/40			
6	Undeveloped/Tourist Commercial	65/55	45/41			
7	Undeveloped/Tourist Commercial	65/55	43/33			
8	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	55/45	52/39			
9	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	55/45	45/33			
10	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	55/45	40/35			
11	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	55/45	38/34			
12	Estate Density Residential	55/45	37/33			
13	Estate Density Residential	55/45	29/26			
14	Estate Density Residential	55/45	32/28			
15	Estate Density Residential	55/45	33/39			
16	Estate Density Residential	55/45	34/30			
17	Estate Density Residential	55/45	34/31			
18	Estate Density Residential	55/45	36/32			
19	Estate Density Residential	55/45	38/35			
20	Estate Density Residential	55/45	40/36			
21	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	55/45	39/35			
22	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	55/45	42/38			
23	Undeveloped/Estate Density Residential	55/45	41/37			
SOURCE:	Appendix N					
dB(A) L _{eq} =	A-weighted decibels equivalent noise level					

As shown in Table 10, operational noise levels would not exceed the applicable limits as specified in Section 9.52.030 of the County's Code of Ordinances. Therefore, operational noise would not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels, and impacts would be less than significant.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

Per the Noise Analysis (see Appendix N), the nearest sensitive receptors are the residential uses located as close as 25 feet from the western and southern boundaries of the off-site soils stockpile area. Construction equipment could include equipment such as loaded trucks, excavators, dozers, and loaders. Vibration levels from these pieces of equipment would generate vibration levels with a peak particle velocity (PPV) ranging from 0.035 to 0.089 inch per second PPV at 25 feet. Therefore, vibration levels are not anticipated to exceed 0.2 inch per second PPV and construction vibration impacts would be less than significant. Once operational, the project would not include the use of any stationary

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

equipment that would generate substantial vibration levels. All trucks generated by the project would travel along County roadways that are regularly maintained to prevent discontinuous pavement (e.g., potholes). The portion of Street A west of Street B would also only be accessible for emergency vehicular access and would not allow vehicles and commercial trucks to travel from Temescal Canyon Road to through to Lawson Road using Street A, therefore reducing the potential for noise impacts to the residential communities west of the project site. As such and based on guidance from the California Department of Transportation, the project's impacts related to operational traffic-related excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES:		
 28. Paleontological Resources a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleonto- logical resource, site, or unique geologic feature? 	\boxtimes	

Source(s): General Plan Open Space Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity" (County of Riverside 2015a), Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix H), County of Riverside Map My County v11.5 Report for APNs 283-180-002, 283-180-020, 283-180-021 (County of Riverside January 2024), Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology [SVP] 2010)

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

The project site is located on a geologic formation with high paleontological sensitivity according to the County's Map My County report and the Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 for the site (County of Riverside 2015). Per the Geotechnical Investigation (see Appendix H), the project site is underlain by artificial fill and old alluvial fan deposits (Qof) of middle to late Pleistocene Age. The Silverado formation was also encountered at some boring locations at a depth of approximately 35 feet.

Due to the likelihood of late Pleistocene sediments at depth, the project has the potential to impact buried paleontological resources during ground-disturbing construction activities for the installation of utilities. As such, prior to initiation of construction activities, a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program must be prepared to outline requirements for monitoring locations, procedures, reporting, and collection management, implemented through mitigation measure **PALEO-1**. Excavations greater than 10 feet below the original ground surface must be monitored by a qualified paleontological monitor, as outlined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP 2010) and detailed in mitigation measure **PALEO-2**. In addition, implementation of mitigation measure **PALEO-3** requires all construction workers to attend a worker environmental awareness program prior to initiation of construction activities. Implementation of mitigation measures **PALEO-1** through **PALEO-3** would reduce impacts to a level **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

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

Mitigation:

PALEO-1 Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a project-specific plan for monitoring site grading/earthmoving activities shall be prepared and implemented by a qualified paleontologist approved by the County (project paleontologist). The project paleontologist shall review the approved development plan and grading plan and conduct any pre-construction work necessary to render appropriate monitoring and mitigation requirements as appropriate and document these requirements in a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) to reduce any potential impacts to significant paleontological resources. The PRIMP shall outline where monitoring is required within the project site based on construction plans and/or geotechnical reports, procedures for adequate paleontological monitoring (below a depth of 10 feet below the original ground surface) and discoveries treatment, and paleontological methods, reporting, and collections management. This PRIMP shall be submitted to the County Geologist for approval prior to issuance of a Grading Permit. Information to be contained in the PRIMP, at a minimum and in addition to other industry standards and Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards, are as follows:

- a. A corresponding and active County Grading Permit (BGR) Number must be included in the title of the report. PRIMP reports submitted without a BGR number in the title will not be reviewed.
- b. PRIMP must be accompanied by the final grading plan for the subject project.
- c. Description of the proposed site and planned grading operations.
- d. Description of the level of monitoring required for all earth-moving activities in the project area.
- e. Identification and qualifications of the qualified paleontological monitor to be employed for grading operations monitoring.
- f. Identification of personnel with authority and responsibility to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for recovery of large specimens.
- g. Direction for any fossil discoveries to be immediately reported to the property owner who in turn will immediately notify the County Geologist of the discovery.
- h. Means and methods to be employed by the paleontological monitor to quickly salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays.
- i. Sampling of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates.
- j. Procedures and protocol for collecting and processing of samples and specimens.
- k. Fossil identification and curation procedures to be employed.
- I. Identification of the permanent repository to receive any recovered fossil material. *Pursuant the County "SABER Policy", paleontological fossils found in the County should, by preference, be directed to the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet. A written agreement between the property owner/developer and the repository must be in place prior to site grading.
- m. All pertinent exhibits, maps, and references.
- n. Procedures for reporting of findings.
- o. Identification and acknowledgement of the developer for the content of the PRIMP as well as acceptance of financial responsibility for monitoring, reporting and curation fees. The property owner and/or applicant on whose land the paleontological fossils are discovered shall provide appropriate funding for monitoring, reporting, delivery and curating the fossils at the institution

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

where the fossils will be placed and will provide confirmation to the County that such funding has been paid to the institution.

p. All reports shall be signed by the project paleontologist and all other professionals responsible for the report's content (e.g., PG), as appropriate. One signed digital copy of the report(s) shall be submitted by email to the County Geologist (dwalsh@rivco.org) along with a copy of this condition and the grading plan for appropriate case processing and tracking. These documents should not be submitted to the project Planner, Plan Check staff, Land Use Counter or any other County office. In addition, the applicant shall submit proof of hiring (i.e., copy of executed contract, retainer agreement, etc.) a project paleontologist for the in-grading implementation of the PRIMP.

PALEO-2 Paleontological Monitoring. If excavations below a depth of 10 feet below the original ground surface (i.e., 10 feet below the depth of documented artificial fill) are planned for the project, a qualified paleontologist or a qualified paleontological monitor meeting the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards must be present to monitor the excavations for paleontological resources. The qualified paleontologist shall determine if the sediments are old enough and fine-grained enough to warrant continued monitoring. If the qualified paleontologist determines paleontological monitoring is not necessary at the 10-foot depth due to subsurface geological conditions, then paleontological spotchecking shall occur at 5-foot increments below 10 feet to determine the suitability for fossil preservation. The qualified paleontologist must produce a final paleontological monitoring report that discusses the paleontological monitoring program, any paleontological discoveries, and the preparation, curation, and accessioning of any fossils into a suitable paleontological repository.

PALEO-3 Worker Environmental Awareness Program. Prior to construction-related excavations, a qualified paleontologist meeting the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP 2010) standards should be retained, attend the pre-construction meeting, and present a worker environmental awareness program (WEAP) to the construction crew. The WEAP should discuss the types of fossils that may potentially be uncovered during project excavations, regulations protecting paleontological resources, and appropriate actions to be taken when fossils are discovered.

<u>Monitoring</u>: Paleontological monitoring is required for ground disturbance greater than 10 feet below the original ground surface, as detailed in **PALEO-2**.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:		
29. Housing a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?		
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?		\boxtimes
c) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?		

Source(s): County of Riverside Map My County v11.5 Report for APNs 283-180-002, 283-180-020, 283-180-021 (County of 2024), County of Riverside General Plan 2021-2029 Housing Element Appendix P Housing Background Report (County of Riverside 2021c)

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

a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

The project would not directly induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area through the development of housing as the project proposes a light industrial building and three retail/drive-through structures. It is noted that the project would extend Street A to connect to Lawson Road and would construct Street B, providing new access to the area. This would potentially facilitate new development in the area as the surrounding parcels are currently vacant. However, it would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area as the vacant adjacent parcels are zoned residential (R-A-2 ½ and R-A-5) (County of Riverside 2024). Growth in these areas therefore are anticipated based on the adopted zoning, and unplanned substantial population growth would not be induced by the project. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth, directly or indirectly, and impacts would be **less than significant.**

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The project site is configured with an existing industrial factory and does not possess any residential structures. Therefore, the project would not displace any existing people or housing. **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

<u>Mitigation</u>: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

c) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?

