

## **Stoneridge Commerce Center Supplemental Information**

**List of Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs):** 307-070-003, 307-080-(005, 006, 008), 307-090-(001, 002, 004, 005, 006), 307-100-(001, 003, 004, 005), 307-110-(003, 007, 008), 307-220-001, and 307-230-(019, 020).

**Schools within 2.0 Miles of Project Site:** Sierra Vista Elementary School; Lakeside Middle School; and Orange Vista High School.

**Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:**

- Land Use: Vacant;
- Zoning: Specific Plan Zone (SP Zone);
- General Plan Designations: "Community Center (CC)," "Commercial Retail (CR)," "Medium Density Residential (MDR)," "Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)," "Very High Density Residential (VHDR)," "Open Space – Recreation (OS-R)," "Open Space – Conservation (OS-C)," "Open Space – Conservation Habitat (OS-CH)," and "Open Space – Water"

**Project Location:** South of the Ramona Expressway, north of Nuevo Road, east of Foothill Drive, and west of the future extension of Menifee Road in unincorporated Riverside County.

**Project Description:** The Project as evaluated in the Project's RDEIR includes applications for the first amendment to the Stoneridge Specific Plan No. 239 (SP 239A1), a General Plan Amendment (GPA 190008), and Change of Zone (CZ 1900024). The Project evaluated in the RDEIR consists of two separate land use alternatives for the 582.6-acre site, both of which are evaluated at an equal level of detail in the RDEIR. Two alternatives are considered because the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) is currently planning for construction of a regional transportation facility, the "Mid-County Parkway" (MCP). A portion of the MCP is currently planned to traverse the northwestern portions of the Project site. It is currently not known when or if the MCP would be constructed by RCTC; thus, the "Primary Land Use Plan" anticipates that the MCP would not be constructed through the property, in which case the site would be developed with up to 7,350,000 s.f. of Light Industrial land uses on 388.5 acres, 1,069,398 s.f. of Business Park land uses on 49.1 acres, 121,968 s.f. of Commercial Retail on 8.0 acres, Open Space – Conservation on 18.1 acres, Open Space – Conservation Habitat on 81.6 acres, and major roadways on 37.3 acres. The "Alternative Land Use Plan" anticipates that the MCP would be constructed through the northwest portions of the site, in which case the site would be developed with 7,350,000 s.f. of Light Industrial land uses on 388.5 acres, 936,540 s.f. of Business Park land uses on 51.5 acres, 126,542 s.f. of Commercial Retail land uses on 8.5 acres, 18.1 acres of Open Space – Conservation, 81.6 acres of Open Space – Conservation Habitat, and 34.4 acres of major roadways. For purposes of analysis throughout the Project's RDEIR, the "Primary Land Use Plan" is the preferred and primary land use plan for the proposed Project. The "Alternative Land Use Plan" only would be implemented in the event that the RCTC constructs the MCP through the northernmost portions of the Project site.

**Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect:**

The Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts, even after the implementation of Project design features, mandatory regulatory requirements, and feasible mitigation measures:

- Aesthetics: Significant and Unavoidable Direct and Cumulatively-Considerable Impact. The Project vicinity exhibits a rural and undeveloped character, and the development of the Project site with light industrial, business park, and commercial retail land uses would represent a substantial change to the existing visual character and quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Although the Project would be required to comply with the design guidelines and development standards of proposed SP 239A1, the SP 239A1 zoning ordinance, and all other applicable requirements of the Riverside County Municipal Code, which would serve to ensure that the Project site is developed in a manner that is not visually offensive, mitigation measures are not available to address the Project's significant impacts due to substantial changes to the existing visual character and quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable on both a direct and cumulatively-considerable basis.
- Air Quality: Significant and Unavoidable Direct and Cumulatively-Considerable Impacts. Long-term operations of the proposed Project would result in daily emissions of NO<sub>x</sub>, VOCs, and CO that exceed the SCAQMD Regional Thresholds. Even with implementation of mitigation measures and with compliance with the anticipated regulations implemented by the EPA and CARB to improve truck efficiency, the estimated long-term emissions generated under full buildout of the proposed Project still would exceed the SCAQMD's regional operational significance thresholds and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations in the SCAB for O<sub>3</sub>. In addition, regarding VOCs, it is important to note that approximately 43% of the total operational VOC emissions are derived from consumer products. As such, the Project Applicant cannot meaningfully control the use of consumer products by future building users via mitigation. Similarly, the predominance of the Project's operational-source emissions (approximately 41% of VOC emissions, 83% of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions, and 61% of CO emissions by weight) would be generated by passenger cars and trucks accessing the Project site. Neither the Project Applicant nor the County have regulatory authority to control tailpipe or consumer product emissions, and no feasible mitigation measures beyond the measures identified herein exist that would reduce Project operational-source VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO emissions to levels that are less than significant. Therefore, for both the Primary Land Use Plan and Alternative Land Use Plan, the proposed Project's operational emissions of VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO would represent a significant and unavoidable impact for which additional mitigation is not available. Due to the level of the Project's regional emissions that would exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds for VOCs, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO, and because the Project's land uses are not consistent with the land use inputs utilized in the SCAQMD 2022 AQMP, the Project also would result in significant and unavoidable impacts due to a conflict with or obstruction of the SCAQMD 2022 AQMP.
- Noise: Significant and Unavoidable Direct and Cumulatively-Considerable Impact. Implementation of Alternative Truck Routes 1 or 2 would result in significant and unavoidable

traffic-related noise impacts to the following roadway segments under each of the identified study scenarios:

- Alternative Truck Route 1:
  - Antelope Road north of Nuevo Road (Segment #4) – Impacts to future residential receptors along the off-site portion of this roadway segment under the Primary Land Use Plan for EAC (2030) conditions and Primary Land Use Plan for HY (2040) conditions.
  - Nuevo Road west of Antelope Road (Segment #16) – Impacts to future residential receptors along this segment under the Primary Land Use Plan for EAC (2030) conditions and Primary Land Use Plan for HY (2040) conditions.
  - Dunlap Drive north of San Jacinto Avenue (Segment #17) – Impacts to existing and future residential receptors along this segment under the Primary Land Use Plan for EAC (2030) conditions and Primary Land Use Plan for HY (2040) conditions.
  - San Jacinto Avenue west of Dunlap Drive (Segment #18) – Impacts to existing and future residential receptors along this segment under the Primary Land Use Plan for EAC (2030) conditions and Primary Land Use Plan for HY (2040) conditions.
  
- Alternative Truck Route 2:
  - Antelope Road north of Nuevo Road (Segment #4) – Impacts to future residential receptors along the off-site portions of this roadway segment under the Primary Land Use Plan for EAC (2030) conditions and Primary Land Use Plan for HY (2040) conditions.
  - Menifee Road south of Nuevo Road (Segment #5) – Impacts to existing and future residential receptors along this segment under the Primary Land Use Plan for EAC (2030) conditions and Primary Land Use Plan for HY (2040) conditions.
  - San Jacinto Avenue west of Dunlap Drive (Segment #18) – Impacts to existing and future residential receptors along this segment under the Primary Land Use Plan for EAC (2030) conditions and Primary Land Use Plan for HY (2040) conditions.

Feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce the Project's significant traffic-related noise impacts that would occur with implementation of Alternative Truck Routes 1 and 2. For example, rubberized asphalt was considered to reduce traffic noise levels at the noise source; however, rubberized asphalt is only effective for in the reduction of tire-on-pavement noise at higher speeds and would not materially reduce primary truck-related noise sources (e.g., truck engine noise and exhaust stack noise) due to the height of noise-generating sources associated with heavy trucks. Since the use of rubberized asphalt would not materially lower off-site traffic noise levels at potentially affected receptors, rubberized asphalt is not a feasible mitigation measure for the Project's traffic-related noise impacts. In addition, off-site noise barriers were considered as a potential measure to reduce the Project's traffic-related noise impacts. While noise barriers are commonly used to reduce the potential traffic noise levels from nearby transportation noise source activities, any exterior noise barriers at receiving noise sensitive

land uses experiencing Project-related traffic noise level increases would need to be high enough and long enough to block the line-of-sight from the noise source (at 11.5 feet high per Caltrans) to the receiver (at 5 feet high per FHWA guidance) in order to provide a 5 dBA reduction per FHWA guidance. It would not be practical to construct 11.5 foot-high barriers at off-site locations along the Study Area roadways. Additionally, arguably such barriers would block views from area land uses and would result in aesthetic and visual impacts affecting passersby that would off-set any noise attenuation benefits that may result from such walls. According to FHWA guidance, outdoor living areas are generally limited to outdoor living areas of frequent human use (e.g., backyards of single-family homes). Therefore, front and side yards of residences adjacent to off-site roadway segments do not represent noise sensitive areas of frequent human use that require exterior noise mitigation. Lastly, the Applicant cannot autonomously unilaterally construct off-site walls or other features at properties owned or controlled by others. As such, off-site noise barriers would not be feasible and would not lower the off-site traffic noise levels below a level of significance, and therefore, noise barriers are not proposed as mitigation for the Project, because such barriers are not feasible mitigation for the Project's traffic-related impacts. Accordingly, because mitigation is not available to reduce Project-related traffic noise impacts, the Project's off-site traffic-related noise level increases at adjacent land uses along the above-listed segments for Alternative Truck Routes 1 and 2 would remain significant and unavoidable prior to construction of the MCP and implementation of Alternative Truck Route 6.

- Transportation: Significant and Unavoidable Direct and Cumulatively-Considerable Impact. Implementation of either the Primary Land Use Plan (without MCP) or Alternative Land Use Plan (with MCP) would exceed the County's threshold of significance for Project work VMT per employee by 26.1%. In addition, under most scenarios, the Project's commercial retail land uses would result in a net increase in VMT within Riverside County as a whole and within a 10-mile radius of the Project site. Although not required pursuant to the County Guidelines, the analysis of the Project's total VMT indicates that the Project's total VMT per SP would exceed the County's threshold of significance by 2.4% with implementation of the Primary Land Use Plan (without MCP) and by 4.8% with implementation of the Alternative Land Use Plan (with MCP). Additionally, the cumulative analysis of the Project's impacts to VMT demonstrates that the Project, when considered in the context of cumulative development, would result in a net increase in total VMT within Riverside County as a whole and within a 10-mile radius of the Project site. Although the Project would be subject to compliance with Mitigation Measures MM 4.18-1 and MM 4.18-2, the future tenants of the proposed Project are unknown at this time. As such, the effectiveness of commute trip reduction measures such as those identified by Mitigation Measures MM 4.18-1 and MM 4.18-2 cannot be guaranteed to reduce Project VMT to a level of less than significant. The inclusion of VMT reduction measures in areas that are characteristically suburban in context are limited to a maximum VMT reduction of 15%. This maximum reduction for cross-category transportation-related mitigation measures of 15% for suburban settings also is noted in the County Guidelines. Therefore, even with the implementation of all feasible VMT reduction measures, Project-generated VMT cannot be reduced to a level of less than significant. Accordingly, Project

impacts due to VMT would be significant and unavoidable on both a direct and cumulatively-considerable basis.