

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (CEQ / EA) Number: CEQ210045
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Plot Plan No. PPT210024
Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department
Address: 4080 Lemon Street 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501
Contact Person: Manny Baeza
Telephone Number: (951) 955-9294
Applicant's Name: Golf Projects International, Inc.
Applicant's Address: 5719 Lake Lindero Drive, Agoura Hills, CA 91301

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Existing Conditions

Under existing conditions, the property has supported agriculture uses since at least the late 1990s. Well permits for agricultural uses were permitted in the 1990s. A citrus and mango ranch, table grapes were previously grown on the project site. Over the years, farmers have installed a reservoir for water storage and have two high producing wells.

The Coachella Valley Water District is currently constructing the Oasis project reservoir to hold canal water on a 4.5-acre site adjacent to the site's southeast corner.

Project Description

The project site is located in the unincorporated community of Thermal in Riverside County (Figure 1, Project Location). The project site is generally bound by Van Buren Street to the west, Lemon Blossom Lane to the east, and 70th Avenue to the south (Figure 2, Project Site). The Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) associated with the project site are 751-250-001, 751-250-002, and 751-250-003.

The project involves the development of a golf course and practice facilities (project) on an approximately 292.16-acre site. The project would include an 18-hole golf course, driving range, and short course with landscaping and walking paths (Figure 3, Plot Plan). Access to the project site would be provided via an entrance road off the northeast corner at Lemon Blossom Lane. The project would include 40 parking spaces.

The proposed golf facility is designed to operate differently from any other golf and country club in Riverside County (County) or the Coachella Valley desert area. Membership will be limited to 50 memberships, with members likely residing throughout the United States who have second or third homes in the desert. No real estate component is proposed.

2,400 of the existing lemon trees covering approximately 25 acres will be transplanted to the northeastern portion of the project site and along the northern and eastern boundaries to frame the entrance so the appearance will be that the entire site will remain a citrus ranch. The entirety of the project site will be surrounded by six-foot tall fencing or wall.

Construction

The First Phase of the project is to tip and mulch 18,000 lemon and mango trees after the September/October harvest. This process will be performed over a five-week period by a local contractor who has served the farming community for many years. Approximately 12 individuals will be onsite for this phase. Approximately 25 acres on lemon trees will be left in place to transplant to

the entrance and along the north and easterly boundaries to preserve the citrus appearance of the property.

The Second Phase is grading. Once the site is cleared, a mass excavation company will perform the grading operations cutting and filling to a balanced site. This grading will take approximately 12 weeks. 25 equipment operators will complete the grading work. The mass excavation company will also be responsible to construct and install the site drainage and desilting basins consistent with the approved drainage plan.

The Third Phase is planned to commence in late December 2021 when the golf course contractor mobilizes. The contractor will be responsible to fine grade and shape the course and to construct the greens, tees, bunkers, and other features. The golf course contractor will also install drainage and irrigation. 50 to 75 workers will be onsite during this third phase.

The Fourth Phase provides for the grassing plan to be executed. The fairways and features will be sodded and sprigged with Tuff Tuff Bermuda grass, and the greens sprigged with mini verde Bermuda. Due to seasonal temperatures the grassing phase will be completed between May and August 2022. Three crews of 8 deliver and install the grass through the grassing window.

Landscaping Installation

Landscaping is installed throughout each phase on the perimeter of the project consistent with the landscape. Interior landscaping between holes is supported with grassland landscape. 165 acres of the project site will be landscaped in addition to the 111 acres of fairways and 6 acres of greens. Based on the current schedule the golf course would be open for play in January 2023.

Operations

Hours of Operation

The golf course will be open through the season from October through May and closed on Tuesday and potentially Wednesdays. Play would commence around 8:00 am. Guest play will be strictly limited, and guests will have to be accompanied by a member with members limited to three guests at one time. It is anticipated that there will be no more than 12 rounds of golf played per day on the site, for a maximum of 25 individuals a day at the site.

Uses and Activities

The course will support golf only, weddings and other social events will not be hosted. Two Star Wagons, which is a portable trailer with bathroom and changing facilities, will be provided onsite. They will be driven on and parked onsite. One facility will be positioned for members to change, take light refreshments and to satisfy bathroom requirements. A facility would be provided for staff as well. Both Star Wagons will both be located near the parking lot, as shown on the Plot Plan. Additionally, a portable shade structure on wheels will be used cover any equipment that might be stored on the site.

Maintenance

Plans are to utilize the services of a third-party to maintain the golf course. A limited amount of equipment will be stored on the property. The company will utilize a crew of approximately 12 individuals to maintain the turfgrass and landscaped areas. The Golf Club will have two or three support staff to work with the golf course maintenance company.

Staffing and Operations

Estimated date of operation is January 2023. The golf operations staff would be limited to 4 employees who would manage play and the range operation. Three maintenance staff would support the third-party golf course maintenance company.

Water Usage

The project would use approximately 1,422-acre feet of water per year. This will be a reduction of approximately 40% as compared to water used on the project site today. Water would be provided by the Coachella Valley Water District, and potentially supplemented from existing onsite wells.

Security

The entire perimeter of the project site will be fenced or walled with a minimum six-foot tall fence. Plans would call for a roving patrol to check the property periodically and video cameras that can be operated remotely may also be installed.

A. Type of Project: Site Specific ; Countywide ; Community ; Policy .

B. Total Project Area: 292.16-acres

Residential Acres: 0	Lots: 0		Projected No. of Residents: 0
Commercial Acres: 0	Lots: 0	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: 0	Est. No. of Employees: 0
Industrial Acres: 0	Lots: 0	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: 0	Est. No. of Employees: 0
Other: 292.16-acres			

C. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 751250001, 751250002, 751250003

Street References: Van Buren Street, 70th Avenue, Lemon Blossom Lane

D. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:
Section: 19 Township: 7 South Range: 8 East

E. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: Under existing conditions, the entire site is used for agricultural purposes. The project site is surrounded by undeveloped desert scrub land and farmland.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. **Land Use:** Land Use Element
2. **Circulation:** Circulation Element
3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** Multipurpose Open Space Element
4. **Safety:** Safety Element
5. **Noise:** N/A
6. **Housing:** N/A
7. **Air Quality:** N/A
8. **Healthy Communities:** N/A

9. Environmental Justice (After Element is Adopted): N/A

B. General Plan Area Plan(s): Eastern Coachella Valley

C. Foundation Component(s): Agriculture Foundation

D. Land Use Designation(s): AG (Agricultural) (Figure 4, General Plan Land Use Designation)

E. Overlay(s), if any: CDO

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

G. Adjacent and Surrounding:

1. **General Plan Area Plan(s):** Eastern Coachella Valley

2. **Foundation Component(s):** Agriculture Foundation, Open Space Foundation

3. **Land Use Designation(s):** OS-CH (Open Space Conservation Habitat), AG (Agriculture), and OS-RUR (Open Space Rural)

4. **Overlay(s), if any:** CDO

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

H. Adopted Specific Plan Information

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

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

I. Existing Zoning: Controlled Development Areas (W-2) (Figure 5, Zoning)

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: N/A

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Controlled Development Areas (W-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.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | |

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 if the project is not otherwise exempt from CEQA, 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

11/18/21

Date

Manuel Baeza

Printed Name

For: Manny Baeza

Urban Regional Planner IV

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.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
AESTHETICS Would the project:				
1. Scenic Resources				
a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2015. Riverside County General Plan - Multipurpose Open Space Element. Revised December 08, 2015.
https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/general_Plan_2017/elements/OCT17/Ch05_MO SE_120815.pdf?ver=2017-10-11-102103-833.

Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2019. State Scenic Highway System Map. Accessed July 2021.
<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2e921695c43643b1aaf7000dfcc19983>.

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not within view of an officially designated scenic highway (County of Riverside 2015). The closest scenic highway is Route 111, an eligible state scenic highway, located approximately 6.3-miles east of the project site (Caltrans 2019). However, the distance and topography between the site and highway would prevent the site from being visible from the highway. Impacts would not occur.

b) Scenic vistas generally refer to views of expansive open space areas or other natural features, such as mountains, undeveloped hillsides, large natural water bodies, or coastlines. Certain urban settings or features, such as a striking or renowned skyline, may also represent a scenic vista. Scenic vistas are accessible from public vantage points, such as public roadways and parks. The County's General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element does not specifically list or identify any designated scenic vistas; however, the General Plan does discuss important elements that comprise the County's scenic resources, such as natural landmarks and prominent or unusual features of the landscape (County of Riverside 2015). The project site is located directly east of the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains which has high scenic value. Construction of the project would temporarily affect the visual environment through grading, landscaping, and on-site storage of equipment and materials. Temporary visual changes would include views of large construction vehicles and earth moving equipment, storage areas, and any potential temporary signage. However, the presence of these items within any scenic view would not be permanent because construction equipment would vacate the project site upon completion of construction. The project would not construct any buildings. Upon completion of construction, the project would largely be open space. Additionally, 2,400 of the existing lemon trees covering approximately 25 acres will be transplanted to the northeastern portion of the property and along the northern and eastern boundaries to frame the entrance so the appearance will be that the entire site will remain a citrus ranch. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Under existing conditions, the project site supports agriculture use in a non-urbanized area. The project would include the development of a new golf course and would discontinue all commercial agricultural production onsite while incorporating fruit trees around and on the site. The project site is zoned W-2 (Controlled Development). The W-2 zone permits agricultural uses and standard-length golf courses. As no change is required in the project site's zoning, and the project provides largely open space as does the existing agricultural use, there will be no change in the project's underlying land use. Additionally, the project does not propose the development of any buildings. Upon completion of construction, the project would largely be open space. Furthermore, 2,400 of the existing lemon trees covering approximately 25 acres will be transplanted to the northeastern portion of the property and along the northern and eastern boundaries to frame the entrance so the appearance will be that the entire site will remain a citrus ranch. Thus, the visual character of the project site would be relatively the same. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory

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

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2012. Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (ECVAP). February 2012. Accessed July 2021.
https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general_plan_2013/3%20Area%20Plan%20Volume%202/Easten%20Coachella%20Valley%20AP.pdf.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy, located in San Diego County, requires darkness so that the night sky can be viewed clearly. The project site is approximately 40-miles east of the Mt.

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

Palomar Observatory. The project site is located within Zone B of the Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy. As such, the project would be subject to Ordinance No. 655 and would comply with all lighting regulations defined in the ordinance. Additionally, per the County's General Plan, Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan, Policy ECVAP 4.2, the project would adhere to the County's lighting requirements for standards that are intended to limit light leakage and spillage that may interfere with the operations of the Palomar Observatory (County of Riverside 2012). However, the project would not propose the development of buildings or exterior light fixtures beyond nominal security lighting that would introduce light to the surrounding area. Two trailers would be parked onsite for staff. Trailers would contain interior lighting; however, lighting would not be anticipated to introduce a significant source of light to the area. As such, the project would not interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2012. Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (ECVAP). February 2012. Accessed July 2021.
https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general_plan_2013/3%20Area%20Plan%20Volume%202/Easten%20Coachella%20Valley%20AP.pdf.

Findings of Fact:

a) Nighttime lighting would not generally be needed for construction activities; however, lighting may be needed during winter months when the hours of daylight are shorter than in other seasons of the year. When in use, nighttime lighting for construction would be focused on construction areas and would not spill over into other areas. In addition, construction lighting would be shielded and directed downward and would be of the minimum required intensity to provide for safe construction activity. Upon completion of construction, the project would be largely open space; no buildings or lighting infrastructure, beyond nominal security lighting, are proposed. Two trailers would be located onsite for staff use. However, light generated from the trailers would be interior lighting only and would not be expected to contribute to any light and glare impacts. Additionally, 2,400 of the existing lemon trees covering approximately 25 acres will be transplanted to the northeastern portion of the property and along the northern and eastern boundaries to frame the entrance so the appearance will be that the entire site will remain a citrus ranch. The entirety of the site will be surrounded by six-foot tall fencing or wall. Therefore, trailers would not be visible from outside the site. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

b) The nearest residential property is located approximately 1.2-miles east of the site. However, lighting from construction would not be significant due to the distance and applied light shielding techniques. Additionally, no buildings are included as part of the project and no lighting infrastructure, part from nominal security lighting, is proposed. Therefore, lighting impacts resulting from the project would be 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2021. Map My County. Accessed July 01, 2021. https://gis1.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/index.html?viewer=MMC_Public.

CDOC (California Department of Conservation). 2021a. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed July 01, 2021. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>.