The project would construct new commercial structures that would necessitate employees for construction and operations. For purposes of analysis, employment estimates were calculated using the County General Plan Housing Element Appendix E-2 Socioeconomic Build-out Assumptions and Methodology (County of Riverside 2021c). The General Plan estimated that Light Industrial (LI) businesses would employ one worker for every 1,030 SF of building area (188,000 SF \div 1,030 SF = 183). For commercial retail businesses would employ one worker for every 500 SF of building area (10,400 SF \div 500 SF = 21). Based on this employment generation rate, the project is expected to create approximately 204 new recurring jobs. According to the County's 2021-2029 Housing Element, unincorporated county overall. Additionally, the western unincorporated communities, of which the project site is located within, account for 73 percent of the housing units, 78 percent of the households, and 84 percent of the employed population of the unincorporated County. The anticipated jobs

Detentially	Loop then	1 000	No
Potentially	Less than	Less	INO
Significant	Significant	Than	Impact
Impact	with	Significant	
	Mitigation	Impact	
	Incorporated		

generated as part of the construction and operational phases of the project could be filled from the local area, as the Riverside County contains an ample supply of potential employees. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the labor demand caused by the project would result in the addition of residents within Riverside County or surrounding jurisdictions or trigger the need for affordable housing. Therefore, the project would not create demand for additional housing. **No impact** would occur

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

 30. Fire Services

30.	Fire Services	

Source(s): Fire Protection Plan (Appendix O)

According to the Fire Protection Plan (see Appendix O), the County Fire Department has adequate emergency response equipment to protect the project site. Station 64 at 25310 Campbell Road would be the closest resource. A second County Fire Resource is located at 20320 Temescal Canyon Road; however, it is eight minutes out. U.S. Forest Service Temescal Fire Station south of site it is a dedicated wildland fire station. Therefore, the project would be adequately served by existing fire facilities and would not result in the provision of fire facilities; therefore, there would be **no impacts** associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire facilities. In addition, the project applicant would be required to comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 (the County Development Impact Fee [DIF]), which requires a fee payment by developers for the funding of public facilities, including fire protection facilities. This fee payment would contribute to the development of future facilities needed in the County. The project would also maintain a Fire Protection Plan (Appendix O), which is consistent with General Plan Safety Element Policy S 6.4 which encourages private businesses to be self-sufficient in an emergency through maintenance of a fire control plan.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

31.	Sheriff Services		\boxtimes

Source(s): County of Riverside General Plan Safety Element (County of Riverside 2021b)

The project proposes the replacement of an existing commercial/industrial site with new light industrial and commercial uses and would not result in a significant increased need for sheriff services in a way

Potent Signific Impa	tially icant act	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		Incorporated		

that would result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. In addition, the project would comply with the existing regulatory policies and General Plan policies that would further reduce any potential impacts to law enforcement services associated with the project. This includes Policy S 6.15 which ensures that the project permit and review process reduces hazard impacts through the use of development standards, designs, and construction practices reduce risk. Therefore, there would not be a need for new or expanded sheriff facilities, and **no impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

32.	Schools				\boxtimes
-----	---------	--	--	--	-------------

The project does not propose residential uses, and therefore would not result in the generation of new students that would directly impact existing school demand which would potentially necessitate new or expanded school facilities. Development of the light-industrial/commercial building in Phase 1 and retail/commercial structures under Phase 2 would not create a direct demand for public school services, nor would it indirectly draw a substantial number of students to the area. The developments would serve the existing community and future employees of the development would primarily consist of existing County residents.

In addition, although the project would not directly create a demand for additional public school services, the Project Applicant would still be required to contribute fees to the Corona-Norco Unified School District (CNUSD) in compliance with SB 50 (Greene), California Government Code Sections 65995.5 to 65998, which allows school districts to collect fees from new developments to offset the costs associated with increasing school capacity needs. The payment of school mitigation impact fees authorized by SB 50 is deemed to provide "full and complete mitigation of impacts" on school facilities from the development of real property (California Government Code § 65995). Per the CNUSD Developer Fee Justification Study (Corona-Norco Unified School District 2024), commercial/industrial developments would be required to pay fees based on the number of employees required prior to issuance of a certificate of compliance from the CNUSD. Therefore, there would not be a need for new or expanded school facilities, and **no impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

33.	Libraries		\boxtimes

The project does not propose residential uses, and therefore would not result in new residents that would increase the demand on existing libraries in a way that would result in the need for new or expanded library facilities. Therefore, there would not be a need for new or expanded library facilities, and **no impact** would occur. The project applicant would be required to comply with the County's DIF Ordinance (Riverside County Ordinance No. 659), which requires a fee payment by developers for the

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
funding of future public facilities, including public lik any potential impacts to library facilities.	braries and other publi	ic facilities. 1	⊺his would	offset
Findings of Fact: No Impact				

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

34.	Health Services		\boxtimes

The project does not propose residential uses and therefore would not induce growth in the area that would result in the need for new or expanded health service facilities. Therefore, there would not be a need for new or expanded health service facilities, and there would be **no impacts** related to construction of health service facilities. In addition, the project applicant would be required to comply with the County's DIF Ordinance (Riverside County Ordinance No. 659), which requires a fee payment by developers for the funding of future public facilities, including public health facilities.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

RECREATION Would the project:		
35. Parks and Recreation a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?		
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?		\boxtimes
c) Be located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?		\boxtimes

Source(s): Riverside County Center for Demographics County Service Area 143 Map (Riverside County Center for Demographics 2020) https://rivcoed.org/sites/g/files/aldnop126/files/2023-02/CSA%20134.pdf, Correspondence with County of Riverside via Email between Gaby Adame and Mark Freed (2023), Riverside County Ordinance. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications)

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

A segment of the historic trial shown on the east side of Temescal Canyon Road continuing under the I-15 to access the Tanning Vat Historic Monument on east side of Temescal Canyon Road is used as a driving route and bicycle route. The project does not propose any housing and would not induce growth that would increase demand for parks. Therefore, the project would not increase the use of

Potential Significa Impact	y Less than t Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of a recreational facility would occur or be accelerated. **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The project does not include any proposed recreational facilities. The project does not propose any housing and would not induce growth that would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. In addition, the park dedication and park fee requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, Section 10.35 (Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications) only applies to residential subdivisions. Therefore, the project is not subject to a recreational CSA or payment of Quimby Fees. **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

c) Be located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?

According to the Riverside County Center for Demographics County Service Area 143 Map (Riverside County Center for Demographics 2020), the project site is not located within a CSA or a recreation and park district subject to Quimby fees. **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

36. Recreational Trails		\boxtimes	
a) Include the construction or expansion of a trail			
system?			

Source(s): County of Riverside General Plan Circulation Element Figure C-6 Trails and Bikeway System (County of Riverside 2020a)

a) Include the construction or expansion of a trail system?

The General Plan identifies a Historic Trail along the project area within the right-of-way (County of Riverside 2020). However, the project does not propose the expansion of this trail. The proposed

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

roadway would not impact this trail as it is located offsite or access to the existing trail. Therefore, there are **less than significant** impacts related to recreational trails.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

TRANSPORTATION Would the project:			
37. Transportation		\boxtimes	
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy			
addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway,			
bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?			
 b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines 		\square	
section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			
 c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric 		\square	
design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous			
intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?			
d) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered		\square	
maintenance of roads?			
e) Cause an effect upon circulation during the pro-		\square	
ject's construction?			
f) Result in inadequate emergency access or access			
to nearby uses?			

Source(s): Traffic Impact Analysis (see Appendix C), Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis (Appendix P)

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

In conformance with County requirements, the countywide minimum level of service (LOS) and impact criteria is LOS "D" per the General Plan Circulation Element Policy. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) (see Appendix C) was prepared for the project that assessed project consistency with these regulations through addressing LOS impacts. The results of the TIA indicated that two (2) of the seven (7) key study intersection are forecasted to operate at an adverse level of service during the AM and/or PM peak hours when compared to the target LOS of "D". For the intersections where future traffic volumes are expected to result in poor operating conditions, the TIA recommends improvements, which change the geometry to increase capacity. The TIA recommends the widening and restriping of the south leg of the Temescal Canyon Road/Lawson Road intersection to provide a second northbound through lane and the widening and restriping of the north leg of the intersection to provide a second northbound departure lane. In addition, the TIA proposes the installation of a traffic signal and a protected left-turn on Maitri Road at Temescal Canyon Road. The proposed improvements are expected to address deficient LOS to an acceptable level.

