Project Name: SR-60/WLC Pkwy Interchange Project
DIST-CO-RTE-PM: DISTRICT 8 – RIV – 60 (PM 20.0/22.0)
EA: 0M590
EFIS ID: 0813000109

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FINDINGS

FOR

STATE ROUTE 60/WORLD LOGISTICS CENTER PARKWAY INTERCHANGE PROJECT

RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

The following information is presented to comply with State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15091). Reference is made to the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the project, which is the basic source of the information.

The following effects have been identified in the FEIR as resulting from the project. Effects found not to be significant have not been included.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Adverse Environmental Effects

During project ground-disturbing activities, there is a potential for significant, nonrenewable paleontological resources to be encountered in the Young Alluvial Fan Deposits, Young Axial Channel Deposits, Old Alluvial Fan Deposits, Very Old Alluvial Fan Deposits, and the unnamed subunit of the middle member of the San Timoteo Formation. As such, construction of the project may have the potential to impact scientifically significant, nonrenewable paleontological resources.

Findings

Changes or alterations that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR have been required in, or incorporated into, the project.

Statement of Facts

Implementation of measure PAL-1 would avoid or minimize potential effects to unanticipated paleontological resources, which may be unearthed during site preparation, grading, or excavation for the project. To further avoid impacts to any paleontological resources that may be present in the project area, in addition to measure PAL-1, a Paleontological Mitigation Plan (PMP), would be implemented during construction, as specified in Mitigation Measure PAL-2 outlined below.

PAL-1 **Discovery of Unanticipated Paleontological Resources.** If unanticipated paleontological resources are discovered, all work within 60 feet of the discovery must cease and the construction Resident Engineer must be notified. Work cannot continue near the discovery until authorized.

PAL-2 **Paleontological Mitigation Plan (PMP).** The PMP shall be developed concurrently with the final design plans and shall follow the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) guidelines in the Standard Environmental Reference (SER) Environmental Handbook, Volume 1, Chapter 8 (Caltrans, 2017), as well as guidelines from the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. Following these guidelines, the PMP shall be prepared by a qualified paleontologist and shall include the following elements:

- Required 1-hour preconstruction paleontological sensitivity training for earthmoving personnel
- A signed repository agreement
- Field and laboratory methods proposed (must be consistent with repository requirements)
- A required Paleontological Mitigation Report upon completion of project earthmoving

With implementation of measure PAL-1 and Mitigation Measure PAL-2, the potential project impacts in regard to paleontological resources would be reduced to less than significant.

CLIMATE CHANGE/GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Adverse Environmental Effects

Caltrans considers an increase in GHG emissions from the existing condition a significant impact under CEQA. Although the project would improve traffic operations and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions compared to the No Build Alternative, it would not reduce GHG emissions from the existing condition and therefore would not contribute to achieving statewide GHG emissions reduction goals. Therefore, the impact would be potentially significant and unavoidable for the project.

Findings

Specific economic and social considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, result in generation of more vehicle miles traveled than occur in the existing condition. Although vehicle miles traveled is not a threshold of significance that applies to the project pursuant to Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines, the GHG emissions resulting from those additional vehicle miles traveled is considered a significant impact under Section 15064.4 of the CEQA

Guidelines. There is no feasible mitigation measure available to reduce the GHG emissions from the privately owned vehicles operating on public roadways; however, measures AQ-2 and AQ-6, and Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through GHG-11 would be implemented to reduce GHG emissions from sources other than privately owned vehicles operating on public roadways.

Statement of Facts

Implementation of measures AQ-2 and AQ-6, and Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through GHG-5 would be implemented during project construction to reduce GHG emissions. Additionally, Mitigation Measures GHG-6 through GHG-11 would be implemented to reduce GHG emissions during project operation.

AQ-2 Project specifications will include the duration of construction. Emissions from construction equipment vehicles will be controlled by maintaining equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturers' specifications. Properly operating engines also help reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

AQ-6 All construction vehicles both on and off site shall be prohibited from idling in excess of 5 minutes.

GHG-1 Use energy and fuel-efficient vehicles and equipment that are the right size equipment for the job.

GHG-2 Require contractors to assemble a comprehensive inventory list (i.e., make, model, engine year, horsepower, emission rates) of all heavy-duty off-road (portable and mobile) equipment (50 horsepower and greater) that could be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. Prepare a plan for approval by the applicable air district demonstrating achievement of the applicable percent reduction for a California Air Resources Board (CARB) approved fleet.

GHG-3 Maximize use of recycled materials (e.g., tire rubber) and use the minimum feasible amount of greenhouse gas (GHG) emitting construction materials.

GHG-4 Reduce need for electric lighting by using ultra-reflective sign materials that are illuminated by headlights.

GHG-5 Develop a traffic plan to minimize traffic flow interference from construction activities. The plan may include advance public notice of routing, use of public transportation, and satellite parking areas with a shuttle service. Schedule operations affecting traffic for off-peak hours. Minimize obstruction of through-traffic lanes. Provide a flag person to guide traffic properly and ensure safety at construction sites.

GHG-6 Include landscaping components such as mulch and compost application to improve carbon sequestration rates in soils and reduce organic waste.

GHG-7 Design and install long-life pavement structures to minimize life-cycle costs.

GHG-8 Design medians to comply with City landscape standards to increase water efficiency with efficient irrigation, grading that retains water run-off, and a drought tolerant plant palette.

GHG-9 Use rubberized asphalt concrete to the maximum extent practical within currently accepted practice.

GHG-10 Use lighting systems that are energy efficient, such as LED technology.