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the California Important Farmland Finder database, the project site is classified as a mix of Unique Farmland, Prime Farmland, and Other Land (CDOC 2021a). The California Department of Conservation defines Prime Farmland as farmland with the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long term agricultural production. Unique farmland is of lesser quality soils used for the production of the state's leading agricultural crops. This land may include orchards or vineyards. Other Land is land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing (CDOC 2021a). The project site currently has a General Plan land use designation of AG and is zoned W-2 (Controlled Development). The project would introduce a new golf course to the site. However, per Chapter 17.144, W-2 Controlled Development Areas Zone, of the Riverside County Municipal Code, golf courses with standard length fairways are permitted provided a

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

plot plan is approved. Under existing conditions, the project site is under agricultural production. As no change is required in the project site's zoning, and a golf course provides largely open space as does the existing agricultural use, there will be no change in the project's underlying land use. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Refer to discussion in response a. Additionally, the project site is not located within a County agricultural preserve or land subject to a Williamson Act contract. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Land uses surrounding the project site to the north and east support agricultural uses. However, the project site and surrounding area is zoned W-2 (Controlled Development). Additionally, the project would retain 2,400 of the existing lemon trees covering approximately 25 acres and transplant them to the northeastern portion of the property and along the northern and eastern boundaries to frame the entrance. As such, because the area surrounding the project site is not zoned for agricultural use and the project would not conflict with site's zoning or underlying land use designation, the project would comply with Ordinance No. 625. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Refer to discussion in responses a-c. Under existing conditions, the project site is under agricultural production. As no change is required in the project site's zoning, and a golf course provides largely open space as does the existing agricultural use, there will be no change in the project's underlying land use. Additionally, 2,400 of the existing lemon trees covering approximately 25 acres will be transplanted to the northeastern portion of the property and along the northern and eastern boundaries to frame the entrance so the appearance will be that the entire site will remain a citrus ranch. Therefore, impacts would be 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
5. Forest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2021. Map My County. Accessed July 01, 2021.
https://gis1.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/index.html?viewer=MMC_Public.

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The project site has a zoning designation of Controlled Development Areas (W-2) (County of Riverside 2021). The site is not zoned for forest land, timberland, or zoned Timberland Production.

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

The site does not contain any forest land so no loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use will occur. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project:

6. Air Quality Impacts

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors, which are located within one (1) mile of the project site, to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Memorandum (Appendix A)

SCAG. 2016. *2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy: A Plan for Mobility, Accessibility, Sustainability, and a High Quality of Life*. Adopted April 2016. Accessed January 21, 2021. <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/f2016rtpsc.pdf?1606005557>.

SCAQMD. 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. Accessed May 2018. [http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ceqa-air-quality-handbook-\(1993\)](http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ceqa-air-quality-handbook-(1993)).

SCAQMD. 2017. *Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan*. Accessed January 21, 2021. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2016-air-quality-management-plan/final-2016-aqmp/final2016aqmp.pdf?sfvrsn=15>.

SCAQMD. 2019. "SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds." Originally published in CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Table A9-11-A. Revised April 2019. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf?sfvrsn=2>.

Findings of Fact:

a) The purpose of a consistency finding is to determine if a project is inconsistent with the assumptions and objectives of the regional air quality plans, and, thus, if it would interfere with the region's ability to comply with federal and state air quality standards. The SCAQMD has established criteria for determining consistency with the currently applicable air quality management plan (AQMP)

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

in Chapter 12, Sections 12.2 and 12.3, in the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The criteria are as follows (SCAQMD 1993):

- **Consistency Criterion No. 1:** Whether the project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of the ambient air quality standards or interim emission reductions in the AQMP.
- **Consistency Criterion No. 2:** Whether the project would exceed the assumptions in the AQMP or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase.

To address Consistency Criterion No. 1 regarding the project’s potential to result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of the ambient air quality standards or interim emission reductions in the AQMP, project-generated criteria air pollutant emissions were estimated and analyzed for significance and are addressed under the second impact criterion, below. Detailed results of this analysis are included in Appendix A of this report. As presented in Appendix A, project construction would not generate criteria air pollutant emissions that would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds. Furthermore, the project is not anticipated to generate substantial operational criteria air pollutant emissions.

The second criterion regarding the project’s potential to exceed the assumptions in the AQMP or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase is primarily assessed by determining consistency between the project’s land use designations and potential to generate population growth. In general, projects are considered consistent with and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP if the growth in socioeconomic factors is consistent with the underlying regional plans used to develop the AQMP (per Consistency Criterion No. 2 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook). The SCAQMD primarily uses demographic growth forecasts for various socioeconomic categories (e.g., population, housing, employment by industry) developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) (SCAG 2016), which is based on general plans for cities and counties in the SSAB, for the development of the AQMP emissions inventory (SCAQMD 2017).¹ The SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS, and associated Regional Growth Forecast, are generally consistent with the local plans; therefore, the 2016 AQMP is generally consistent with local government plans.

The project site is zoned W-2 (Controlled Development). The W-2 zone permits agricultural uses and standard-length golf courses. As no change is required in the project site’s zoning, and the project provides largely open space as does the existing agricultural use, there will be no change in the project’s underlying land use. Thus, the project does not include a change in zoning designation and no housing is proposed. Accordingly, the project is consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS forecasts used in the SCAQMD AQMP development and does not propose activities that would induce additional population in the project area.

In summary, the project would involve the construction of a new golf course. The project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new

¹ Information necessary to produce the emission inventory for the SSAB is obtained from the SCAQMD and other governmental agencies, including the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the California Department of Transportation, and SCAG. Each of these agencies is responsible for collecting data (e.g., industry growth factors, socioeconomic projections, travel activity levels, emission factors, emission speciation profile, and emissions) and developing methodologies (e.g., model and demographic forecast improvements) required to generate a comprehensive emissions inventory. SCAG incorporates these data into its Travel Demand Model for estimating/projecting vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and driving speeds. SCAG’s socioeconomic and transportation activities projections in their 2016 RTP/SCS are integrated in the 2016 AQMP (SCAQMD 2017).

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

violations, or conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 1. Given the nature of the activity uses associated with the project are consistent with the existing land use, the project would not change the population, housing, or employment forecast considered by SCAG and SCAQMD in their regional planning documents. Therefore, the project would not generate growth or change or affect the existing zoning or land use designations in project area and would not conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 2. Accordingly, impacts relating to the project’s potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2016 AQMP would be less than significant.

b) Proposed construction activities would result in the temporary addition of pollutants to the local airshed caused by on-site sources (i.e., off-road construction equipment and soil disturbance) and off-site sources (i.e., on-road haul trucks, delivery trucks, and worker vehicle trips). Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity; the specific type of operation; and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions. Therefore, such emission levels can only be approximately estimated with a corresponding uncertainty in precise ambient air quality impacts.

Table 1 presents the estimated maximum daily construction emissions generated during construction of the project. The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod. Refer to Appendix A for further details.

Table 1. Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

Year	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
	<i>Pounds per day</i>					
2021	4.26	46.45	31.55	0.06	10.67	6.43
2022	3.69	38.89	29.66	0.06	5.25	3.12
2023	1.60	14.52	16.52	0.03	0.79	0.68
Maximum Daily Emissions	4.26	46.45	31.55	0.06	10.67	6.43
<i>SCAQMD Threshold</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>55</i>
Threshold exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM₁₀ = coarse particulate matter; PM_{2.5} = fine particulate matter; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District. See Appendix A for detailed results.

These estimates reflect control of fugitive dust (watering two times daily) required by SCAQMD Rule 403, which is shown in the “mitigated” portion of the CalEEMod output.

As shown in Table 1, daily construction emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5} during project construction. Notably, the project would be required to adhere with SCAQMD Rule 403 to reduce fugitive dust emissions. Therefore, project construction would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions of nonattainment pollutants, and impacts would be less than significant.

Operation of the project would generate criteria pollutant emissions from mobile sources (vehicular traffic), area sources (consumer products, landscaping equipment), and energy sources (electrical consumption). CalEEMod was used to estimate daily emissions from project-related operational sources. Table 2 summarizes the operational emissions from the daily mobile, energy, and area emissions of criteria pollutants that would be generated from the project and are compared to the SCAQMD operational thresholds. Complete details of the emissions calculations are provided in Appendix A.

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

Table 2. Estimated Maximum Daily Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

Emission Source	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
	Pounds per day					
Area	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Energy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile	1.33	1.37	9.26	0.02	1.88	0.51
Total	1.34	1.37	9.26	0.02	1.88	0.51
<i>SCAQMD Threshold</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>55</i>
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM₁₀ = coarse particulate matter; PM_{2.5} = fine particulate matter; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; <0.01 = value less than reported 0.01.

See Appendix A complete results.

The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod.

As shown in Table 2, maximum daily operational emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} generated by the project would not exceed the SCAQMD's significance thresholds. As previously discussed, the SSAB has been designated as a federal and state nonattainment area for O₃ and PM₁₀. The nonattainment status is the result of cumulative emissions from various sources of air pollutants and their precursors within the SSAB, including motor vehicles, off-road equipment, and commercial and industrial facilities. Construction and operational activities of the project would generate VOC and NO_x emissions (precursors to O₃) and emissions of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. However, as indicated in Tables 1 and 2, project-generated emissions resulting from construction and operations would not exceed the SCAQMD emission-based significance thresholds for VOCs, NO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}.

Cumulative localized impacts would potentially occur if a project were to occur concurrently with another off-site project. Schedules for potential future projects near the project component areas are currently unknown; therefore, potential impacts associated with two or more simultaneous projects would be considered speculative.² However, future projects would be subject to CEQA and would require air quality analysis and, where necessary, mitigation. Criteria air pollutant emissions associated with construction activity of future projects would be reduced through implementation of control measures required by the SCAQMD. Cumulative PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions would be reduced because all future projects would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), which sets forth general and specific requirements for all sites in the SCAQMD. In addition, cumulative VOC emissions would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings).

Therefore, project operations would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions of nonattainment pollutants, and impacts would be less than significant during operation.

c) People most likely to be affected by air pollution include children, the elderly, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. According to the SCAQMD, sensitive receptors include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, long-term healthcare facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, and retirement homes (SCAQMD 1993). The nearest sensitive-receptor land uses differ for each of the four proposed sites, with the closest (single-family residences) immediately adjacent to the La Palma site to the south.

² The CEQA Guidelines state that if a particular impact is too speculative for evaluation, the agency should note its conclusion and terminate discussion of the impact (14 CCR 15145).

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

A Localized Significance Threshold (LST) analysis has been prepared to determine potential impacts to nearby sensitive receptors during construction of the project. SCAQMD recommends the evaluation of localized NO₂, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} impacts as a result of construction activities to sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The impacts were analyzed using methods consistent with those in the SCAQMD’s Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology (2009). According to the Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, “off-site mobile emissions from the project should not be included in the emissions compared to the LSTs” (SCAQMD 2009). Hauling of soils and construction materials associated with the project construction are not expected to cause substantial air quality impacts to sensitive receptors along off-site roadways. Emissions from the trucks would be relatively brief in nature and would cease once the trucks pass through the main streets.

Construction activities associated with the project would result in temporary sources of on-site fugitive dust and construction equipment emissions. Off-site emissions from vendor trucks, haul trucks, and worker vehicle trips are not included in the LST analysis. The maximum allowable daily emissions that would satisfy the SCAQMD localized significance criteria for SRA 30 are presented in Table 3 and compared to the maximum daily on-site construction emissions generated during the project, which are rounded up to the nearest whole number.

Table 3. Localized Significance Thresholds Analysis for Project Construction

Pollutant	Project Construction Emissions (pounds/day)	LST Criteria (pounds/day)	Exceeds LST?
NO ₂	38.84	840	No
CO	29.04	29,484	No
PM ₁₀	5.08	240	No
PM _{2.5}	3.07	96	No

Source: SCAQMD 2009.

Notes:

NO₂ = nitrogen dioxide; CO = carbon monoxide; PM₁₀ = coarse particulate matter; PM_{2.5} = fine particulate matter; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District. See Appendix A for detailed results.

Localized significance thresholds are shown for 4-acre area of disturbance per day corresponding to a distance to a sensitive receptor of 500 meters for SRA 30 (Coachella Valley). These estimates reflect control of fugitive dust required by Rule 403.

As shown in Table 3, construction activities would not generate emissions in excess of site-specific LSTs; therefore, site-specific construction impacts during construction of the project would remain less than significant.