The project would construct the sidewalk along the project frontage on Temescal Canyon Road (i.e. the west side of Temescal Canyon Road). The project would also construct crosswalks at the proposed signalized intersection at Street A/Temescal Canyon Road. The nearest transit stop operated by the

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

Riverside Transit Agency is located across Temescal Canyon Road at Tom's Farm. The project proposes a signalized intersection with a crosswalk at Street A and Temescal Canyon Road to allow for adequate pedestrian access to this transit stop. In addition, bicycle circulation would be provided via adjacent roadways and sidewalks, accordingly. Therefore, the TIA found that all the adjacent roadways on an overall basis are adequate for pedestrians, bicycles, and public transit users with construction of the on-site circulation layout of the project and the addition of project-specific improvements. Therefore, the project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, and impacts would be **less than significant.**

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

A Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis (see Appendix P) was prepared for the project that is consistent with the County of Riverside Transportation Analysis Guidelines for Level of Service, Vehicle Miles Traveled (2020b), which provides additional detail on the language and analysis procedures utilized in this analysis. The project was evaluated against the various screening methods outlined in the guidelines to determine whether the project will screen out, either in its entirety or partially based on individual land uses. As noted in the VMT analysis (see Appendix P), the three retail/commercial structures (totaling approximately 10,400 SF) of the project can be screened out based on the "Retail buildings with area less than or equal to 60,000 SF" criteria. In addition, the 188,000 SF commercial building can be screened out based on the "Project GHG emissions less than 3,000 Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (MT CO₂E)" criteria consistent with the GHG Analysis Report (see Appendix J). As shown in Table 6, the commercial building project GHG emissions total 2,820 MT CO₂E, which is below the 3,000 MT CO₂E threshold under this screening criteria and would not require a VMT analysis. Therefore, as the project can be screened out via the "Small Projects Screening" criteria, impacts related to VMT would be **less than significant.**

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Internal circulation and the new proposed roadways would be designed consistent with the County's roadway standards. The County Transportation Department reviewed the project's Plot Plan application materials and determined that no hazardous transportation design features would be introduced by the project. All improvements planned as part of the project would be in conformance with applicable County roadway standards and would not result in any hazards due to a design feature. Therefore, impacts would be considered **less than significant**.

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

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The project proposes to construct public Street A and private Street B. These new roadways would require routine, intermittent maintenance; however, maintenance of public streets along the project's frontage to Temescal Canyon Road would not result in any significant impacts to the environment. The project would contribute traffic to off-site public roadways; however, public roads require periodic maintenance as part of their inherent operational activities, and such maintenance would not result in substantial impacts to the environment. Public roadway maintenance would be funded through the project proponent and the project site owner(s) future payment of property taxes. Maintenance of roads would not result in any new impacts to the environment beyond that which is already disclosed and mitigated by this Initial Study. Therefore, the project would not cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

e) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?

During the construction phase of the project, traffic to and from the project site would be generated by activities such as construction employee trips, delivery of construction materials, and use of heavy equipment. Vehicular traffic associated with construction employees would be substantially less than daily and peak hour traffic volumes generated during project operational activities, especially because construction activities typically begin and end outside of the peak hour; therefore, a majority of the construction employees would not be driving to or from the project site during hours of peak congestion. Traffic volumes from construction workers is not expected to result in a substantial adverse effect to the local roadway system because most trips would occur during non-peak hours. Deliveries of construction materials to the project site would also have a nominal effect to the local roadway network because most trips would occur during non-peak hours. Construction materials would be delivered to the project site throughout the construction phase based on need and would not occur on an everyday basis. Heavy equipment would be utilized on the project site during the construction phase. Because most heavy equipment is not authorized to be driven on public roadways, most equipment would be delivered and removed from the site via flatbed trucks. As with the delivery of construction materials, the delivery of heavy equipment to the project site would not occur on a daily basis but would occur periodically throughout the construction phase on need. Temescal Canyon Road and Lawson Road would remain open with no reasonably foreseeable lane closures. Therefore, project construction would not cause an effect upon circulation, and impacts would be less than significant.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The project includes the construction of an emergency access only segment of Street A west of Street B connecting to Lawson Road and would provide secondary emergency access to the project site via ingress/egresses along Street A. All improvements planned as part of the project would be in conformance with applicable County roadway standards and would not result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, impacts would be considered **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

38. Bike Trails		\boxtimes
a) Include the construction or expansion of a bike		
system or bike lanes?		

a) Include the construction or expansion of a bike system or bike lanes?

The project does not propose the construction of bike lanes nor expansion of the bike system. **No impact** would occur.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

39. Tribal Cultural Resources a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k)?		
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? (In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)		

Page 94 of 122

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

Source(s): Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Temescal Commercial Project (see Appendix E)

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

As noted under the discussion of Cultural Resources in the analysis under "8. Historic Resources" above, the records search results from California Historical Resources Information System, Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California, Riverside, prepared for the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment (see Appendix E) did not identify historic structures or sites on the project site or within one mile of the project site. It was noted that a segment of the historic alignment of the Butterfield Overland Stage route within the right-of-way of Temescal Canyon Road that abuts the eastern boundary of the project site. However, neither of these are significant to a Native American tribe and therefore, there would be **no impact** related to a listed historic resource with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? (In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)

In compliance with SB 18, the County requested a Sacred Lands File search and a consultation list from the Native American Heritage Commission of tribes whose historical extent includes the project area. A response from Native American Heritage Commission was returned with a positive search (see Appendix E).

Tribal scoping letters were sent via email or a hard copy letter on December 8, 2023, to the Tribal list provided by the Native American Heritage Commission (see Appendix E). Four responses have been received to date and is summarized as follows. On December 8, 2023, Lorrie Gregory from the Cahuilla Band of Indians stated in part that the Tribe has no known knowledge of cultural resources within the project area; however, they requested that any cultural materials associated with the project be sent for their review and that Tribal monitors be present during ground disturbing activities. Also on December 8, 2023, Christina Conley from the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California requested their comment be diverted to the Gabrielino Tongva Nation led by Sandonne Goad. On December 11, 2023, Anthony Madrigal, the Tribal Cultural Historic Preservation Officer for the Cahuilla Band of Indians, indicated that the Cahuilla would desire to consult on the project, be kept up to date on any new developments, and participate in monitoring once construction begins. On December 13, 2023, Jacobia Kirksey, a Tribal Operations Specialist with the Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians, indicated that the Tribe is unaware of any specific cultural resources that may be affected by the project but would like their office to be notified of any discoveries made during development of the project. One mailed hard copy letter has been returned to the RECON office as undeliverable. The mailed hard copy letter to Sam Dunlap, the cultural resources director for the Gabrielino/Tongva Nation, was returned on December 15, 2023, with an unable to forward note. A sample of the Tribal Scoping Letter along with these responses are found in Attachment 2.

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

In addition, based on the list provided by Native American Heritage Commission, project notices were sent on January 11, 2024, and February 13, 2024, to 21 Native American Tribal representatives. SB 18 consultations were requested by the Pechanga and Soboba tribes. Other tribes declined to consult, deferred consultation to another tribe, or did not respond to the consultation request. In compliance with AB 52, notices regarding this project were mailed to all requesting tribes on January 11, 2024. Other tribes declined to consult, deferred consultation to another tribe, or did not respond to the consultation request. In compliance with AB 52, notices regarding this project were mailed to all requesting tribes on January 11, 2024. Other tribes declined to consult, deferred consultation to another tribe, or did not respond to the consultation request. Consultations were requested by the Rincon, Soboba and Pechanga tribes. At the time of this writing, tribal consultation is still being conducted and will be concluded prior to project approval. Although no known tribal cultural resources are present on the site, the potential for discovery during ground disturbance remains.

It is anticipated that typical County Conditions/Mitigation would be required–Project Archaeologist, Monitoring Plan, and a Tribal Monitoring Agreement would be required.

As noted under the cultural resources analysis above, the project would also be required to adhere to multiple conditions of approval related to unanticipated cultural resources, monitoring, and State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. This is state law and a standard condition of approval and is not considered a mitigation measure for the purposes of this project.

With implementation of the conditions of approval detailed in the cultural section and reasserted in this section, impacts would be reduced to a level **less than significant.**

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

<u>Monitoring</u>: Construction monitoring by Archaeological Monitor(s) and Native American Monitor(s) during all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of soils in each portion of the project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading, and trenching.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:			
40. Water			
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction			
of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm			
water drainage systems, whereby the construction or			
relocation would cause significant environmental effects?			
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve		\square	
the project and reasonably foreseeable future development			
during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?			

Source(s): 2023 Development Services Department and Facility Guidelines (Eastern Water Management District [EMWD] 2023), 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (Eastern Water Management District 2021), Water and Sewer Availability for APN 283-180-002 and 283-180-020 (Appendix Q), Preliminary Water Demand Memo (Appendix R)

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage systems, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?

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

The project would propose new water lines, recycled water lines, storm water drainage systems, and sewer lines on-site and within the roadway footprint of Street A and Street B to connect with existing infrastructure (Figure 14). The project would also connect to water lines within Temescal Canyon Road. In response to the Sewer Area Study completed for the project, TVWD has provided Will Serve letters stating that TVWD is willing to provide water and sewer services to the project (see Appendix Q). These utility improvements and connections would be located within the footprint of the project that has been evaluated throughout this Initial Study. Therefore, impacts associated with the construction of new water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage systems, would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?