GHG-11 Incorporate bicycle and pedestrian facilities into project design.

Because the project would not reduce GHG emissions below the existing 2018 condition, the impact would be significant and unavoidable. There is no feasible mitigation measure available to reduce the GHG emissions from the privately owned vehicles operating on public roadways. The measures stated above, such as bicycle and pedestrian improvements, higher efficiency street lighting, and low-water-use landscaping would reduce this impact, but not to a less than significant level. Thus, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

NOISE

Adverse Environmental Effects

The project would result in substantial increases in permanent noise levels at Receptors R-25 and R-28 within the project area.

Findings

Noise barriers were proposed in the Draft EIR as mitigation for increases in permanent noise levels at Receptors R-25 and R-28. A noise barrier survey was undertaken with the benefitted receptors. The owner of Receptor R-25 did not support a noise barrier; therefore, there is no feasible mitigation measure available for Receptor R-25.

Statement of Facts

The project would result in substantial increases in permanent noise levels at Receptors R-25 and R-28 within the project area. Implementation of Mitigation Measure N-2 requires construction of noise barriers on private property to reduce noise levels at the two receptors.

N-2 Noise mitigation in the form of a noise barrier will be implemented to reduce significant noise impacts at Receptor R-28. During final design, the final height and length of the noise barrier will be determined. During

construction, the construction contractor will construct the noise barrier as specified in the final design plans.

Both property owners at Receptors R-25 and R-28 must accept the mitigation for installation of noise barriers to constitute a less than significant impact. Both property owners at Receptors R-25 and R-28 were mailed letters during public review of the Draft EIR/EA so as to indicate their preference for construction of noise barriers. The property owners at Receptor R-25 indicated they were not in favor of the proposed noise barrier, and the property owners at Receptor R-28 indicated they were in favor of a 14-foot noise barrier. Because the property owners at Receptor R-25 indicated they were not in favor of a noise barrier, the permanent noise levels would be a significant and unavoidable impact at Receptor R-25. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure N-2 would reduce traffic noise levels at Receptor R-28, and permanent noise impacts would be less than significant at Receptor R-28.

MANDATORY FINDINGS

The discussion in this section provides mandatory findings as required in Section 15065 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

History

Adverse Environmental Effects. As discussed in detail in the FEIR, the project-related adverse impacts to paleontological resources can be mitigated to below a level of significance based on implementation of the measures identified in the FEIR for the project.

Findings. Changes or alterations that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect for paleontological resources as identified in the FEIR have been required in, or incorporated into, the project.

Statement of Facts. Implementation of measure PAL-1 and Mitigation Measure PAL-2 would avoid or minimize potential effects to unanticipated paleontological resources, which may be unearthed during site preparation, grading, or excavation for the project.

Cumulative Effects

Adverse Environmental Effects. As discussed in detail in Section 2.23, Cumulative Impacts, in the FEIR, the project may result in adverse impacts to the following that are not mitigated or offset to below a level of significance under CEQA, and that were determined to potentially contribute to cumulative adverse impacts:

- Physical Environment
  - Noise
- Climate Change/GHG Emissions

Findings. Specific economic and social considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, result in the generation of more vehicle miles traveled than occur in the existing condition. There is no feasible mitigation measure available to reduce the GHG emissions from the privately owned vehicles operating on public roadways. Additionally, because the owner of Receptor R-25 did not support a noise barrier, there is no feasible mitigation measure available for Receptor R-25.

Statement of Facts. Extensive measures included in the FEIR would reduce potential adverse effects of the project related to the physical environment (noise) and related to climate change/GHG emissions. However, those measures are not sufficient to reduce the potential contribution of the project to cumulative impacts related to those environmental parameters to below a level of significance under CEQA.

Adverse Effects on Human Beings

Adverse Environmental Effects. As discussed in detail in the FEIR, there is no feasible mitigation measure available to reduce the GHG emissions from the privately owned vehicles operating on public roadways. In addition, because the owner of Receptor R-25 did not support a noise barrier, there is no feasible mitigation measure available to reduce permanent noise levels at Receptor R-25. Therefore, these climate change/GHG and noise impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable adverse effects on human beings in the FEIR.

Findings. Changes or alterations that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts to human beings as identified in the FEIR have been required in, or incorporated into, the project. However, specific economic and social considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, result in the generation of more vehicle miles traveled than occur in the existing condition. There is no feasible mitigation measure available to reduce the GHG emissions from the privately owned vehicles operating on public roadways. Additionally, because the owner of Receptor R-25 did not support a noise barrier, there is no feasible mitigation measure available for Receptor R-25.

Statement of Facts. Implementation of measures AQ-2 and AQ-6, and Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through GHG-11 would be implemented to reduce GHG emissions during project construction and operation. Additionally, the City of Moreno Valley (project sponsor and Responsible Agency under CEQA) has committed to the above listed energy efficiency and climate action measures to reduce City-wide GHG emissions. However, although the project would improve traffic operations and reduce GHG emissions compared to the No Build condition, because it would not reduce GHG emissions from the existing condition, it would not contribute to achieving statewide GHG emissions reduction goals. The impact would be significant and unavoidable.

As discussed in detail in the FEIR, the project would result in substantial increases in permanent noise levels at Receptor R-25 because the property owner does not desire mitigation in the form of a noise barrier. Other than a noise barrier, there is no feasible

mitigation measure available for the significant noise impact at Receptor R-25; therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

David Bricker		12/10/2020
Deputy District Director, District 8 Division of Environmental Planning California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) CEQA and NEPA Lead Agency	Signature	Date

This page intentionally left blank