Health Impacts of Toxic Air Contaminants

In addition to impacts from criteria pollutants, project impacts may include emissions of pollutants identified by the state and federal government as toxic air contaminants (TACs) or hazardous air pollutants. State law has established the framework for California’s TAC identification and control program, which is generally more stringent than the federal program and aimed at TACs that are a problem in California. The state has formally identified more than 200 substances as TACs, including the federal hazardous air pollutants, and is adopting appropriate control measures for sources of these TACs. The following measures are required by state law to reduce diesel particulate emissions:

- Fleet owners of mobile construction equipment are subject to the CARB Regulation for In-Use Off-road Diesel Vehicles (Title 13 California Code of Regulations, Chapter 9, Section 2449),

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

the purpose of which is to reduce diesel particulate matter (DPM) and criteria pollutant emissions from in-use (existing) off-road diesel-fueled vehicles.

- All commercial diesel vehicles are subject to Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations, limiting engine idling time. Idling of heavy-duty diesel construction equipment and trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to 5 minutes; electric auxiliary power units should be used whenever possible.

The greatest potential for TAC emissions during construction would be diesel particulate emissions from heavy equipment operations and heavy-duty trucks during construction of the project and the associated health impacts to sensitive receptors. The closest sensitive receptors is an existing residence located 1.7 miles east of the project site. Total project construction would last approximately 18 months, after which project-related TAC emissions would cease. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, health risk assessments (which determine the exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic emissions) should be based on a 30-year exposure period for the maximally exposed individual receptor; however, such assessments should also be limited to the period/duration of activities associated with the project. An 18-month construction schedule represents a short duration of exposure (5% of a 30-year exposure period) while cancer and chronic risk from DPM are typically associated with long-term exposure. Thus, the project would not result in a long-term source of TAC emissions.

No residual TAC emissions and corresponding cancer risk are anticipated after construction, and no long-term sources of TAC emissions are anticipated during operation of the project. Thus, the project would not result in a long-term (i.e., 9-year, 30-year, or 70-year) source of TAC emissions. Therefore, the exposure of project-related TAC emission impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

Health Impacts of Carbon Monoxide

Traffic-congested roadways and intersections have the potential to generate localized high levels of CO. Localized areas where ambient concentrations exceed federal and/or state standards for CO are termed “CO hotspots.” The transport of CO is extremely limited, as it disperses rapidly with distance from the source. Under certain extreme meteorological conditions, however, CO concentrations near a congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthy levels, affecting sensitive receptors. Typically, high CO concentrations are associated with severely congested intersections operating at an unacceptable level of service (LOS) (LOS E or worse is unacceptable). Projects contributing to adverse traffic impacts may result in the formation of a CO hotspot. Additional analysis of CO hotspot impacts would be conducted if a project would result in a significant impact or contribute to an adverse traffic impact at a signalized intersection that would potentially subject sensitive receptors to CO hotspots.

As discussed in Appendix A, CO concentrations at intersections would not exceed the 1-hour or 8-hour CO CAAQS unless projected daily traffic would be at least over 100,000 vehicles per day. Because operation of the project would not increase daily traffic volumes at any study intersection to more than 100,000 vehicles per day, a CO hotspot is not anticipated to occur, and associated impacts would be less than significant. In addition, due to continued improvement in vehicular emissions at a rate faster than the rate of vehicle growth and/or congestion, the potential for CO hotspots in the SSAB is steadily decreasing. Based on these considerations, the project would result in a less than significant impact to air quality with regard to potential CO hotspots. Refer to Appendix A for further details.

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

d) The occurrence and severity of potential odor impacts depends on numerous factors. The nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; the wind speeds and direction; and the sensitivity of receiving location each contribute to the intensity of the impact. Although offensive odors seldom cause physical harm, they can be annoying and cause distress among the public and generate citizen complaints.

Odors would be potentially generated from vehicles and equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project. Potential odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment, architectural coatings, and asphalt pavement application. Such odors would disperse rapidly from the project site and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect substantial numbers of people. Therefore, impacts associated with odors during construction would be less than significant.

Land uses and industrial operations associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food-processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding (SCAQMD 1993). The project entails operation of a new golf course, which would not result in the creation of a land use that is commonly associated with odors. Therefore, project operations would result in an odor impact that is less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:

7. 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?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

Biological Resources Assessment (Appendix B)

County of Riverside. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan – Multipurpose Open Space Element. Accessed July 2021. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/general_Plan_2017/elements/OCT17/Ch05_MO_SE_120815.pdf?ver=2017-10-11-102103-833.

CVAG (Coachella Valley Association of Governments). 2016. *Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan*. As amended August 2016. Accessed October 2021. http://www.cvmshcp.org/Plan_Documents_old.htm#plan.

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located within the CVMSHCP area. The project site is not located within any CVMSHCP conservation areas; however, it is adjacent to the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains Conservation Area. A fee is required for all projects located within the CVMSHCP plan area. With payment of this fee and adherence to Land Use Adjacency Guidelines in Section 4.5 of the CVMSHCP, the project would be consistent with the CVMSHCP. As such, mitigation measure (MM) **MM-BIO-1** and **MM-BIO-2** would be incorporated to reduce potential impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

b-c) A Biological Resources Assessment (Appendix B) was prepared for the project in October 2021. Appendix B presents the existing conditions of the project site and any special-status biological resources on the project site and within a 500-foot buffer where access was granted. For the biological resources assessment prepared, “special-status” species are those that are (1) listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act; (2) listed or candidates for listing as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act; (3) state fully protected species; (4) CDFW Species of Special Concern; (5) Fish and Game Code Section 4000 fur-bearing animal; (6) species listed on the California Native Plant Society’s (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants with a California Rare Plant Rank of 1B or 2B; or (7) species requiring additional surveys under the CVMSHCP (CVAG 2016).

On September 17, 2021, a Dudek biologist conducted a general reconnaissance survey of the project site. The potential for special-status plant and wildlife species to occur within the project site was evaluated based on the vegetation communities, soils present, and surrounding features.

As stated in Appendix B, five bird species were detected within the project site: American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), northern mockingbird (*Mimus polygottos*), mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), greater roadrunner (*Geococcyx californianus*), and a swallow (*Hirundo* spp.). No nests were observed during the

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

survey. Additionally, no amphibian species were observed during the survey. Two reptile species were observed within the project site, including common side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana*) and desert spiny lizard (*Sceloporus magister*). Two mammal species were detected during the survey: coyote (*Canis latrans*) and California ground squirrel (*Otospermophilus beecheyi*). Lastly, no invertebrate species were observed during the survey. Wildlife species observed within the study area are listed in Appendix B.

Special-Status Plants

No federally or state-listed plant species have a potential to occur within the project site. There are no special-status plant species with a moderate or high potential to occur. Therefore, the project would not result in direct or indirect impacts to special-status plant species. Impacts would be less than significant.

Special-Status Wildlife

As discussed in Appendix B, no listed or non-listed special-status wildlife species were incidentally observed during the August and September 2021 surveys. Two federally and state-listed species have a low potential to occur. Peninsular bighorn sheep has a low potential to occur within the project site, and the Mojave desert tortoise has a low potential to occur in the project site area, but is not expected to occur on the project site. Both species are covered under the CVMSHCP. Two non-listed species have a moderate potential to occur within the project site. Burrowing owl has a moderate potential to occur in the project site, and western yellow bat has a moderate potential to forage in the project site and a moderate potential to roost in the project site area. These species are covered under the CVMSHCP. No other non-listed species have a moderate or high potential to occur within the project site.

In addition, Palm Springs pocket mouse and Palm Springs round-tailed ground squirrel have a moderate potential to occur within the project site area due to the presence of suitable creosote bush scrub habitat; however, are not expected to occur within the proposed project footprint. Both species are covered under the CVMSHCP. Finally, pallid bat is not expected to roost; however, this species has a moderate potential to forage in the project site area. This species is not covered under the CVMSHCP.

Birds

One non-listed special-status species, burrowing owl, has a moderate potential to occur within the project site. This species is covered by the CVMSHCP; therefore, with consistency with the CVMSHCP, including payment of the CVMSHCP development mitigation fee (Mitigation Measure BIO-1) and adherence to the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (Mitigation Measure BIO-2), there would be no significant direct or indirect impacts to this special-status wildlife species. This species is also protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code Section 3516, which protect nesting birds. Implementation of **MM-BIO-3** and **MM-BIO-4** would reduce potential direct and indirect impacts to less than significant.

Mammals

Peninsular Bighorn Sheep

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

One federally and state-listed species, Peninsular bighorn sheep has a low potential to occur within the project site; however, this species is covered under the CVMSHCP. Therefore, with consistency with the CVMSHCP, including payment of the CVMSHCP development mitigation fee (**MM-BIO-1**) and adherence to the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (**MM-BIO-2**), there would be no significant direct or indirect impacts to Peninsular bighorn sheep.

Western Yellow Bat

One non-listed species, western yellow bat, has a moderate potential to forage within the project site, and a moderate potential to roost in the project site area (i.e., no roosting habitat is present within the project footprint); however, this species is covered under the CVMSHCP. Therefore, with consistency with the CVMSHCP, including payment of the CVMSHCP development mitigation fee (**MM-BIO-1**) and adherence to the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (**MM-BIO-2**), there would be no significant direct or indirect impacts to western yellow bat.

Pallid Bat

One non-listed species not covered under the CVMSHCP, pallid bat, has a moderate potential to forage in the project site area, and impacts could be potentially significant absent of mitigation. This species is not expected to roost or forage within the project footprint; therefore, the proposed project would not result in direct impacts (i.e., loss of foraging habitat). Indirect impacts to pallid bat within the project site that could occur during construction and operation of the project include an dust, increase in human activity and noise, and lights, especially at night. Adherence and implementation of **MM-BIO-2** would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

Palm Springs pocket mouse and Palm Springs Round-Tailed Ground Squirrel

Two non-listed species, Palm Springs pocket mouse and Palm Springs round-tailed ground squirrel, are not expected to occur within the proposed project footprint due to absence of suitable habitat; therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in direct impacts to these species. However, these species have a moderate potential to occur within the project site area due to the presence of suitable creosote bush scrub habitat. These species are covered under the CVMSHCP; therefore, with consistency with the CVMSHCP, including payment of the CVMSHCP development mitigation fee (**MM-BIO-1**) and adherence to the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (**MM-BIO-2**), there would be no significant direct or indirect impacts to these species.

Therefore, impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation.

d) Wildlife corridors are linear features that connect large patches of natural open space and provide avenues for the migration of animals. Habitat linkages are small patches that join larger blocks of habitat and help reduce the adverse effects of habitat fragmentation; they may be continuous habitat or discrete habitat islands that function as steppingstones for wildlife dispersal. Wildlife movement within the project site is unlikely due to the surrounding active agriculture to the north, east, and southeast of the project site that extends for several miles in all three directions. However, the area west of the project site and the surrounding environment consist of open desert scrub habitat that likely function as open habitat but do not function as a corridor for wildlife. Furthermore, the CVMSHCP addresses regional wildlife linkages and crossings, and the project site is not within a designated linkage. Refer to Appendix B for further details. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

e) As stated in Appendix B, the project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified by CDFW or USFWS. However, the project includes creosote bush wash, which is a natural community covered under the CVMSHCP. The study area buffer also includes blue palo verde–ironwood woodland alliance that is associated with an ephemeral drainage within the eastern portion of the study area buffer, but outside of the project footprint. To comply with the CVMSHCP, development fees will be required to mitigate habitat loss. Therefore, with compliance with the CVMSHCP, including payment of the CVMSHCP development mitigation fee and adherence to the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, there would be no significant impacts to special-status vegetation communities, and the project would not be in conflict with the CVMSHCP. As such, **MM-BIO-1** and **MM-BIO-2** would be incorporated reduce potential impacts. Refer to Appendix B for further details. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

f) While a formal jurisdictional delineation was not conducted, Dudek biologists surveyed both the northwestern and southeastern portions of the project site during the field reconnaissance survey for any evidence of streams that appear in the National Hydrography Dataset. No streams/waters were observed at either of these locations. Both locations ran through developed agricultural areas. Refer to Appendix B for further details.

The project site contains a man-made stock pond/reservoir. This feature is isolated and was created in uplands; therefore, would not be regulated by the USACE. However, this feature may be regulated as a non-wetland waters of the State under the RWQCB and potential jurisdictional streambed under CDFW. In addition, there is a unvegetated wash and river bottom located within the eastern project site area and flows south to north. This natural ephemeral feature may be regulated as a non-wetland waters of the U.S under USACE and State under the RWQCB, and jurisdictional streambed under CDFW.