TVWD provides imported water to its potable customers and local non-potable groundwater and recycled water to its non-potable customers. Potable water is supplied through Western Municipal Water District (Western) who purchases State Water Project water from Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan). Local non-potable groundwater is extracted from the Bedford-Coldwater subbasin and provided directly to customers for non-potable uses such as irrigation. TVWD also produces tertiary-treated recycled water at the Temescal Valley Water Reclamation Facility and provides it directly to customers for non-potable uses. The project would utilize potable and recycled water for the operations of the commercial businesses on-site, including the operation of interior plumbing devices (e.g., sinks, toilets, faucets) as well as outdoor landscape irrigation. During construction, water demand would be negligible and used for the application of water for site compaction and dust control purposes, consistent with SCAQMD regulations. TVWD has approved recycled water for landscape irrigation (parks/playgrounds, golf courses, residential landscaping, commercial/industrial landscaping, freeway landscaping, open space/median strips), agricultural irrigation, construction dust control/compaction, industrial uses, commercial car washes, commercial laundries, fountains/water features, and sewer flushing/street sweeping uses. TVWD primarily projects recycled water to be used for irrigation or percolated into the ground, with minimal recycled water used for construction (approximately 4 acre-feet). To determine the potential water usage of the project, the Eastern Water Management District's 2023 Development Services Department and Facility Guidelines was consulted. According to those guidelines, light industrial land uses and commercial land uses have an average of 500 gallons per day (gpd) per acre and 2,200 gpd per acre water demand, respectively (Eastern Water Management District 2023). According to the 2021 Urban Water Management Plan (TVWD 2021). TVWD forecasts for projected water demand are based on the population projections of the California Department of Water Resources, Population Tool for 2020. The California Department of Water Resources has developed this Geographic Information Systems based tool to estimate the population within a water agency's service area using census data and number of water service connections. TVWD anticipates that sufficient imported supplies would be available, even in dry years, based on both Western and Metropolitan Urban Water Management Plans through 2025. In addition, both Western and Metropolitan anticipate meeting customer demands through 2025, including in a 5-year drought. TVWD also does not expect any reliability concerns within its non-potable and recycled water systems.



FIGURE 14 Utilities Plan

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

Recycled water is considered a drought-proof supply, as it is generated from indoor water uses. Local groundwater from the Bedford-Coldwater Subbasin is considered reliable because TVWD's extractions are relatively small, the groundwater basin provides storage capacity, and the Bedford-Coldwater Groundwater Sustainability Authority (of which TVMD is a part) efforts would be designed to maintain sustainability into the future. As TVWD approaches buildout, it is anticipated that additional recycled water would be used, and non-potable groundwater use may be reduced. It is noted that the Urban Water Management Plan projected water demands through the planning period of 2025, but also made the assumption that full buildout of the service area would be completed by 2030. Therefore, the TVWD anticipated that demand would be constant after this year and there would be sufficient supplies available to meet demands.

As part of the assessment for the Preliminary Water Demand Memo for the project (see Appendix R), the max daily flow water demand for the project was calculated to be 32.81 gpd for 10.8 acres of the proposed light industrial lot and approximately 10 gpd for the commercial for a total of approximately 42.81 gallons per minute max daily flow for the project. As the Maximum Daily Demand is specified as 1.75 times the Average Daily Demand, it can be reasonably assumed that the project would not exceed the average of 500 gallons per day gpd per acre as the project would have an average water demand of 25.5 gpd per acre. Because the project's projected water demand under a light industrial land use designation would be significantly less than the projection for the site's existing commercial land use designation (assuming commercial land use to be equivalent to the commercial tourist land use), TVWD would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements/resources and no new or expanded entitlements are needed.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15155 (a)(1)(c), a Water Supply Analysis is not required for the project because the project does not involve a land use that would house more than 1,000 persons, occupy more than 40 acres of land, or have more than 650,000 SF of floor area. In addition, per the California State Water Quality Resources Control Board AB 1572, use of potable water to irrigate nonfunctional turf is wasteful and incompatible with state policy relating to climate change, water conservation, and reduced reliance on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta ecosystem. The project would rely on non-potable, recycled water for all landscape irrigation, further reducing potable water demands. Therefore, sufficient water supplies are available to serve the project, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

41. Sewer a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?		
b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?		
Page 99 of 122		

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

Source(s): Water and Sewer Availability for APN 283-180-002 and 283-180-020 (see Appendix Q) Sewer Area Study (Appendix S), Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (see Appendix K)

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

The Phase 1 ESA (see Appendix K) identified a septic tank on-site that was formerly used to discharge wastewaters from the maintenance building into the septic system; however, this would be removed as part of the project. The project proposes new gravity sewer lines within the footprint of the proposed Street A and Street B that would connect to the existing TVWD (formerly Lee Lake Water District) 15-inch sewer line in Temescal Canyon Road (see Appendix S). As noted by the water and sewer availability letters from the TVWD (see Appendix Q), the project would be adequately served by the proposed connections to the existing infrastructure. These utility improvements and connections would be located within the footprint of the project that has been evaluated throughout this Initial Study. Therefore, the project would not require the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

As noted in the Sewer Area Study prepared for the project (see Appendix S), there would be adequate capacity from existing sewer systems to support a connection to serve the project. The TVWD issued letters with the intent to serve the project (see Appendix Q). Therefore, adequate wastewater treatment capacity exists to serve the project, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

42. Solid Waste a) Generate solid waste in excess of State or Local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?		
b) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?		
Dage 100 of 122		

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

Source(s): County of Riverside General Plan, Riverside County Waste Management District of the Inland Empire correspondence (November 2023), Mandatory Commercial Recycling (California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery [CalRecycle] 2024a), Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CalRecycle 2024b), SB 1383 Educational and Outreach Resources (CalRecycle 2024c), Mandatory Commercial Organics Recycling (CalRecycle 2024d), El Sobrante (Waste Management, Inc 2024), Solid Waste Information System Facility/Site Activity Details El Sobrante Landfill (33-AA-0217) (CalRecycle 2024e), Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates (CalRecycle 2024f), Estimating 2003 Building-Related Construction and Demolition Materials Amounts (U.S. EPA 2009)

a-b) Generate solid waste in excess of State or Local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?

The project site would be served by Waste Management of the Inland Empire, which would provide commercial waste service (consisting of trash, recycling, and organics) to local landfills. The Waste Management El Sobrante Landfill (SWIS 33-AA-0217) is located approximately 2.2 miles from the project site and would likely be the landfill designated to serve the site. According to Waste Management, this landfill has a capacity to process up to 70,000 tons of waste per week and per the SWIS facility/site activities details database, has a remaining capacity of approximately 3.2 million tons as of 2022 with an anticipated closure date of 2052. Additionally, approximately 1.4 miles south of the project site is the Maitri Road Recycling Inert Debris facility and Recycling yard, which provides an option for private disposal site for construction material recycling.

The project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local agency regulations related to solid waste. Waste Management of the Inland Empire has provided a will-serve letter for the project (Appendix T) and has conditioned the project to comply with the requirements of SB 341 Mandatory Commercial Recycling Law, SB 1826 Mandatory Commercial Organics Recycling, and SB 1383 regulation.

Under SB 341, a business that generates four cubic yards or more of commercial solid waste per week shall arrange for recycling services. Businesses can take one or any combination of the following in order to reuse, recycle, compost, or otherwise divert solid waste from disposal:

- Self-haul.
- Subscribe to a hauler(s).
- Arrange for the pickup of recyclable materials.
- Subscribe to a recycling service that may include mixed waste processing that yields diversion results comparable to source separation.

Under SB 1826, businesses are required to recycle their organic waste on and after April 1, 2016, depending on the amount of waste they generate per week. This law also requires that on and after January 1, 2016, local jurisdictions across the state implement an organic waste recycling program to divert organic waste generated by businesses, including multi-family residential dwellings that consist of five or more units (please note, however, that multifamily dwellings are not required to have a food waste diversion program). Organic waste (also referred to as organics throughout this resource), for the purposes of AB 1826, means food waste, green waste, landscape and pruning waste, nonhazardous wood waste, and food-soiled paper waste that is mixed in with food waste.

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

SB 1383 regulations require that jurisdictions conduct education and outreach on organics recycling to all residents, businesses (including those that generate edible food that can be donated) haulers, solid waste facilities, and local food banks and other food recovery organizations.

Construction

The project would demolish 110,070 SF of existing structures, which would be required to be diverted from the landfill or recycled. According to the U.S. EPA construction generation rate of factor of 4.34 pounds per square foot for non-residential uses, approximately 238.9 tons of waste is expected to be generated during the project's construction phase ([110,070 SF × 4.34 pounds per SF = 477,703.8 pounds] ÷ 2,000 pounds per ton = 238.9 tons). The Construction and Demolition, or C&D, Waste Diversion Program is a Riverside County Program designed to comply with AB 939 and CALGreen, Materials Conservation and Resource Efficiency section. The requirement is intended for applicants (anyone applying for a building permit or a demolition permit within Riverside County) to recycle a minimum of 65 percent of non-hazardous construction materials from the total waste generated from construction. Solid waste that cannot be diverted would likely be taken to the landfills operated by the County. Therefore, the project is estimated to generate approximately 0.32 tons of solid waste per day during construction (238.9 tons x 0.35 percent not diverted from recycling = 83.6 ÷ 260 days of construction = 0.32 tons per day) requiring landfill disposal. Per applicable County requirements, the project applicant would submit a construction waste plan prior to demolition activities to identify the expected material types and locations for recycling of C&D waste resulting from the project, prior to permit issuance. Thus, the County would evaluate the project for compliance with all applicable provisions, including the County Integrated Waste Management Plan, ensuring that any inconsistencies are satisfactorily resolved.

Operational

Once operational, the project would not result in any substantial solid waste disposal needs. Based on a daily waste generation factor of 1.42 pounds of waste per 100 square feet for a manufacturing/warehouse building area obtained from CalRecycle, long-term, on-going operation of the project would generate approximately 1.33 tons of solid waste per day ([1.42 pounds ÷ 100 SF] × 188,000 SF1 ÷ 2,000 pounds = 1.33 tons per day) (CalRecycle 2024f). Based on a daily waste generation factor of 2.5 pounds per 1000 SF per day for operation of the commercial drive through structures obtained from CalRecycle for commercial retail uses, on-going operation commercial drive through businesses would generate approximately 26 tons of solid waste per day ([2.5 pounds ÷ 1000 SF] × 10,400 SF] ÷ 2,000 pounds = 0.013 tons per day) (CalRecycle 2024f). As the site would support an industrial warehouse and retail/commercial drive-through structures, the drive-through businesses would be required to divert organic waste under SB 1826 and recycle solid, nonhazardous wastes under SB 341. The County Department of Waste Resources would provide resources for the project to comply with the County Integrated Waste Management Plan under AB 1826. It can be anticipated that the project would generate up to 1.34 tons per day of waste, which after diversion and recycling per regulations, would reduce this total waste. Pursuant to AB 939, at least 50 percent of the project's solid waste is required to be diverted from landfills, which has been updated to 65 percent per the subsequent CALGreen's construction and demolition diversion ordinance; therefore, the project would generate a maximum of 0.87 tons of solid waste per day requiring landfilling (1.34 tons per day \times 0.65 = 0.87 tons per day). This quantity of waste would not contribute to the exceedance of the remaining capacity of El Sobrante Landfill As described above, the El Sobrante Landfill has adequate landfill capacity to serve the region until approximately 2052 and therefore, the operational waste from the project would not cause the landfill to exceed its maximum permitted capacity. Therefore, the project would not generate

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

solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, and impacts would be less than significant. With submittal of a project specific waste recycling plan to identify the expected material types and locations for recycling of C&D waste resulting from the project, prior to permit issuance and consistency with solid waste diversion regulations, impacts associated with solid waste disposal and regulations would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

43. Utilities

Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?

a) Electricity?		\boxtimes	
b) Natural gas?		\boxtimes	
c) Communications systems?		\boxtimes	
d) Street lighting?		\boxtimes	
e) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?		\boxtimes	
f) Other governmental services?		\boxtimes	

Source(s): Road Standards and Standard Specifications (County of Riverside 2023).

a-f) Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?

a) Electrical

The project site is currently served by existing electrical facilities and electricity is provided by Southern California Edison. The project would provide new connections to existing Southern California Edison electricity infrastructure within the proposed roadways and on-site. These utility installations and connections would be accomplished in conformance with the rules and standards enforced by the applicable service provider. Impacts associated with the construction and installation of electrical infrastructure are an inherent part of the project's construction process, and the environmental effects associated with the project's construction- and operational-related impacts to the maximum feasible extent throughout this Initial Study. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant.**

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

Potential Significar Impact	y Less than t Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

b) Natural Gas

The project site is currently served by existing gas infrastructure which is provided by Southern California Gas. These utility installations and connections would be accomplished in conformance with the rules and standards enforced by the applicable service provider. Impacts associated with the construction and installation of natural gas infrastructure are an inherent part of the project's construction process, and the environmental effects associated with the project's construction phase have been evaluated throughout this initial study. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce construction- and operational-related impacts to the maximum feasible extent throughout this Initial Study. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

c) Communications Systems

The project site is currently served by existing communications infrastructure which is provided by AT&T. These utility installations and connections would be accomplished in conformance with the rules and standards enforced by the applicable service provider. Impacts associated with the construction and installation of communications infrastructure are an inherent part of the project's construction process, and the environmental effects associated with the project's construction phase have been evaluated throughout this initial study. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce construction- and operational-related impacts to the maximum feasible extent throughout this Initial Study. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

<u>Mitigation</u>: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

d) Street Lighting

The project would provide new sources of street lighting on-site as well as along the new roadways. Lighting would be designed in accordance with the County's Road Standards and Standard Specifications (County of Riverside 2023). Impacts associated with the construction and installation of streetscape electrical infrastructure (i.e., lighting) are an inherent part of the project's construction process, and the environmental effects associated with the project's construction phase have been evaluated throughout this initial study. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce construction-and operational-related impacts to the maximum feasible extent throughout this Initial Study. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.
Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

e) Maintenance of Public Facilities (Roads)

The project proposes to construct Street A and Street B as part of the project and would connect to the existing Temescal Canyon Road. The impacts of the construction of these roadways have been assessed throughout this initial study and any necessary mitigation would be implemented to reduce environmental impacts to less than significant. These new roadways would require routine, intermittent maintenance; however, maintenance of public streets along the project's frontage to Temescal Canyon Road would not result in any significant impacts to the environment. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce construction- and operational-related impacts to the maximum feasible extent throughout this Initial Study. Therefore, the construction and maintenance of roadways would not cause significant environmental effects, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

f) Other Governmental Services

As detailed in the Project Description, the project would propose the installation of new water lines, recycled water lines, and sanitary sewer lines within the project's proposed roadways to connect to existing infrastructure within Temescal Canyon Road and Lawson Road. An off-site installation of a new water line within the segment of Lawson Road south of Street A is proposed but would be managed within an existing developed roadway, which would not result in impacts. As detailed under Section e), the impacts related to construction of these roadways, which would include the installation of these utilities, has been assessed throughout this Initial Study and any necessary mitigation would be implemented to reduce environmental impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the installation of utilities within new roadways would not cause significant environmental effects, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: No Impact

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

WILDFIRE If located in or near a State Responsibility Area ("SRA"), lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zone, or other hazardous fire areas that may be designated by the Fire Chief, would the project:

44. Wildfire Impacts a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency		\boxtimes	
response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project		\boxtimes	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				
e) Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?			\boxtimes	

Source(s): County of Riverside General Plan Safety Element Figure 6 "Fire Hazard Severity Zones" (County of Riverside September 2021b), County of Riverside Map My County v11.5 Report for APNs 283-180-002, 283-180-020, 283-180-021 (County of Riverside 2024), Fire Protection Plan (see Appendix O), Emergency Operations Plan for the Riverside County Operational Area (County of Riverside August 2019b)

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The project site is located within a State Responsibility Area moderate/very high fire hazard severity zone (Figure 15). Chapter 49 of the 2022 California Fire Code provides requirements for a Fire Protection Plan in development areas that are within VHFHZs. The Fire Protection Plan (see Appendix O) addresses fire department access, egress, road and address signage, water supply in addition to fuel reduction in accordance with Public Resources Code 4290; the defensible space requirements in accordance with Public Resources Code 4291 or Government Code 51182; and the applicable building codes and standards for wildfire safety. The project would construct two driveways for access to the site, accessible from Street A and Street B to the primary roadway Temescal Canyon Road. Construction of Street A and Street B would incorporate applicable federal and local standards regarding internal road design and circulation, particularly those provisions related to emergency vehicle access. The County Emergency Operations Plan addresses wildfire as one of the most common hazard incidents faced by the Riverside County. In the event of a wildfire emergency requiring evacuation and emergency vehicle access, the Riverside County Sheriff's Department would establish evacuation routes (County of Riverside 2019b). Construction of the project would not result in impacts to the use of the local roadways from the movement of construction vehicles and trucks, including Temescal Canyon Road.

Temporary detours or blockages on local roadways to transport oversized equipment and materials to the site would be managed by a transportation management plan. The County Department of Building and Safety and the County Fire Department enforce fire standards as they review building plans and conduct building inspections. This includes a review for compliance with County Ordinance Number 787, which requires, among other measures, the County to review all future building plans to ensure that every building is positioned in a way that allows adequate access for emergency vehicles. Therefore, the project would not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be **less than significant**.



Very High

FIGURE 15 Fire Hazard Severity Zone

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

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

The project site is generally flat with an increase in elevation to the north, a steeper slope area exists outside the development area to the northwest of the project site. The southern area south of what would be Street A is generally flat sloping away. As noted in the Fire Protection Plan (see Appendix O), various slope areas on the off-site parcels north and south of the project site and the vacant vegetated parcel to the west have been affected by years of drought, with areas of increased dead fuel loading. However, wildfire modeling completed as part of this Fire Protection Plan (see Appendix O) concluded that flame lengths would only minimally impact the project site and would further reduce with development of these sites currently zoned for development. With implementation of the recommendations in the Fire Protection Plan regarding building materials, plant palettes, and fire access requirements, development of the site would not exacerbate wildfire risks in a way that would expose the commercial site to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

The project would remove existing vegetation which would reduce wildfire risks on-site and design the site according to County regulations to reduce the risks of hazardous vegetation. The project would implement safety measures in accordance with the applicable requirements of the California Fire Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Chapter 4, Emergency Planning and Preparedness) which would reduce wildfire risks. Building construction in very high fire hazard severity zone areas are required to comply with the special construction provisions contained in current local, state, and federal applicable codes. Plans must be submitted to the County Office of the Fire Marshal for review and approval prior to building permit issuance. Therefore, the project would not expose people to pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrollable spread of wildfire, and impacts would be **less than significant.**

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

The project would install necessary fire hydrants and 12-inch water lines for fire prevention within the footprint of the site and new roadways. The environmental impacts associated with installation of this infrastructure and construction of these new roadways have been evaluated throughout this initial study as part of the grading and development of the site. Therefore, project infrastructure would not exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment and impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

The site is located on a FEMA FIRM mapped area of minimal flood hazard and existing drainage patterns on the site ultimately discharges sheet flow from the southeast corner to a natural drainage on the northwestern portion of the site or from the easterly area to an existing storm drain in Temescal Canyon Road. To mitigate the increase in flows from the proposed development, two underground detention systems are proposed to detain the increased flows to ensure no significant impacts to the existing downstream drainage facilities. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

e) Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?