If the project impacts waters and streams that are regulated under Section 404 of the federal CWA, California’s Porter-Cologne Act, and California Fish and Game Code, permits would be required from each of the regulatory agencies. The USACE regulates discharge dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including jurisdictional wetlands. The RWQCB regulates waters of the state under the California’s Porter-Cologne Act. California Fish and Game Code Sections 1600–1616 give CDFW regulatory powers over streams and lakes, as well as vegetation associated with these features. Permits are required from each of the regulatory agencies and typically entail providing mitigation to offset the impacts and loss of beneficial uses and functions and values to the jurisdictional waters and habitats. A Water Quality Certification is required from the RWQCB pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA (401 Certification) for any federal action, including a 404 permit; therefore, an application for a 401 Certification must be submitted to the RWQCB. A Streambed Alteration Agreement would be required for impacts to jurisdictional streambed under CDFW.

The unvegetated wash along the eastern boundary of the project lies outside of the proposed project footprint; therefore, implementation of the project will not have any substantial adverse effects on the unvegetated wash. Implementation of **MM-BIO-5** would reduce any potential indirect impacts to the unvegetated wash to less than significant. Refer to Appendix B for further details. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation.

g) The project site is located within the County of Riverside. General Plan policies OS 9.3 and OS 9.4 protect native trees, natural vegetation, stands of established trees, oak trees and other features for

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

ecosystem, aesthetic, and water conservation purposes within the County (County of Riverside 2015). The project would remove onsite fruit trees; however, the project would not remove or effect any protected trees located on or adjacent to the project site. The project would comply with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources. Therefore, project activities would have no impact related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

Mitigation:

MM-BIO-1 As a signatory to the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, the County of Riverside shall require a local development mitigation fee prior to the issuance of building permits for the proposed use on the project site at the rates applicable at the time of payment of the fee as set forth in the most recent fee schedule. The project applicant shall be required to provide documentation to the County of Riverside confirming the payment of the local development mitigation fee.

MM-BIO-2 The project applicant shall implement the following Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan [CVMSHCP], Section 4.5) to minimize and avoid indirect effects from development adjacent to conservation areas (i.e., Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains Conservation Area), where applicable:

- **Drainage:** Proposed Development adjacent to or within a Conservation Area shall incorporate plans to ensure that the quantity and quality of runoff discharged to the adjacent Conservation Area is not altered in an adverse way when compared with existing conditions. Stormwater systems shall be designed to prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials, or other elements that might degrade or harm biological resources or ecosystem processes within the adjacent Conservation Area.
- **Toxics:** Land uses proposed adjacent to or within a Conservation Area that use chemicals or generate bioproducts such as manure that are potentially toxic or may adversely affect wildlife and plant species, habitat, or water quality shall incorporate measures to ensure that application of such chemicals does not result in any discharge to the adjacent Conservation Area.
- **Lighting:** For proposed development adjacent to or within a Conservation Area, lighting shall be shielded and directed toward the developed area. Landscape shielding or other appropriate methods shall be incorporated in project designs to minimize the effects of lighting adjacent to or within the adjacent Conservation Area in accordance with the guidelines to be included in the Implementation Manual.
- **Noise:** Proposed development adjacent to or within a Conservation Area that generates noise in excess of 75 A-weighted decibels sound equivalent level hourly shall incorporate setbacks, berms, or walls, as appropriate, to minimize the effects of noise on the adjacent Conservation Area in accordance with the guidelines to be included in the Implementation Manual.
- **Invasives:** Invasive, non-native plant species shall not be incorporated in the landscape for land uses adjacent to or within a Conservation Area. Landscape treatments within or adjacent to a Conservation Area shall incorporate native

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

plant materials to the maximum extent feasible; recommended native species are listed in Table 4-112 [CVMSHCP, Section 4.5.5]. The plants listed in Table 4-113 shall not be used within or adjacent to a Conservation Area. This list may be amended from time to time through a Minor Amendment with Wildlife Agency Concurrence.

- **Barriers:** Land uses adjacent to or within a Conservation Area shall incorporate barriers in individual project designs to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal trespass, or dumping in a Conservation Area. Such barriers may include native landscaping, rocks/boulders, fencing, walls and/or signage.
- **Grading/Land Development:** Manufactured slopes associated with site development shall not extend into adjacent land in a Conservation Area.

MM-BIO-3

To maintain compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code, if ground-disturbing and/or vegetation clearance activities are scheduled to occur during the avian nesting season (typically February 15 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey within the project impact footprint and a 500-foot buffer where legal access is granted around the disturbance footprint. Surveys shall be conducted within 3 days prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities.

If an active nest is detected during the nesting bird survey, avoidance buffers shall be implemented as determined by a qualified biologist (typically 300 feet for passerines and 500 feet for raptors and special-status species). The buffer shall be of a distance to ensure avoidance of adverse effects to the nesting bird by accounting for topography, ambient conditions, species, nest location, and activity type. All nests shall be monitored as determined by the qualified biologist until nestlings have fledged and dispersed or it is confirmed that the nest has been unsuccessful or abandoned. The qualified biologist shall halt all construction activities within proximity to an active nest if it is determined that the activities are harassing the nest and may result in nest abandonment or take. The qualified biologist shall also have the authority to require implementation of avoidance measures related to noise, vibration, or light pollution if indirect impacts are resulting in harassment of the nest.

MM-BIO-4

Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owls shall be completed within areas of suitable habitat (i.e., flatter portions of the site) in accordance with the *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012), with the first survey no less than 14 days prior to initiation of project-related activities, and the second within 24 hours of project-related activities. If an active burrowing owl burrow is detected within 500 feet of the impact footprint, avoidance and minimization measures shall be implemented in accordance with the *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* guidelines or agreed upon by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, including implementation of a non-disturbance buffer and monitoring of the nest to ensure activities are not adversely affecting the nest. If the project will occur within this zone, then work must occur outside the nesting season, or until it can be shown that the birds have finished nesting, at which point passive relocation may occur.

MM-BIO-5

If jurisdictional waters that are regulated under Section 404 of the federal CWA, California’s Porter-Cologne Act, and California Fish and Game Code are impacted as

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

a result of project implementation, appropriate permits shall be obtained from the regulatory agencies, including USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW.

All mitigation measures and conditions contained within the permits shall be implemented. At a minimum, the following shall be completed for mitigation for impacts to waters of the state and jurisdictional streambed:

- **Compensation for Permanent Impacts:** Permanent impacts to waters of the state and jurisdictional streambeds shall be offset by compensation at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio, or as otherwise required by the respective permits.
- **Temporary Impacts:** All areas temporarily impacted shall be restored to native grade and contour and revegetated with native species as determined by an adjacent reference site or through documentation of baseline conditions prior to impacts.
- **Best Management Practices:** Avoided jurisdictional waters shall be fenced or flagged as environmentally sensitive areas. Best management practices shall be implemented to avoid indirect impacts to jurisdictional waters, including the following:
 - i. Vehicles and equipment shall not be operated in ponded or flowing water except as described in the permits.
 - ii. Water containing mud, silt, or other pollutants from grading or other activities shall not be allowed to enter jurisdictional waters or be placed in locations that may be subjected to high storm flows.
 - iii. Spoil sites shall not be located within 30 feet from the boundaries of jurisdictional waters or in locations that may be subject to high storm flows, where spoils might be washed back into drainages.
 - iv. Raw cement/concrete or washings thereof, asphalt, paint or other coating material, oil or other petroleum products, or any other substances that could be hazardous to vegetation or wildlife resources resulting from Project-related activities shall be prevented from contaminating the soil and/or entering avoided jurisdictional waters.
 - v. No equipment maintenance shall occur within 150 feet of jurisdictional waters and no petroleum products or other pollutants from the equipment will be allowed to enter these areas or enter any off-site state-jurisdictional waters under any flow.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. Historic Resources				
a) Alter or destroy a historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Cultural Report (Appendix C)

Findings of Fact:

a-b) A cultural resources records search, review of literature and archival resources (historic maps, aerial photographs, topographic maps) and a pedestrian field survey were conducted for the project site. The CHRIS records search identified 17 previously recorded cultural resources within the 1-mile records search buffer; none of these resources intersect, overlap or are adjacent to the project site. Of the 17 previously recorded cultural resources identified within the records search area, 12 are prehistoric archaeological sites and five are prehistoric isolates. No historic sites were identified within the records search area of the project site or the 1-mile radius. The review of historic topographic maps and aerial photographs shows the project site as vacant and undeveloped within an alluvial fan as early as 1950 and transformation of the property for agricultural use since at least 1989. No newly identified cultural resources were found within the project site as a result of the intensive-level pedestrian survey completed on July 23, 2021. No newly or previously recorded historic sites were identified within the project site as a result of the CHRIS records search, archival research, or the intensive-level pedestrian survey. There is no evidence to demonstrate that the project would alter, destroy or adversely affect a historic site. Therefore, impacts associated with substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 would be 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
9. Archaeological Resources				
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Cultural Report (Appendix C)

Findings of Fact:

a-c) A cultural resources records search, review of literature and archival resources (historic maps, aerial photographs, topographic maps) and a field survey were conducted for the project site. The CHRIS records search identified 17 previously recorded cultural resources within the 1-mile records search buffer. None of these resources intersect, overlap or are adjacent to the project site and the

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

closest archaeological resource is located approximately 360 m (1181 ft.) west of the project site. Additionally, 11 cultural resources studies have been conducted within the 1-mile search radius of the project site between 1980 and 2011; one of which overlaps a portion of the project site. Of the 17 previously recorded cultural resources identified within the records search area, 12 are prehistoric archaeological sites and five are prehistoric isolates. No historic archaeological sites were identified within the project site or within a 1-mile radius. None of the identified resources have been formally evaluated for eligibility of listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). Although located outside the 1-mile records search area, it is important to mention the Fish Traps Archaeological Site, is located approximately 2 miles northwest and at a 300-400 foot higher elevation than the project site. The fish traps site consists of three rows of shallow pits along the ancient shoreline of Lake Cahuilla. Along these rows, there are about 40 stone features that are dug into the lower mountain slopes that are approximately 10 feet in diameter. It is believed that these pits were created and utilized by the Cahuilla tribe for fishing purposes based on the location of the pits in relation to the water mark line of the ancient Lake Cahuilla shoreline. The review of historic topographic maps and aerial photographs shows the project site as vacant and undeveloped within an alluvial fan as early as 1950 and transformation of the property for agricultural use since at least 1989. No newly identified cultural resources were found within the project site as a result of the intensive-level pedestrian survey completed on July 23, 2021. Evidence of disturbances within the project site consisted of irrigation features for agricultural purposes, grading for dirt access roads and pathways in between the orchard rows, including earthen berms overlaid with large boulders that delineate the boundaries for each of the three parcels. A review of the geotechnical report prepared for the project site determined that all areas investigated consist of fill or disturbed soils within the top 2 feet. The presence of fill soils demonstrates that the native soils upon and within which cultural deposits would exist in context could not be observed during the survey.

No newly or previously recorded cultural resources were identified within the project site as a result of the CHRIS records search, archival research, or the intensive-level pedestrian survey. However, given that the project site has not been subjected to significant previous ground disturbance below fill soils and in consideration of the known sensitivity of the surrounding area for prehistoric resources, the potential of encountering unknown cultural resources during ground disturbing activities associated with the project is considered low within fill soils and moderate within native soils.

Therefore,

- a) the potential for unknown archaeological resources to be altered or destroyed by proposed Project impacts is low to moderate.
- b) the potential for unknown archaeological resources to be adversely affected by proposed Project impacts is low to moderate.
- c) the potential exists for unknown human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries to be disturbed is low to moderate.

Considering the potential sensitivity for archaeological resources, mitigation measures **MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-4** are required to reduce potential impacts and for potential sensitivity of human remains, mitigation measure **MM-CUL-5** is required to reduce potential impacts. With incorporation of MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-5, impacts associated with the inadvertent discovery of unknown archaeological resources and human remains would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation:

MM-CUL-1 Prior to commencement of construction activities for all phases of Project implementation, the Project applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology, to prepare a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP). The WEAP shall be submitted to the County for review and approval. All construction personnel and monitors who are not trained archaeologists shall be briefed regarding inadvertent discoveries prior to the start of construction activities. A basic presentation and handout or pamphlet shall be prepared in order to ensure proper identification and treatment of inadvertent discoveries. The purpose of the Workers Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training is to provide specific details on the kinds of archaeological materials that may be identified during construction of the project and explain the importance of and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. Each worker shall also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event that cultural resources or human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include work curtailment or redirection, and the immediate contact of the site supervisor and archaeological monitoring and if appropriate, Tribal representative. Necessity of training attendance should be stated on all construction plans.