Development of the commercial project would increase the number of people and structures exposed to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires as the site is located in a moderate/very high fire hazard severity zone. However, the project would be required to be designed and constructed according to the requirements listed in the 2022 Edition of the Fire and Building Codes, with special adherence to Chapter 7A, and California Code of Regulations Title 14 Fire Safety Regulations with other local amendments/ordnances adopted by the County, which would reduce risks associated with exposing people or structures to wildland fire hazard risks to **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Does the Project:				
45. Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self- sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				

Source(s): All sources are noted in the appropriate threshold as analyzed within this Initial Study.

Implementation of the project would not substantially degrade the guality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory, as detailed throughout this Initial Study. As described under Biological Resources, the project has the potential to impact burrowing owl and sensitive bird species onsite due to the presence of potential suitable habitat. Mitigation has been incorporated to avoid, reduce, and mitigate impacts to these species through pre-construction surveys and measures as needed if these species are discovered during surveys. In addition, the project would implement BMPs to avoid impacts to the ephemeral drainage that traverses the site as it is considered a riverine feature. As described under Cultural Resources, the project has the potential to impact unanticipated subsurface archaeological resources during ground disturbance and/or unanticipated paleontological resources at depth during ground disturbance activities. Mitigation has been incorporated to avoid, reduce, and mitigate for these resources in the event of unanticipated discovery (CR-1 through CR-3 and PALEO-1 through PALEO-3). Therefore, there would be less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

46. Have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects and probable future projects)?		
projects)?		

Source(s): All sources are noted in the appropriate threshold as analyzed within this Initial Study.

As discussed through the analysis of this Initial Study, implementation of the project has the potential to result in effects to the environment that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

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

Aesthetics

The project would increase development on the project site which would change the existing character of the project site. However, the project would be required to comply with the development regulations and design standards contained in the County's Development Code, which would ensure that minimum standards related to visual character and quality are met to preclude adverse aesthetic effects (e.g., size, scale, building materials, lighting). Development review of projects in the County would ensure that standards and regulations related to the protection of visual character and quality are met to preclude adverse aesthetic effects (e.g., size, scale, building materials, lighting) for all development in the immediate vicinity. Accordingly, the project's aesthetic impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Agriculture and Forest Resources

The project would have no impact on agricultural resources or forest resources. Therefore, there is no potential for the project to contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact associated with agriculture and forest resources.

<u>Air Quality</u>

Based on SCAQMD cumulative significance methodologies, the emissions-based thresholds shown in Table 4 are used to determine if a project's contribution to regional cumulative emissions is cumulatively considerable. These thresholds were used to assess the significance of the project-specific and cumulative air quality impacts. Air quality impacts are basin-wide, and air quality is affected by all pollutant sources in the Southern California Air Basin. As the individual project thresholds are designed to help achieve attainment with cumulative basin-wide standards, they are also appropriate for assessing the project's contribution to cumulative impacts. Emissions of ozone precursors (ROG and NO_x), PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} during construction and operation of the project would not exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds of significance. These thresholds are designed to provide limits below which project emissions from an individual project would not significantly affect regional air quality or the timely attainment of the NAAQS and CAAQS. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions of ozone, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}, and impacts would be less than significant.

Biological Resources

As discussed under Biological Resources, the survey area is not located inside or immediately adjacent to any Criteria Area, Criteria Cell, Public/Quasi-Public lands, or Conservation Area identified for conservation potential by the MSHCP but is located within a MSHCP NEPSSA and the burrowing owl survey area identified in the MSHCP. The project would result in impacts to three vegetation communities/land cover types: Riversidean sage scrub, disturbed Riversidean sage scrub and residential/urban/exotic. To comply with the requirements of the MSHCP, payment of the appropriate fee for impacts would be required prior to the start of construction activities. Since the project is not intended to be part of the MSHCP Conservation Area (i.e., not located in a Criteria Cell), and complies with the conditions of the MSHCP, any biological impacts that could occur to these plant and wildlife species listed above would be less than significant.

Although no burrowing owls or sign (e.g., pellets, whitewash, feathers) were observed during site specific focused surveys, to ensure no burrowing owls have entered the site, a 30-day pre-construction take avoidance survey in accordance with the Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the MSHCP Area shall be conducted pursuant with the requirements of the MSHCP. With mandatory payment of fees, impacts would be less than significant on a direct and cumulatively considerable basis. With

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

implementation of mitigation, which required herein as **BIO-1** and **BIO-2**, direct and cumulatively considerable impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Impacts to oak trees would be mitigated through the implementation of mitigation measure **BIO-3**, which will require the oak tree to be removed on site to be replaced at a ratio of 2:1. The two replacement oak trees shall be no smaller than one gallon.

Cultural Resources

As discussed under the analysis for Cultural Resources, because previously undiscovered subsurface resources that meet CEQA's definition of a significant archaeological resource have the potential to be uncovered by the Project's ground-disturbing construction activities, conditions of approval related to monitoring, unanticipated cultural resources are required. With implementation of these conditions of approval to properly identify and treat resources that may be uncovered during the project's ground disturbing activities, impacts would be reduced to less than significant on a direct and cumulatively considerable basis.

<u>Energy</u>

The project would not require nonstandard equipment or construction practices that would increase fuel-energy consumption above typical rates. As such, energy use associated with construction of the project would not result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel or other forms of energy and construction-related impacts would be less than significant. Project operations would also not contribute to cumulative energy impacts as the project and all development within the county would be subject to regional, state, and federal requirements related to energy efficiency requirements, CALGreen) and fuel efficiency. Therefore, project-related impacts regarding excessive energy consumption would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Geology/Soils

Potential effects related to geology and soils are site-specific; therefore, there is no potential for the project to contribute to a cumulatively-considerable impact under this topic. Furthermore, all development proposals would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations that are in place to preclude adverse geology and soils effects, including effects related to strong seismic ground shaking, fault rupture, soil erosion, and hazardous soil conditions (e.g., liquefaction, expansive soils, landslides).

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As discussed in the GHG Emissions Analysis (see Appendix J), global climate change occurs as the result of global emissions of GHGs. An individual development project does not have the potential to result in direct and significant GCC-related effects in the absence of cumulative sources of GHGs. The CEQA Guidelines also emphasize that the effects of GHG emissions are cumulative and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA's requirements for cumulative impacts analysis (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15130[f]). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(h)(3) and 15130(b), a project's incremental contribution to GHG emissions may be determined not to be cumulatively considerable if it complies with the requirements of the CAP. At project buildout, the project's total annual GHG emissions would potentially exceed the County CAP's annual GHG emissions threshold of $3,000 \text{ MTCO}_2\text{E}$. However, the project would be consistent with the CAP's requirement to achieve at least 100 points and thus the project is considered to have a less than significant individual and cumulatively considerable impact on GHG emissions. With implementation of project design features and adherence to applicable

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

regulations, the project would not cause a significant impact due to a conflict with the County's CAP and impacts related to GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable basis.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As impacts and effects related to hazards and hazardous materials are site-specific, there is no potential for the project to contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Construction and operation of the project and other projects in the Santa Ana River watershed would have the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable water quality impact, including erosion and sedimentation. However, in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, all development projects would be required to implement plans during construction and operation (e.g., SWPPP and WQMP) to minimize adverse effects to water quality, which would avoid a cumulatively considerable impact. The project and other projects in the Santa Ana River Basin would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations in order to preclude flood hazards both on- and off-site. Compliance with federal, state, and local regulations would require on-site areas to be protected, at a minimum, from flooding during peak storm events (i.e., 100-year storm) and ensure that proposed development projects would not expose downstream properties to increased flooding risks during peak storm events. Accordingly, a cumulatively-considerable effect related to hydrology and water quality would not occur.

Land Use/Planning

The project would replace an existing industrial use on an infill site and therefore would not physically divide an established community, or conflict with applicable land use/planning documents and the project is consistent with the County's land use designation and zoning classifications for the project site; therefore, there is no potential for the project to contribute to a cumulatively-considerable impact related to land use and planning.

Mineral Resources

The project would have no impact related to mineral resources. Therefore, there is no potential for the project to contribute to a cumulatively-considerable impact related to mineral resources.

<u>Noise</u>

There are no construction projects in the immediate vicinity of the project site that would overlap with project-related construction activities which would result in a cumulative impact. In addition, the project would not produce noticeable levels of vibration; therefore, cumulatively considerable impacts related to these issue areas would not occur. As discussed in the analysis in the Initial Study, industrial and manufacturing uses are "clearly compatible" with noise levels up to 75 CNEL, "normally compatible" with noise levels from 70 to 80 CNEL, and "clearly incompatible" with noise levels above 75 CNEL. There are no land use compatibility standards for fast food restaurants since these are not noise sensitive land uses. As calculated in this analysis, on-site vehicle traffic noise levels would be 70 CNEL or less and would be considered "clearly compatible". As calculated in the analysis, operational noise levels are not anticipated to exceed the applicable limits as specified in Chapter 9.52 Noise Regulations Section 9.52.040 of the Code of Ordinances regarding on-site generated noise would not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of limits established in the Code of Ordinances, and impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, operational noise levels would be less than significant and not contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts.

F S	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with	Less Than Significant	No Impact
	impaor	Mitigation	Impact	
		Incorporated		

Paleontological Resources

No paleontological resources are identified on or near the project site; however, grading and excavation activities on the project site that occur deeper than 35 feet in depth in areas of the project site that are composed of old alluvial fan deposits (Qof) of middle to late Pleistocene Age have the potential to unearth paleontological resources that may exist below the ground surface as they are mapped by the County as high paleontological sensitivity. Similarly, cumulative development in this same geologic formation has the potential to unearth paleontological resources. With implementation of mitigation (**PALEO-1 through PALEO-3**) to properly identify and treat resources that may be uncovered during the project's earth-moving activities, the project's impacts would be reduced to less than significant on a direct and cumulatively considerable basis.

Population and Housing

The project does not implement residential land uses that would generate new residential populations and would not require the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, there is no potential for the project to result in an adverse, cumulatively-considerable environmental effect related to population and housing.

Public Services

All development projects in the County, including the project, would be subject to payment of Development Impact Fees, a portion of which would be used by the County for the provision of public services to offset the incremental increase in demand for public services which is caused, in part by cumulative development projects. As the project does not include residential development, it would not directly result in the introduction of substantial numbers of new residents to the County and, therefore, would have no potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to resident-serving public facilities such as schools, parks, libraries, and other public facilities or services.

Recreation

The project would have no impact to recreation facilities as the project does not include residential development that would induce new population growth that would result in increased use of these facilities. Therefore, there is no potential for the project to contribute to a cumulatively-considerable impact to recreational facilities.

Transportation

The VMT Analysis (see Appendix P) noted that according to the screening criteria as contained in the County of Riverside Transportation Analysis Guidelines for Level of Service, Vehicle Miles Traveled (County of Riverside 2020b), it can be presumed that a land development project would not have a significant impact under Cumulative conditions if it is determined not to have one under baseline conditions unless there are known circumstances, as determined by the Transportation Department, that might alter this outcome. Unless specifically required by the Transportation Department, project analysis for cumulative conditions. As detailed under the analysis for Transportation, results of the TIA (see Appendix C) indicated that four of the seven key study intersection are forecast to operate at an adverse level of service during the AM and PM peak hours when compared to the target LOS. However, implementation of the recommended improvements as defined in the TIA and under the Transportation analysis above would improve these intersections to acceptable service levels. Therefore, there would be less than significant impacts related to LOS.

As noted in the VMT analysis, the project has been screened out of a VMT analysis under the "Small Projects" criteria and would therefore have a less than significant impact. As no significant impact was determined under Baseline Plus Project conditions (i.e. under implementation of the project), no

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

cumulative impacts analysis was necessitated and there would be less than significant cumulative impacts related to LOS or VMT.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Impacts to tribal cultural resources would be cumulatively considerable as archaeological resources are nonrenewable. Compliance with tribal consultation requirements required under state law is required by all projects subject to CEQA, which ensures that no cumulatively considerable impact to tribal cultural resources occurs statewide. The County has complied with tribal consultation requirements for the Project and with implementation of standard conditions of approval, the Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable tribal cultural resources impact. With implementation of monitoring and evaluation in the event of discovery as detailed in the conditions of approval, impacts to potential archaeological resources from inadvertent discovery would be reduced to less than significant and would not contribute to cumulative impacts.

Utilities/Service Systems

All development projects in Riverside County are assessed for utility capacity needs and impacts to the existing infrastructure. Extensive infrastructure planning is completed for the County through its various departments and partner agencies and programming is based on County growth projections and land use. The project would require new water lines, recycled water lines, storm water drainage systems, and sewer lines on-site and within the roadway footprint to connect with existing infrastructure (see Figure 14). The project and other planned development projects in the County are subject to connection and service fees to offset increased demand and assist in planned facility expansion and service improvements. Because of the utility planning and coordination activities described above, cumulatively considerable impacts to utilities and service systems would not occur.

<u>Wildfire</u>

The project site is located in a moderate/very high fire hazard severity zone. However, as discussed under the Wildfire analysis, the project would clear vegetation from the existing site that would contribute to wildfire risk and would implement a flame-proof plant palette and construct structures per the California Fire Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Chapter 4, Emergency Planning and Preparedness) which would reduce wildfire risks. The Fire Protection Plan (see Appendix O) also notes that the adjacent vacant parcels would be developed over time and would further reduce cumulative impacts from wildfire. Therefore, there is no potential for the project to contribute to a cumulatively-considerable impact from wildfire risks.

Based on the analysis in this document, the project's contribution to environmental impacts would not be cumulatively considerable in the context of, or in combination with, past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. As such, cumulatively considerable impacts associated with the project would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant with Mitigation

Mitigation: See above discussion.

Monitoring: See above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
47. Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				

Source(s): All sources are noted in the appropriate threshold as analyzed within this Initial Study.

The project's potential to result in environmental effects that could adversely affect human beings, either directly or indirectly, has been discussed throughout the analysis of this Initial Study. As discussed, the project would result in less than significant with mitigation incorporated, less than significant impacts, or no impact to all resource topic areas. In instances where the project has the potential to result in direct or indirect adverse effects to human beings (air quality and associated effects on human health from air pollutants, and construction-related noise and potential effects on hearing impairment), project design features would ensure impacts do not rise above a level of significance. For instance, commercial vehicle loading docks were located to the northern portion of the site away from existing sensitive noise receptors and construction would be subject to County regulations to reduce impacts related to construction noise and air quality. In addition, truck traffic would not be allowed on Street A through to Lawson Road which would minimize noise impacts to adjacent residential communities. With required implementation of County regulations and project design features, construction and operation of the project would not involve any activities that would result in environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Therefore, the project would not result in environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Findings of Fact: Less than Significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

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

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

Revised: 8/28/2024 3:24 PM Y:\Planning Master Forms\Templates\CEQA Forms\EA-IS_Template.docx

	Pote Sign Im	entially nificant npact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------	-------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

Mitigation Measures

Biological

BIO-1 Burrowing Owl Surveys. A pre-construction take avoidance survey for this species would be required within 30 days prior to disturbance within all suitable habitat located inside the burrowing owl survey area. This pre-construction survey shall be conducted following the protocol established by the WRCRCA Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Area (2006). Take of active nests shall be avoided. If burrowing owls are detected, the WRCRCA and CDFW shall be notified within 48 hours and a burrowing owl relocation plan for active or passive relocation would be developed for review and approval by WRCRCA and CDFW.

BIO-2 Migratory and Nesting Birds. To remain in compliance with Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code 3503 and 3503.5, no direct impacts shall occur to any nesting birds, their eggs, chicks, or nests during the breeding season as mentioned above. If vegetation removal activities must occur during the bird breeding season of February 1 to September 15, then a pre-construction survey would be necessary to confirm the presence or absence of breeding birds within the grasses and trees existing on-site. If nests or breeding activities are located on the survey area, then an appropriate buffer area around the nesting site shall be maintained until the young have fledged. If no nesting birds are detected during the pre-construction survey, no buffer would be required.

BIO-3 Oak Tree Replacement. The removal of the single native oak tree onsite shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio in accordance with the County's Oak Tree Management Guidelines. The project's landscape plans shall include at least two oak trees to mitigate for the one native tree that will be impacted as a result of the project implementation. The two replacement oak trees shall be no smaller than one gallon.

Paleontological Resources

PALEO-1 Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a project-specific plan for monitoring site grading/earthmoving activities shall be prepared and implemented by a qualified paleontologist approved by the County (project paleontologist). The project paleontologist shall review the approved development plan and grading plan and conduct any pre-construction work necessary to render appropriate monitoring and mitigation requirements as appropriate and document these requirements in a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) to reduce any potential impacts to significant paleontological resources. The PRIMP shall outline where monitoring is required within the project site based on construction plans and/or geotechnical reports, procedures for adequate paleontological monitoring (below a depth of 10 feet below the original ground surface) and discoveries treatment, and paleontological methods, reporting, and collections management. This PRIMP shall be submitted to the County Geologist for approval prior to issuance of a Grading Permit. Information to be contained in the PRIMP, at a minimum and in addition to other industry standards and Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards, are as follows:

- a. A corresponding and active County Grading Permit (BGR) Number must be included in the title of the report. PRIMP reports submitted without a BGR number in the title will not be reviewed.
- b. PRIMP must be accompanied by the final grading plan for the subject project.
- c. Description of the proposed site and planned grading operations.
- d. Description of the level of monitoring required for all earth-moving activities in the project area.