MM-CUL-2 Impacts to cultural resources should be minimized through implementation of pre- and post- construction tasks. Tasks pertaining to cultural resources include the development of a Construction Monitoring and Treatment Plan (CMTP). The purpose of the CMTP is to outline a program of monitoring procedures and protocols as well as treatment and mitigation in the case of an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during ground-disturbing phases (including but not limited to preconstruction site mobilization and testing, grubbing, removal of soils for remediation, construction ground disturbance, construction grading, trenching, and landscaping) and to provide for the proper identification, evaluation, treatment, and protection of any cultural resources throughout the duration of the Project. This CMTP should define the process to be followed for the identification and management of cultural resources in the Project area during construction. Existence of and importance of adherence to the CMTP should be stated on all Project site plans intended for use by those conducting the ground disturbing activities.

MM-CUL-3 A qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, and a Native American observer, preferably ancestrally connected to the general Project area, should monitor all initial ground disturbances. Initial ground disturbance is defined as initial construction-related earth moving of sediments from their place of deposition. As it pertains to archaeological and Native American monitoring, this definition excludes movement of sediments after they have been initially disturbed or displaced by current project-related construction. A County-qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, should oversee and adjust monitoring efforts as needed (increase, decrease, or discontinue spot monitoring frequency) based on the observed

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

potential for construction activities to encounter cultural deposits. The archaeological monitor should be responsible for maintaining monitoring logs. Following the completion of construction, the County-qualified archaeologist should provide an archaeological monitoring report to the County and the EIC with the results of the cultural monitoring program.

MM-CUL-4 In the event that archaeological resources (sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during construction activities for the Project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find should immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, can evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted. Depending upon the significance of the find under the California Environmental Quality Act (14 CCR 15064.5(f); California PRC Section 21082), the archaeologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work, such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, or data recovery, may be warranted. If the discovery is Native American in nature, consultation with and/or monitoring by a Tribal representative may be necessary.

MM-CUL-5 In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found, the County coroner shall be immediately notified of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County coroner has determined, within two working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the County coroner determines that the remains are, or are believed to be, Native American, he or she shall notify the NAHC in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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?

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

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

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact:

a) Construction of the project would require the use of electric power for as-necessary lighting and electronic equipment. The amount of electricity used during construction would be limited to energy demand that typically stems from the use of electrically powered construction equipment. This electricity demand would be temporary and would cease upon completion of construction; thus, the project would not adversely impact the available electricity supply. During construction, natural gas would typically not be consumed on the project site.

Petroleum would be consumed throughout construction of the project. Fuel consumed by construction equipment would be the primary energy resource expended over the course of construction. Vehicle miles traveled associated with the transportation of construction materials and construction worker commutes also would result in petroleum consumption. However, the project would be required to comply with CARB's Airborne Toxics Control Measure, which restricts heavy-duty diesel vehicle idling time to 5 minutes. In addition, the construction of the project would be a temporary, short-term activity, and any petroleum used during the construction phase would be used towards the development of the project; as such, petroleum use for construction would be relatively nominal and would not be wasteful or inefficient use of resources.

Under existing conditions, the project site uses energy as the site requires substantial irrigation for existing commercial agriculture onsite. The project would consist of a new golf course and would also require irrigation. However, the project would require less irrigation than under existing conditions. Additionally, the project does not propose new buildings; thus, no additional energy would be required for operation of the project. As such, the project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction or operation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) The project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction or operation. Therefore, no impacts associated with the potential of the project to conflict with a state or local renewable energy or energy efficiency plan would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project directly or indirectly:

11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones

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?

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

Source(s):

CDOC. 2021b. "Regulatory Maps." Accessed January 2021. <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=regulatorymaps>.

County of Riverside. 2019a. County of Riverside General Plan – Safety Element. Revised August 06, 2019. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/2019/elements/Ch06_Safety_080619.pdf

Findings of Fact:

a) The Alquist-Priolo Zones Special Studies Act defines active faults as those that have experienced surface displacement or movement during the last 11,000 years. As shown in Figure S-2, in the Safety Chapter of the County’s General Plan, the project site would not be located within an Alquist-Priolo Zone or a County designated fault hazard zone. The nearest Alquist-Priolo Zone is located approximately 13.9 miles east of the project site and the nearest County fault hazard zone is located approximately 14 miles east of the project site (County of Riverside 2019a). Furthermore, based on a review of the California Department of Conservation regulatory maps (CDOC 2021b), the project site is not located in a designated earthquake fault zone. Therefore, no impact associated with fault rupture would occur.

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. 2019a. County of Riverside General Plan – Safety Element. Revised August 06, 2019. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/2019/elements/Ch06_Safety_080619.pdf.

Findings of Fact:

a) Liquefaction occurs when partially saturated soil loses its effective stress and enters a liquid state, which can result in the soil’s inability to support structures above. Liquefaction can be induced by ground-shaking events and is dependent on soil saturation conditions. According to the County’s General Plan, the potential for liquefaction is low (County of Riverside 2019a). Additionally, based on a review of the California Department of Conservation regulatory maps (CDOC 2021b), the project site is located in an area that has not been evaluated for liquefaction. The project would largely be open space and does not propose any buildings. Therefore, impacts associated with liquefaction would be 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
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

13. Ground-shaking Zone				
a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact:

a) Similar to other areas located in the seismically active Southern California region, the County is susceptible to strong ground shaking during an earthquake. However, the project site is not located within an active fault zone, and the site would not be affected by ground shaking more than any other area in this seismic region. The project does not propose any habitable structures or other structural development intended for human occupancy. Therefore, the project would not directly or indirectly cause potential adverse effects involving strong seismic ground shaking, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

14. Landslide Risk				
a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2019a. County of Riverside General Plan – Safety Element. Revised August 06, 2019. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/2019/elements/Ch06_Safety_080619.pdf.

Findings of Fact:

a) As shown in Figure S-4 in the Safety Chapter of the County’s General Plan, the project site would not be located in an area susceptible to landslides. The project site is located approximately 0.3-mile east of areas that are considered low to locally moderate landslide zones (County of Riverside 2019a). The project would largely be open space and no buildings are proposed. Therefore, impact associated with landslides would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

15. Ground Subsidence				
a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2019a. County of Riverside General Plan – Safety Element. Revised August 06, 2019. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/2019/elements/Ch06_Safety_080619.pdf.

Geotechnical Report (Appendix D)

Findings of Fact:

a) Subsidence is the gradual, local setting or sinking of the earth’s surface with little or no horizontal motion. According to the County’s General Plan Safety Element, the project site is located in an area with documented subsidence (County of Riverside 2019a). A soil map prepared for the project identifies the soil composition of the site as Carsitas gravelly sand, 0 to 9 percent slopes (44.3%), Myoma fine sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes (35.7%), Carsitas cobbly sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes (15.2%), Carrizo stony sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes (4.9%). The properties of the onsite soils range from somewhat excessively drained to excessively drained (Appendix D). Soils like sand and gravel are less susceptible to shrinkage and growth as compared to clay soils. Additionally, the project would largely be open space and does not propose any new buildings that could be impacted by subsidence. Therefore, impacts would be 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): N/A

Findings of Fact:

a) A seiche is a wave that reverberates on the surface of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed basin, such as a reservoir, lake, bay, or harbor, in response to ground shaking during an earthquake. The closest body of water to the project site is Salton Sea, located approximately 7 miles east of the site. However, due to the distance between the site and Salton Sea, it is unlikely the project site would be susceptible to seiche. Additionally, the project site is not subject to mudflows due to the surrounding topography. Furthermore, the project would not be affected by geologic hazards such as volcanic hazards. Therefore, impacts would be 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
17. Slopes				
a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Geotechnical Report (Appendix D)

Findings of Fact:

a) The topography of the site is predominately flat. Once the site is cleared, a mass excavation company will perform the grading operations cutting and filling to a balanced site. Construction of the project would not result in a significant change to the site's topography. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) The project site is predominately flat and construction of the project would not include slopes. As discussed in Appendix D, if fill is required on slopes steeper than five horizontal to one vertical (5H:1V), all weak soil should be removed and these areas should be positively benched horizontally into competent soil in conjunction with fill placement. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) The project site is located in a rural area of Riverside County. Historically, the site has been used for agricultural purposes and has not supported any structures. While the project involves grading and excavations as part of construction, the project site is not connected to the sewer system and would not result in impacts to s subsurface sewage disposal system. Thus, no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

18. Soils				
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code (2019), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Geotechnical Report (Appendix D)

Findings of Fact:

a) The project involves construction and operation of a golf course. Construction activities would disturb surface soils and temporarily leave exposed soil on the ground's surface. Common causes of

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

soil erosion from construction sites include stormwater, wind, and soil being tracked off site by vehicles. To help curb erosion, project construction activities must comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations for erosion control. The project would be required to comply with standard regulations, including South Coast Air Quality Management District Rules 402 and 403, which would reduce construction erosion impacts. Rule 402 requires that dust suppression techniques be implemented to prevent dust and soil erosion from creating a nuisance off site (SCAQMD 1976). Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that it does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emissions source (SCAQMD 2005). Upon completion of construction, the project would sodded and sprigged with grass as well as landscaped. As such, impacts resulting from the loss of topsoil would be reduced as compared to existing conditions.

Because the project would disturb one or more acres of soil, the project is subject to the California State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit. Construction activities would be required to incorporate various temporary best management practices (BMPs) designed to prevent erosion and siltation during excavation activities. Additionally, upon completion of construction, all exposed areas would be landscaped. Therefore, impacts associated with soil erosion would be less than significant.

b) Expansive soils are characterized by their potential shrink/swell behavior. Shrink/swell is the change in volume (expansion and contraction) that occurs in certain fine-grained clay sediments from the cycle of wetting and drying. Clay minerals are known to expand with changes in moisture content. The higher the percentage of expansive minerals present in near-surface soils, the higher the potential for substantial expansion. A soil map prepared for the project identifies the soil composition of the site as Carsitas gravelly sand, 0 to 9 percent slopes (44.3%), Myoma fine sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes (35.7%), Carsitas cobbly sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes (15.2%), Carrizo stony sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes (4.9%). The properties of the onsite soils range from somewhat excessively drained to excessively drained (Appendix D). The soil onsite is not made up of clay materials typically associated with expansive soils. Therefore, the project would not create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property from being located on expansive soils. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) The project would not connect to the municipal sewer system, and no septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal system are proposed. Therefore, no impacts associated with septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

19. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.

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

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2019a. County of Riverside General Plan – Safety Element. Revised August 06, 2019. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/2019/elements/Ch06_Safety_080619.pdf.

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

Geotechnical Report (Appendix D)

Findings of Fact:

a) According to Figure S-8 in the Safety Element of the County’s General Plan, the project has a high wind erodibility rating (County of Riverside 2019a). The project would be influenced by wind erosion and blowsand issues during grading. Per the Geotechnical Report prepared for the project, the soils onsite are assigned to group 1 which are the most susceptible to wind erosion (Appendix D). However, the project would comply with any general conditions regarding dust control, project dust control plan and restricting grading to the project site and any Building and Safety Department Grading Section requirements. Upon completion of construction, the project site would largely be open space with landscaped areas. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Memorandum (Appendix A)

CARB. 2008. *Climate Change Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change*. December 2008. Accessed December 9, 2009. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/scopingplandocument.htm>.

CARB. 2014. *First Update to the AB 32 Scoping Plan: Building on the Framework*. Accessed February 3, 2021. https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2013_update/first_update_climate_change_scoping_plan.pdf.

CARB. 2017c. *The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update*. Accessed January 21, 2021. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/cc/scopingplan/2030sp_pp_final.pdf.

County of Riverside. 2019b. *Climate Action Plan Update*. Accessed on January 21, 2021. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/CAP/2019/2019_CAP_Update_Full.pdf.

SCAG. 2020. *The 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy of the Southern California Association of Governments, Connect SoCal*.

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

Findings of Fact:

a) Construction of the project would result in GHG emissions, which are primarily associated with use of off-road construction equipment, on-road vendor trucks, and worker vehicles. The total construction GHG emissions were calculated, amortized over 30 years, and added to the total operational emissions for comparison with the GHG significance threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year.

Construction of the project is anticipated to commence in third/fourth quarter of 2021. On-site sources of GHG emissions include off-road equipment, and off-site sources include vendor trucks and worker vehicles. Table 4 presents construction GHG emissions for the project in 2021, 2022, and 2023 from on-site and off-site emission sources.

Table 4. Estimated Annual Construction GHG Emissions

Year	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
	Metric Tons			
2021	99.14	0.03	<0.01	99.95
2022	378.49	0.10	<0.01	381.26
2023	74.54	0.02	<0.01	75.06
Total				556.27
Amortized over 30 years				18.54

Notes: CO₂ = carbon dioxide; CH₄ = methane; N₂O = nitrous oxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent; <0.01 = value less than reported 0.01. See Appendix A for complete results.

As shown in Table 4, the estimated total GHG emissions during construction would be approximately 556 MT CO₂e over the construction period. Estimated project-generated construction emissions amortized over 30 years would be approximately 19 MT CO₂e per year. As with project-generated construction air quality pollutant emissions, GHG emissions generated during construction of the project would be short-term in nature, lasting only for the duration of the construction period, and would not represent a long-term source of GHG emissions. As stated above, construction emissions are amortized and added to operational emissions to estimate total project-generated GHG emissions.

Operational Emissions

Operation of the project would generate GHG emissions through motor vehicle trips to and from the project site; landscape maintenance equipment operation; energy use (generation of electricity consumed by the project); solid waste disposal; and generation of electricity associated with water supply, treatment, and distribution and wastewater treatment.

Table 5. Estimated Annual Operational GHG Emissions

Emission Source	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
	Metric Tons			
Area	<0.01	0.00	0.00	<0.01
Energy (electricity)	0.48	<0.01	<0.01	0.49
Mobile	263.10	0.02	0.02	268.22
Solid waste	0.49	0.03	0.00	1.21

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

Table 5. Estimated Annual Operational GHG Emissions

Emission Source	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
	Metric Tons			
Water supply and wastewater	143.34	0.02	<0.01	144.86
	Total			414.78
	<i>Amortized Construction Emissions</i>			<i>18.54</i>
	Operation + Amortized Construction Total			433.32

Notes: CO₂ = carbon dioxide; CH₄ = methane; N₂O = nitrous oxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent; <0.01 = value less than reported 0.01. See Appendix A for complete results.

As shown in Table 5, the project would result in approximately 415 MT CO₂e per year as a result of project operations. After summing the project’s amortized construction emissions, total GHGs generated by the project would be approximately 433 MT CO₂e per year. As such, annual operational GHG emissions with amortized construction emissions would not exceed the County’s screening threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year. Therefore, the project’s GHG emissions would be less than significant.

b) Applicable plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions including the County of Riverside CAP, SCAG’s 2020 RTP/SCS, CARB’s Scoping Plan, SB 32, and Executive Order (EO) S-3-05. A consistency analysis with these regulations and plans are presented below:

Project Consistency with County of Riverside Climate Action Plan

The County of Riverside CAP, originally adopted in 2015 and updated in 2019 (County of Riverside 2019b), presents a comprehensive set of actions to reduce its internal and external GHG emissions to 15% below 2008 GHG emission levels by 2020, consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. The County provided the CAP update in November 2019 and was adopted on December 17, 2019. The CAP update builds upon the information gathered by the GHG inventories and forecasts emissions for 2030 and 2050. Projects below the screening threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year for GHGs are determined to be less than significant, and no further GHG analysis would be required. As presented in Table 5, the project would result in approximately 433 MT CO₂e per year. Therefore, the project does not conflict with any of the GHG-reducing measures of the GHG Reduction Plan, and thus, is consistent with this plan.

Project Consistency with 2020-2045 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal)

On September 3, 2020, SCAG’s Regional Council formally adopted the 2020 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal). The SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS is forecast to help California reach its GHG reduction goals by reducing GHG emissions from passenger cars by 8 percent below 2005 levels by 2020 and 19 percent by 2035 in accordance with the most recent CARB targets adopted in March 2018. The 2020 RTP/SCS includes ten goals focused on promoting economic prosperity, improving mobility, protecting the environment, and supporting healthy/complete communities. Furthermore, the 2020 RTP/SCS establishes a land use vision of center-focused placemaking, concentrating growth in and near Priority Growth Areas, transferring of development rights, urban greening, creating greenbelts and community separators, and implementing regional advance mitigation (SCAG 2020). As previously discussed, the project involves development of a new golf course, thus many of the goals within the 2020 RTP/SCS may not be applicable to the project. Furthermore, the project would not result in significant emissions or a substantial amount of vehicle trip generation or traffic distribution along area roadways. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any of the goals within SCAG’s 2020 RTP/SCS.

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

Project Consistency with CARB’s Scoping Plan

The Scoping Plan (approved by CARB in 2008 and updated in 2014 and 2017) provides a framework for actions to reduce California’s GHG emissions and requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and other initiatives to reduce GHGs. The Scoping Plan is not directly applicable to specific projects, nor is it intended to be used for project-level evaluations.³ Under the Scoping Plan, however, there are several state regulatory measures aimed at the identification and reduction of GHG emissions. CARB and other state agencies have adopted many of the measures identified in the Scoping Plan. Most of these measures focus on area source emissions (e.g., energy usage, high-GWP GHGs in consumer products) and changes to the vehicle fleet (i.e., hybrid, electric, and more fuel-efficient vehicles) and associated fuels (e.g., Low Carbon Fuel Standard), among others. To the extent that these regulations are applicable to the project, the project would comply will all regulations adopted in furtherance of the Scoping Plan to the extent required by law.

Project Consistency with Senate Bill 32 and Executive Order S-3-05

The project would not impede the attainment of the most recent state GHG reduction goals identified in SB 32 and EO S-3-05 and. SB 32 establishes a statewide goal of reducing GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030, while EO S-3-05 establishes a statewide goal of reducing GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. While there are no established protocols or thresholds of significance for that future year analysis, CARB forecasts that compliance with the current Scoping Plan puts the state on a trajectory of meeting these long-term GHG goals, although the specific path to compliance is unknown (CARB 2014).

CARB has expressed optimism with regard to both the 2030 and 2050 goals. It states in the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan that “California is on track to meet the near-term 2020 GHG emissions limit and is well positioned to maintain and continue reductions beyond 2020 as required by AB 32” (CARB 2014, p. ES2). With regard to the 2050 target for reducing GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels, the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan states the following (CARB 2014, p. 34):

This level of reduction is achievable in California. In fact, if California realizes the expected benefits of existing policy goals (such as 12,000 megawatts of renewable distributed generation by 2020, net zero energy homes after 2020, existing building retrofits under AB 758, and others) it could reduce emissions by 2030 to levels squarely in line with those needed in the developed world and to stay on track to reduce emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. Additional measures, including locally driven measures and those necessary to meet federal air quality standards in 2032, could lead to even greater emission reductions.

In other words, CARB believes that the state is on a trajectory to meet the 2030 and 2050 GHG reduction targets set forth in AB 32, EO B-30-15, and EO S-3-05. This is confirmed in the 2017 Scoping Plan, which states the following (CARB 2017):

The Scoping Plan builds upon the successful framework established by the Initial Scoping Plan and First Update, while also identifying new, technologically feasible, and

³ The Final Statement of Reasons for the amendments to the CEQA Guidelines reiterates the statement in the Initial Statement of Reasons that “[t]he Scoping Plan may not be appropriate for use in determining the significance of individual projects because it is conceptual at this stage and relies on the future development of regulations to implement the strategies identified in the Scoping Plan” (CNRA 2009).

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

cost-effective strategies to ensure that California meets its GHG reduction targets in a way that promotes and rewards innovation, continues to foster economic growth, and delivers improvements to the environment and public health, including in disadvantaged communities.

As discussed previously, the project is consistent with the SCAG’s 2020 RTP/SCS and CARB’s 2017 Scoping Plan, and would not conflict with the state’s trajectory toward future GHG reductions. In September 2018, EO B-55-18 was signed which commits the state to total carbon neutrality by 2045. However, since the specific path to compliance for the state in regards to the long-term goals will likely require development of technology or other changes that are not currently known or available, specific additional mitigation measures for the project would be speculative and cannot be identified at this time. The project’s consistency would assist in meeting the County’s contribution to GHG emission reduction targets in California.

With respect to future GHG targets under SB 32 and EO S-3-05, CARB has also made clear its legal interpretation is that it has the requisite authority to adopt whatever regulations are necessary, beyond the AB 32 horizon year of 2020, to meet SB 32’s 40% reduction target by 2030 and EO S-3-05’s 80% reduction target by 2050; this legal interpretation by an expert agency provides evidence that future regulations will be adopted to continue the state on its trajectory toward meeting these future GHG targets.

Summary

Based on the considerations previously outlined, the project would not generate substantial GHG emissions or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, and no mitigation is required. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source(s):

CalEPA (California Environmental Protection Agency). 2021. Cortese List: Section 65962.5(a). Accessed June 02, 2021. <https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/section-65962-5a/>.

DTSC (California Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2021. EnviroStor [database]. Accessed July 2021. <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>.

RWQCB (Regional Water Quality Control Board). 2010. Order No. R8-2010-0062. Accessed July 2021. <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/search.asp>.

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix E)

Findings of Fact:

a-b) A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the project on June 22, 2021. According to the Phase I ESA, during the project site reconnaissance, a portable restroom disposal pad that drains to a septic tank and leach field was found onsite. Although the leach field represents a conduit from the surface to the subsurface, no indication of illicit disposal or disposal of unintended materials such as pesticides or petroleum products was noted. The Phase I ESA also identified several areas of poor housekeeping along the eastern portion of the site. These included piles of pallet and wood storage, equipment storage on unpaved ground, and staging of empty buckets and containers previously containing petroleum products. Staining was observed on the ground in proximity to several pieces of equipment in the eastern portion of the site, where vehicles or equipment had previously been stored, and near several empty buckets. These stains were concentrated in the eastern portion of the site. However, it is unlikely a regulatory agency would require an investigation based on the surficial nature and extent of these stains.

In addition, two deep water production wells are located on the site and are used to fill the on-site irrigation reservoir. Water from these wells is processed through a filtration system and diverted to the reservoir. The wells represent conduits from the surface to the subsurface through which contaminants could be introduced to the aquifer below. However, no evidence of materials (hazardous or otherwise) being injected or put into the wells was observed. Lastly, aerial photographs indicated that portions of the site or adjacent properties were cleared in the 1980s for agricultural use, including mango, grape, and lemon farming. It is likely that pesticides or herbicides (considered hazardous substances) were used on-site; however, no indication of improper pesticide/herbicide usage/application was identified in the Phase I ESA (Appendix E). These conditions identified in the Phase I ESA generally do not present a threat to human health or the environment and generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies.

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

Construction and operation of the project would require the use of hazardous or potentially hazardous materials to be handled, transported, used, and disposed of both on and off the project site. These materials include gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricants, and other petroleum-based products used to operate and maintain construction and maintenance equipment and vehicles as well as fertilizers for ongoing maintenance. Potential impacts to public and the environment from accidental spills of small amounts of hazardous materials from construction equipment during construction could occur with the transport, use, or disposal of these materials. The materials used would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety or environmental hazard. Project construction workers would be trained in safe handling and hazardous materials use, as required. Activities at the project site, including those conducted by a contractor, shall comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding hazardous material use, storage, disposal, training, and transport to prevent project-related risks to public health and safety. All on-site generated waste that meets hazardous criteria shall be stored, manifested, transported, and disposed of in accordance with federal, state, and local requirements. Operation of the project would include use of minor quantities of commercially available hazardous materials, such as cleaning materials and landscaping maintenance materials. Handling, storage, and disposal of these hazardous materials would comply with all federal, state, and local requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) The project must comply with the County's EOP for both construction and operation. Construction activities would be required to implement adequate and appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through and around any required road closures in accordance with the County's EOP. Operation of the project would not interfere with the County's EOP because the project site entrance would remain accessible for emergency vehicles. The project applicant would be required to design, construct, and maintain the project to comply with applicable local, regional, state, and federal requirements related to emergency access and evacuation plans. Adherence to these requirements would ensure that potential impacts related to this issue remain insignificant. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) The closest school to the project site is Toro Canyon Middle School (86150 Avenue 66), located about 1.8 miles northeast from the site. As previously mentioned, during construction, any hazardous materials would be stored, handled, and disposed of in accordance with all federal, state, and local requirements. Upon completion of construction, the project would include a golf course and would largely contain open space. Thus, the project would not expose nearby schools to hazardous materials. No impact would occur.

e) The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese List) is a planning document providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop, at least annually, an updated Cortese List. The Department of Toxic Substances Control is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List. Other state and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous materials release information for the Cortese List (CalEPA 2021). A review of Cortese List online data resources does not identify hazardous materials or waste sites on or adjacent to the project site (DTSC 2021; RWQCB 2021). No impact would occur.