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

- e. Identification and qualifications of the qualified paleontological monitor to be employed for grading operations monitoring.
- f. Identification of personnel with authority and responsibility to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for recovery of large specimens.
- g. Direction for any fossil discoveries to be immediately reported to the property owner who in turn will immediately notify the County Geologist of the discovery.
- h. Means and methods to be employed by the paleontological monitor to quickly salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays.
- i. Sampling of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates.
- j. Procedures and protocol for collecting and processing of samples and specimens.
- k. Fossil identification and curation procedures to be employed.
- I. Identification of the permanent repository to receive any recovered fossil material. *Pursuant the County "SABER Policy", paleontological fossils found in the County should, by preference, be directed to the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet. A written agreement between the property owner/developer and the repository must be in place prior to site grading.
- m. All pertinent exhibits, maps, and references.
- n. Procedures for reporting of findings.
- o. Identification and acknowledgement of the developer for the content of the PRIMP as well as acceptance of financial responsibility for monitoring, reporting and curation fees. The property owner and/or applicant on whose land the paleontological fossils are discovered shall provide appropriate funding for monitoring, reporting, delivery and curating the fossils at the institution where the fossils will be placed and will provide confirmation to the County that such funding has been paid to the institution.
- p. All reports shall be signed by the project paleontologist and all other professionals responsible for the report's content (e.g., PG), as appropriate. One signed digital copy of the report(s) shall be submitted by email to the County Geologist (dwalsh@rivco.org) along with a copy of this condition and the grading plan for appropriate case processing and tracking. These documents should not be submitted to the project Planner, Plan Check staff, Land Use Counter or any other County office. In addition, the applicant shall submit proof of hiring (i.e., copy of executed contract, retainer agreement, etc.) a project paleontologist for the in-grading implementation of the PRIMP.

PALEO-2 Paleontological Monitoring. If excavations below a depth of 10 feet below the original ground surface (i.e., 10 feet below the depth of documented artificial fill) are planned for the project, a qualified paleontologist or a qualified paleontological monitor meeting the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards must be present to monitor the excavations for paleontological resources. The qualified paleontologist shall determine if the sediments are old enough and fine-grained enough to warrant continued monitoring. If the qualified paleontologist determines paleontological monitoring is

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

not necessary at the 10-foot depth due to subsurface geological conditions, then paleontological spot-checking shall occur at 5-foot increments below 10 feet to determine the suitability for fossil preservation. The qualified paleontologist must produce a final paleontological monitoring report that discusses the paleontological monitoring program, any paleontological discoveries, and the preparation, curation, and accessioning of any fossils into a suitable paleontological repository.

PALEO-3 Worker Environmental Awareness Program. Prior to construction-related excavations, a qualified paleontologist meeting the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP 2010) standards should be retained, attend the pre-construction meeting, and present a worker environmental awareness program (WEAP) to the construction crew. The WEAP should discuss the types of fossils that may potentially be uncovered during project excavations, regulations protecting paleontological resources, and appropriate actions to be taken when fossils are discovered.

REFERENCES

Airport Land Use Commission, County of Riverside

- 2014 New Compatibility Plan. January 9, 2024. https://rcaluc.org/new-compatibility-plan.
- 2016 Airport Influence Areas Map. September. https://gisopendatacountyofriverside.opendata.arcgis.com/maps/5941dc5fc4ab448990b8aa1078c1d128_30/a bout.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District

2022 California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines.

Bedford Coldwater Groundwater Sustainability Authority

2021 Groundwater Sustainability Plan Bedford-Coldwater Basin. November. https://www.bedfordcoldwatergsa.com/sgma-gsp/.

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) 2022 California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) 2022.1

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) 2024a Mandatory Commercial Recycling. Accessed January 11, 2024. https://calrecycle.ca.gov/recycle/commercial/.

- 2024b Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan. Accessed January 11, 2024. https://rcwaste.org/planning-services-overview/ciwmp.
- 2024c SB 1383 Educational and Outreach Resources. Accessed January 11, 2024. https://calrecycle.ca.gov/organics/slcp/education/.
- 2024d Mandatory Commercial Organics Recycling. Accessed January 11, 2024. https://calrecycle.ca.gov/recycle/commercial/organics/.
- 2024e SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details El Sobrante Landfill (33-AA-0217). Accessed January 11, 2024. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/2256?siteID=2402.
- 2024f Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates. Accessed January 15, 2024. Estimated Solid https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates.

California Department of Water Resources

SGMA Portal. Accessed January 9, 2024. https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gsa/print/267.

Corona-Norco Unified School District

2024 Developer Fee Justification Study. March 2024. https://cdnsm5ss18.sharpschool.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_211876/File/Our%20Departments/Faciliti es/Developer%20Fees/Developer%20Fee%20Justification%20Study%20Final-03-05-2024.pdf.

Eastern Water Management District (EMWD)

2023 Development Services Department and Facility Guidelines. October. https://www.emwd.org/sites/main/files/fileattachments/development_services_department_and_facility_design_guidelines_rev._5.24 .221.pdf

Page 120 of 122

Google Earth Pro

2024 Google Earth Pro. Accessed January 2024.

Peak Visor

2024 Temescal Mountains. Accessed January 22, 2024. https://peakvisor.com/range/temescalmountains.html.

Riverside, County of

- 1988 Riverside County Ordinance No. 655. June. https://rivcocob.org/ordinance-no-655#:~:text=The%20intent%20of%20this%20ordinance,on%20astronomical%20observatio n%20and%20research.
- 2012 Riverside County Ordinance No. 915. January. https://library.municode.com/ca/riverside_county/ordinances/code_of_ordinances?nodeId= 516239.
- 2015a General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element. December. https://planning.rctlma.org/sites/g/files/aldnop416/files/migrated/Portals-14-genplangeneral-Plan-2017-elements-OCT17-Ch05-MOSE-120815.pdf
- 2015b County of Riverside General Plan Figure OS-3a "Forestry Resources Western Riverside County Parks, Forests, and Recreation Areas."
- 2015c Butterfield Overland Trail Project Temescal Valley Alignment Analysis. September. https://rivcoparks.org/sites/g/files/aldnop306/files/migrated/-files-ugd-691623-41b06ff88d1d41fba7a79a62d0663b29.pdf
- 2015d General Plan Noise Element. December. https://planning.rctlma.org/sites/g/files/aldnop416/files/migrated/Portals-14-genplangeneral-Plan-2017-elements-OCT17-Ch07-Noise-120815.pdf
- 2016 Temescal Canyon Area Pla. December 6. https://planning.rctlma.org/sites/g/files/aldnop416/files/migrated/Portals-14-genplangeneral-Plan-2017-areaplans-TCAP-120616.pdf.
- 2019a Riverside County Climate Action Plan. November. https://planning.rctlma.org/general-planand-zoning/riverside-county-climate-action-plan.
- 2019b Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) for the Riverside County Operational Area (OA). August.
- 2020a General Plan Circulation Element. July. https://planning.rctlma.org/sites/g/files/aldnop416/files/migrated/Portals-14-genplan-2019elements-Ch04-Circulation-072720v2.pdf.
- 2020b Transportation Analysis Guidelines for Level of Service, Vehicle Miles Traveled. December.
- 2021a Temescal Canyon Area Plan, September. https://planning.rctlma.org/sites/g/files/aldnop416/files/migrated/Portals-14-genplan-GPA-2022-Compiled-TCAP-4-2022-rev.pdf.

- 2021b General Plan Safety Element. September. https://planning.rctlma.org/sites/g/files/aldnop416/files/migrated/Portals-14-genplan-2021elements-Ch06-Safety-092821.pdf.
- 2021c 2021-2029 Housing Element Appendix P Housing Background Report. September.
- 2023 Road Standards and Standard Specifications. March. https://trans.rctlma.org/sites/g/files/aldnop401/files/migrated/Portals-7-documents-ord461-2023-ORD-461-11-County-Road-Standards-and-Specs-PRINT.pdf
- 2024 Map My County v11.5 Report for APNs 283-180-002, 283-180-020, 283-180-021. https://gis1.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/?viewer=MMC_Public.
- **Riverside County Center for Demographics**
 - 2020 Riverside County Center for Demographics County Service Area 143 Map (Riverside County. March. https://rivcoed.org/sites/g/files/aldnop126/files/2023-02/CSA%20134.pdf
- Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP)
 - 2010 Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources. https://vertpaleo.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/SVP_Impact_Mitigation_Guidelines.pdf
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
 - 2023 U.S. Census Urbanized Areas SCAG Region. October 2023. https://gisdata-cag.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/c98ee3c6677d43058d30ed53c41c965a.
- State of California Department of Conservation
 - 2020 California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed February 7, 2024. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/
- State Water Resources Control Board
 - 2024 Water Quality Control Plan for the Santa Ana River Basin (Basin Plan). June 2019.
- Temescal Valley Water District (TVWD)
 - 2021 2022 Urban Water Management Plan. December. https://www.temescalvwd.com/pdf/TVWD_UWMP_Report_Final_w%20Appendices.pdf.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA)
 - 1992 Screening Procedures for Estimating the Air Quality Impact of Stationary Sources.
 - 2009 Estimating 2003 Building-Related Construction and Demolition Materials Amounts.

Waste Management, Inc.

2024 El Sobrante. Accessed January 11, 2024. https://www.wm.com/location/california/inlandempire/riverside-county/elsobrante.jsp#:~:text=With%20a%20capacity%20to%20process,of%20the%20County's%2 0annual%20waste.

Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (WRCRCA)

2006 Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Area.