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
22. Airports				
a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

RCALUCP (Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan). 2006. Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Accessed July 2021. <http://www.rcaluc.org/Plans/New-Compatibility-Plan>.

Findings of Fact:

a-d) The closest public airport to the project site is Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport, which is located approximately 4.8 miles northeast of the project site. According to the Land Use Plan for the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport, the project is not located within an impact zone and is outside the airport planning area (RCALUCP 2006). Additionally, the closest private airstrip is Desert Air Sky Ranch-63CA, located approximately 18.4 miles east of the site. The project site is located outside of any airport impact zones, and as such, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area. The project would not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan and is not required to be reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:				
d) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk the release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2019a. County of Riverside General Plan – Safety Element. Revised August 06, 2019. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/2019/elements/Ch06_Safety_080619.pdf.

DWR (Department of Water Resources). 2021. Groundwater Basin Boundary Assessment Tool. Accessed July 19, 2021. <https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/bbat/>.

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). 2018. FEMA Flood Map Service Center. Accessed July 19, 2021. <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=lemon%20blossom%20lane%20#searchresultsanchor>.
Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) Case 18-09-0328P
Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel 06065C2925H Effective Date: March 6, 2018

UWMP (Urban Water Management Plan). 2016. Coachella Valley Water District 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Adopted July, 1, 2016. Accessed August 5, 2021. <https://www.cvwd.org/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/516>.

Findings of Fact:

a) Because the project would result in more than 1 acre of ground disturbance, the project would be subject to the NPDES stormwater program, which includes obtaining coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board’s Construction General Permit. Construction activities subject to the Construction General Permit include clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation. The Construction General Permit requires development and implementation of a SWPPP. Among the required items that must be included within a SWPPP are project design features intended to protect against substantial soil erosion as a result of water and wind erosion, commonly known as BMPs. The implementation of a Construction General Permit, including preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of BMPs, would reduce stormwater runoff during project construction impacts to acceptable levels. It follows that because construction of the project would not violate any

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

water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, the project would not otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) The project site is located within the Coachella Valley Groundwater Basin (DWR 2021). The project would use only limited amounts of water resources for construction activities and landscaping activities. Once operational, the project site would largely be open space and would require irrigation. Water used at the project site would be provided from canal water from a recently constructed delivery system owned and operated by the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD). Quality of canal water and compatibility for all projected landscape uses is being evaluated, and future water use may not preclude the utilization of groundwater derived from the two existing groundwater wells. Utilization of groundwater for operational purposes would substantially be reduced with the utilization of canal water from CVWD as compared to existing conditions. Thus, the project's reliance on existing groundwater supplies is anticipated to be lessened substantially based on the change of land use. Additionally, the Coachella Valley Water District 2015 Urban Water Management Plan is considering an alternative groundwater sustainability plan (UWMP). Per the UWMP, CVWD anticipates using treated canal water as an urban potable supply starting in 2025 to reduce the amount of groundwater pumping. By 2040, canal water is projected to meet 28 percent of total urban potable demand, while the rest is met by groundwater (CVWD UWMP 2016). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) The project site is located on an alluvial fan associated with the adjacent Martinez Canyon and related tributary areas of the Santa Rosa Mountains. The storm water flows and related hydrologic conditions are summarized in the Oasis Area of the Eastern Coachella Valley Stormwater Master Plan, developed by the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD). The storm water flows and related flood hazards were analyzed by CVWD in 2014 and reflected in FEMA's Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) and updated Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panels for the area dated 2018. Flood water associated with the 100-year storm event exits the apex of the alluvial fan at the mouth of Martinez Canyon and is radially distributed in sheet flows in a manner that dissipates relative to velocity and flow depth with increasing distance from the apex of the Canyon. These sheet flows intersect the project site with a depth of flow of approximately 1 foot. This incident flow carries quantities of debris typical of a mountain canyon environment, consisting of silt, gravels and rock cobble which is evident on the project site, as well as in the surrounding natural terrain. CVWD addresses these types of conditions with a combination of training levees, diversion dikes, debris basins and receiving channels, which ultimately convey drainage to the Salton Sea. The drainage in the greater project area was addressed in the CVWD's Master Plan Alternatives Study for Oasis Area, and reflected a combination of training levees to intercept storm flows associated with tributary portions of the alluvial fan, a debris basin, and associated outlet channel as part of the 68th Avenue Drain improvements. The project design provides for debris and drainage attenuation facilities that are consistent with the intent of the CVWD Master Plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Project construction would involve some earth-disturbing activities, including grading, that could expose on-site soils to erosion and surface water runoff. However, inclusion of project BMPs would reduce erosion and siltation from the project site occurring from construction activities. As such, the development of the project would not cause a significant change to surface bodies of water in a manner that could cause siltation or erosion. Therefore, impacts associated with altering of the existing drainage patterns and erosion would be less than significant.

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

e-g) The project would include landscaped areas and pervious surfaces that would allow for water to percolate into the subsurface soils. The proposed grading associated with the development of the golf course is anticipated to alter the drainage patterns within the project site, however the general drainage patterns of both on-site and offsite flows will be maintained. While the project site is located in a FEMA-designated flood hazard zone, Zone AO, which is a regulatory floodway area, the project would not propose any new buildings which would alter the flood flow (FEMA 2018). Further, per the County General Plan, Figure S-10 Dam Failure Inundation Zones, the project site is located outside of a dam inundation area (County of Riverside 2019a). As such, the project would not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff which would result in flooding, exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage system, or impede flood flows.

h) The project site is located approximately 73-miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and would not be susceptible to a tsunami. Additionally, the project site is located approximately 7.2-miles west of Salton Sea and due to the distance is not likely to be susceptible from a seiche. While the project site is located in a regulatory floodway area, the project would remain largely open space and would not introduce any buildings. Thus, in the event of a tsunami, seiche, or flood, the project would not risk release of pollutants. Impacts would be less than significant.

i) The project site is located within the Coachella Valley Groundwater Basin. However, the project would comply with regional and local regulations related to water quality control plans and would not obstruct existing plans. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project:

24. Land Use

a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2015. Riverside County General Plan - Multipurpose Open Space Element. Revised December 08, 2015. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/general_Plan_2017/elements/OCT17/Ch05_MOSE_120815.pdf?ver=2017-10-11-102103-833.

County of Riverside. 2021. Riverside County Municipal Code. Updated through July 12, 2021. Accessed July 2021. https://library.municode.com/ca/riverside_county/codes/code_of_ordinances.

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is currently zoned W-2 (Controlled Development). Per Chapter 17.144, W-2 Controlled Development Areas Zone, of the Riverside County Municipal Code, golf courses with standard length fairways are permitted provided a plot plan is approved (County of Riverside 2021). As such, the project would not change the project site’s zoning. Additionally, the project would largely be open space. Consistent with Policy OS 20.1 of the General Plan, the project would maintain open space that protects County environmental and other nonrenewable resources (County of Riverside 2015). As there is no change in the project site’s zoning, and the project would provide open space, like the existing site, there will be no change in the project’s land use. Additionally, this IS/MND evaluates the project’s consistency with the environmental justice policies included in the Draft Land Use Element of the General Plan. Table 6, shown below, demonstrates the project’s consistency with environmental justice policies in the draft Land Use Element. As such, the project would be consistent with policies identified in the County’s General Plan and impacts would be less than significant.

Table 6. Environmental Justice Policies Consistency Table

Environmental Justice Policies		Is the Project Consistent?
<i>Health Risk Reduction Policies</i>		
Policy HC 16.13:	Provide buffer spaces and vegetative barriers between high-volume roadways/transportation and train track corridors and sensitive land uses.	<p>Consistent. The project site is located in a rural area of unincorporated Riverside County. The project site is surrounded by undeveloped desert scrub land and farmland. The nearest sensitive receptor to the project site is a single-family residence located approximately 1.7-miles east of the project site.</p> <p>As part of the project, 165 acres of the project site will be landscaped in addition to the 111 acres of fairways and 6 acres of greens. Additionally, 2,400 of the existing lemon trees covering approximately 25 acres of the site will be transplanted to the northeastern portion of the project site and along the northern and eastern boundaries to frame the entrance so the appearance will be that the entire site will remain a citrus ranch. Therefore, the project would be consistent with Policy HC 16.13.</p>
Policy HC 16.14	Assure that sensitive receptors are separated and protected from polluting point sources, as feasible, including agricultural businesses that produce or use pesticides and chemical fertilizers.	<p>Consistent. The project involves the development of a golf course and practice facilities on an approximately 292.16-acre site. The project would include an 18-hole golf course, driving range, and short course with landscaping and walking paths. 2,400 of the existing lemon trees covering approximately 25 acres will be transplanted to the northeastern portion of the project site and along the northern and eastern boundaries to frame the entrance so the appearance will be that the entire site will remain a citrus ranch. The entirety of the project site will be surrounded by six-foot tall fencing or wall.</p> <p>The project site is surrounded by undeveloped desert scrub land and farmland. The nearest sensitive receptor to the project site is a single-family residence located approximately 1.7-miles east of the project site. Because the project site is surrounded by existing farmland and would convert a large portion of the site to a golf course (consisting of open space), which would reduce the site’s use of pesticides and chemical fertilizers (excluding perimeter of site with transferred lemon trees), the project would be consistent with Policy HC 16.14.</p>
Policy HC 16.16	Apply pollution control measures such as landscaping, vegetation, and green zones (in cooperation with the SCAQMD) and other materials, which trap particulate matter or control air pollution.	<p>Consistent. See responses to Policy HC 16.13 and HC 1.14. As discussed in Section 6, Air Quality, the project would be consistent with the assumptions utilized in SCAQMD’s AQMP. Additionally, the project would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 to control dust emissions generated during any dust-generating activities. Therefore, the project is consistent with Policy HC 16.16.</p>

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

Environmental Justice Policies		Is the Project Consistent?
Policy: HC 16.17	Landscape by planting of trees on a community basis that removes pollutants from the air, provides shade and decreases the negative impacts of extreme heat on the community.	Consistent. See response to Policy HC 16.13. The project would be consistent with Policy HC 16.17.
Policy: HC 16.23	Discourage industrial and agricultural uses which produce significant quantities of toxic emissions into the air, soil, and groundwater to prevent the contamination of these physical environments	Consistent. Under existing conditions, the project site has supported agriculture uses since at least the late 1990s. A citrus and mango ranch, table grapes were previously grown on the project site. The project involves the development of a golf course and practice facilities on an approximately 292.16-acre site. 2,400 of the existing lemon trees covering approximately 25 acres will be transplanted to the northeastern portion of the project site and along the northern and eastern boundaries to frame the entrance so the appearance will be that the entire site will remain a citrus ranch. However, while the project would retain existing lemon trees, the project would decrease agricultural use on the site. As such, the project would decrease the amount of toxic emissions into air, soil, and groundwater that would result from agricultural use. The project would be consistent with Policy HC 16.23.
Policy HC 19.2	Develop high-quality parks, green space, hiking trails, recreational facilities and natural environments in areas where such facilities are lacking.	Consistent. The project site is located in a rural area of unincorporated Riverside County. The project site is surrounded by undeveloped desert scrub land and farmland. The project involves the development of a golf course and practice facilities on land that is currently used for agricultural use. The nearest golf course to the project site is Coral Mountain Golf Club, located approximately 5.48-miles north of the site. Additionally, the nearest park, Key Key Tum Park, is located approximately 3.4-miles north of the site. While there are various types of recreational facilities further surrounding the site, the immediate area is predominantly barren of parks and other recreational facilities. As such, the project is consistent with Policy HC 19.2.
<i>Public Facilities Policies</i>		
Policy HC 20.6	With the availability of funding and pursuant to health and safety considerations, ensure that surface drainage is properly captured and disposed and does not mix or otherwise interface with septic systems.	Consistent. Because the project would result in more than 1 acre of ground disturbance, the project would be subject to the NPDES stormwater program, which includes obtaining coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board's Construction General Permit. The implementation of a Construction General Permit, including preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of BMPs, would reduce stormwater runoff during project construction impacts to acceptable levels. It follows that because construction of the project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, the project would not otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. The project would not connect to the municipal sewer system, and no septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal system are proposed. The project would be consistent with Policy HC 20.6.
Policy HC 20.7	Ensure that health and safety facilities such as fire stations and sheriff substations are adequately sited, improved and staffed to serve affected communities. Identify which communities need services to be built in close proximity to reduce the amount of time it takes to respond to an emergency.	Consistent. The project would not directly induce substantial population growth in the area. Although the project would require fire protection and/or paramedic services in the event of an emergency, given the relatively low number of visitors that would use the project site and given that fire and emergency services already serve the project area, the project is not expected to result in the need for new or physically altered fire facilities, or to result in the station's inability to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Similarly, while the project could require police services, given the relatively low number of visitors that would use the project site and given that police services already serve the project area, the project is not anticipated to add a new strain on the existing police functions. Therefore, the project would be consistent with Policy HC 20.7.

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

Environmental Justice Policies		Is the Project Consistent?
Policy HC 20.8	Review the location and extent of community recreational facilities to ensure maximum use by children and adults and use that information to develop new recreational facilities and opportunities for the community, including indoor and outdoor facilities.	<p>Consistent. The County offers a range of parks and recreational opportunities. However, parks and recreational facilities in the community of Thermal are limited and the closest golf course is the Coral Mountain Golf Club located in the City of La Quinta.</p> <p>The project involves the development of a golf course and practice facilities (project) on an approximately 292.16-acre site. The project would include an 18-hole golf course, driving range, and short course with landscaping and walking paths. Membership will be limited to 50 persons, with members likely residing throughout the United States who have second or third homes in the desert. Therefore, the project would be consistent with Policy HC 20.8.</p>
<i>Other EJ Related Policies</i>		
Policy HC 22.1	Increase coordination and collaboration with the implementation of existing climate action plans such as the county's 2020 Climate Action Plan update, resilience action plans, mobility plans and AB 617 plans, as may be amended.	<p>Consistent. Refer to Section 6, Air Quality, of the IS/MND. The Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Memorandum (Appendix A) finds that the project is consistent with the County's 2020 Climate Action Plan. The project would be consistent with Policy HC 22.1.</p>

Note: The Environmental Justice policies referenced above were provided from the County of Riverside and will be inserted within the 4th section of the Land Use Element that ends on page LU-74. The new subsection will be the fourth section.

b) The physical division of an established community is typically associated with the construction of a linear feature, such as a major highway or railroad tracks, or removal of a means of access, such as a local road or bridge, which would impair mobility within an existing community or between a community and an outlying area. The project would not create a physical division of an existing community, like what could occur with the development of a freeway or large linear infrastructure. and thus, is not used as a connection between two established communities. Instead, connectivity in the surrounding project area is facilitated via local roadways. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:

25. Mineral Resources

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

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

c) Potentially expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines?

Source(s):

CDOC (California Department of Conservation). 2015. CGS: Information Warehouse: Mineral Land Classification. Accessed July 2021. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc>.

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

Findings of Fact:

a) According to maps prepared by the California Department of Conservation (CDOC 2015), the project site is located in Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ)-1, which is an “unstudied” area. While it is unknown whether the site contains mineral resources, the project would consist largely of open space and would not propose development of buildings. Additionally, the project site is not currently being used for mineral resource extraction and is currently used for commercial agriculture production. No mining operations would be impacted by this development and the site would likely never be used for any mining operations in the future. Given these factors, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state. No impact would occur.

b) The County’s General Plan does not identify a mineral resource recovery site within the project site (County of Riverside 2015). The project site is not currently being used for mineral resource extraction and is currently used for commercial agriculture production. No mining operations would be impacted by this development and the site would likely never be used for any mining operations in the future. As such, the project would not 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. No impact would occur.

c) According to maps prepared by the California Department of Conservation (CDOC 2015), the project site is not located near any abandoned quarries or mines. The nearest mine is located approximately 2.4-miles south of the site. As such, because the site does not contain any abandoned quarries or mines and is located over two miles from the nearest mine, the project would not expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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?

Source(s):

RCALUCP (Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan). 2006. Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Accessed July 2021. <http://www.rcaluc.org/Plans/New-Compatibility-Plan>.

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

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The closest public airport to the project site is Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport, which is located approximately 4.8 miles northeast of the project site. According to the Land Use Plan for the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport, the project is not located within an impact zone and is outside the airport planning area (RCALUCP 2006). Additionally, the closest private airstrip is Desert Air Sky Ranch-63CA, located approximately 18.4 miles east of the site. The project site is located outside of any airport impact zones, and as such, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area. Therefore, no impacts associated with exposing people residing or working in the project to excessive noise levels would occur.

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 agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact:

a-b) On-site noise-generating activities associated with the project would include short-term construction as well as long-term operational noise associated with use of the new golf course.

Construction noise and vibration levels are temporary phenomena that can vary from hour to hour and day to day. Riverside County Code Section 9.52.020 does not permit construction noise that would create a noise disturbance between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. during the months of June through September and between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. during the months of October through May. The project would conduct construction activities between the allowable hours. Additionally, any noise and vibration generated from construction of the project would cease upon completion of construction. Long-term (i.e., operational) noise associated with the project would include operation of the new golf course. Access to the golf course would be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. most days and 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. during shaping for 120 days. Primary noise associated with the project would include vehicles traveling to and from the site. However, it is not anticipated that the project would generate a significant number of trips. Thus, operational noise as a result of the project would be minimal.

The major concern regarding construction vibration is related to building damage. Construction vibration as a result of the project would not result in structural building damage, which typically occurs at vibration levels of 0.5 inches per second or greater for buildings of reinforced-concrete, steel, or timber construction. The heavier pieces of construction equipment used would include typical

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

construction equipment for this type of project, such as backhoes, front-end loaders, and flatbed trucks. Pile driving, blasting, and other special construction techniques would not be used for construction of the project; therefore, excessive groundborne vibration and groundborne noise would not be generated. Operation of the project would not result in any sources of vibration. Therefore, impacts would be 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 paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature?

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan - Multipurpose Open Space Element. Revised December 8, 2015. Accessed August 2021. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/general_Plan_2017/elements/OCT17/Ch05_MOSE_120815.pdf?ver=2017-10-11-102103-833.

Findings of Fact:

a) Per the Geotechnical Report prepared for the project, the project site is considered to be immediately underlain by alluvial sediments, which do not often reveal paleontological sites and resources because they are generally too young to contain fossils (Appendix D). Additionally, Figure OS-8 in the Multipurpose Open Space Element of the County General Plan, designates the project site as having an undetermined paleontological sensitivity (County of Riverside 2015). However, the possibility of a paleontological discovery cannot be discounted. Accordingly, destruction of paleontological resources or unique geologic features during site-disturbing activities associated with construction of the proposed project is considered a potential significant impact. Therefore, MM-PAL-1 is provided and would be implemented to ensure potential impacts during construction activities to paleontological resources or unique geologic features are reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation:

MM-PAL-1 In the event that paleontological resources (fossil remains) are exposed during construction activities for the proposed project, all construction work occurring within 50 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified paleontologist, as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology’s 2010 guidelines, can assess the nature and importance of the find. Depending on the significance of the find, the paleontologist may record the find and allow work to continue or recommend salvage and recovery of the resource. All recommendations will be made in accordance with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology’s 2010 guidelines and shall be subject to review and approval by the County of Riverside. Work in the area of the find may only resume upon approval of a qualified paleontologist.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:				
29. Housing				
a) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact:

a-c) A significant impact would occur if the project would induce substantial population growth that would not have otherwise occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude, or if the project would displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing. The project would develop a new golf course presumed to be utilized by residents in the local area. The project would not introduce residential uses nor businesses to the project area and would not directly or indirectly lead to unplanned population growth. Additionally, the project would not displace existing housing or require the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

RCFD (Riverside County Fire Department). 2021. Our Department. Accessed July 19, 2021. <http://www.rvcfire.org/Pages/default.aspx>.

Findings of Fact: The County of Riverside Fire Department (County Fire Department) provides fire services to the unincorporated areas of the County, including the project site, as well as to partner cities within the County. The department operates 93 fire stations in six divisions composed of 17-line battalions, providing fire suppression, emergency medical, technical rescue, fire prevention and related services. The equipment used by the department has the versatility to respond to both urban

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

and wildland emergencies (RCFD 2021). Fire Station 40, located at 91350 66th Avenue, would serve the project site. Fire Station 40 is located approximately 13-miles east of the site.

The project would not directly induce substantial population growth in the area. Although the project would require fire protection and/or paramedic services in the event of an emergency, given the relatively low number of visitors that would use the project site and given that fire and emergency services already serve the project area, the project is not expected to result in the need for new or physically altered fire facilities, or to result in the station's inability to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. The increase in demand for fire protection services due to the project would result in a less than significant impact.

As such, the project would not change local fire protection response times or affect demand for fire protection services in the project area. Therefore, impacts associated with fire protection services would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

31. Sheriff Services

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2019a. County of Riverside General Plan – Safety Element. Revised August 06, 2019. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/2019/elements/Ch06_Safety_080619.pdf.

Findings of Fact: The project site is served by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department (County Sheriff's Department) which contracts with Police Departments throughout the County (County of Riverside 2019a). In the event of an emergency, the Thermal Sheriff Station, located at 86625 Airport Boulevard, would respond to the site. The Thermal Sheriff Station is located approximately 6.6 miles north of the project site.

The project would not directly induce substantial population growth in the area. Although the project could require police services, given the relatively low number of visitors that would use the project site and given that police services already serve the project area, the project is not anticipated to add a new strain on the existing police functions. The increase in demand for police protection services due to the project would result in a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

32. Schools

Source(s): N/A

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

Findings of Fact: The project's closest school is Toro Canyon Middle School (86150 Avenue 66), located about 1.8 miles northeast from the project site. The project would not involve a housing component that would result in population growth and increased demands on existing schools within the area. Therefore, no impact to schools would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

33. Libraries

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact: The project would not involve a housing component or increase employment opportunities that would result in population growth within the area. Therefore, additional demands on other public facilities, such as libraries would not occur as a result of project implementation, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

34. Health Services

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact: The project would not involve a housing component or increase employment opportunities that would result in population growth within the area. Therefore, additional demands on other public facilities, such as health care services would not occur as a result of project implementation, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

RECREATION Would the project:

35. Parks and Recreation

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact:

a-c) A significant impact would occur if the project increased the use of existing parkland and recreational facilities so as to accelerate or induce their physical deterioration. The County offers a range of parks and recreational opportunities. However, parks and recreational facilities in the community of Thermal are limited and the closest golf course is the Coral Mountain Golf Club located in the City of La Quinta. The project would introduce a new golf course. Thus, the project would increase and improve recreational services available in the community of Thermal. The project site is not located within a recreation or park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

36. Recreational Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Include the construction or expansion of a trail system?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact:

a) The project would develop a new golf course. The project would not include the construction or expansion of a trail. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

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

Source(s):

County of Riverside. 2020a. *Transportation Analysis Guidelines for Level of Service and Vehicle Miles Traveled*. December 2020.

County of Riverside. 2020b. Riverside County General Plan – Circulation Element. Revised July 7, 2020. Accessed July 2021. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/2019/elements/Ch04_Circulation_072720v2.pdf.

ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers). 2017. *Trip Generation Manual*. 10th ed.

OPR 2018. OPR (California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research). 2018. *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*. December 2018.

Transportation Consistency Memorandum (Appendix F)

Findings of Fact:

a) The project would generally have a maximum of 25 individuals play golf per day on the site during the season, which is from October through May, each year. The project would not be used to host weddings or other social events. Additionally, there would be four full-time employees for operations on site daily and a crew of approximately 12 members from a third-party company for periodic maintenance. Per the County’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines (County of Riverside 2020a), projects that would generate less than 100 peak hours typically do not affect level of significance (LOS) significantly and are exempt from requiring a traffic analysis that includes LOS analysis.

Table 7 provides a summary of trip generation estimates for the project based on the Institute of Transportation Engineer’s (ITE) Trip Generation, 10th Edition, for Golf Course use (ITE Code 430) (ITE 2017).

Table 7. Project Trip Generation Summary

Land use	Unit	Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Trip Rate								
Golf Course	hole	30.38	1.39	0.37	1.76	1.54	1.37	2.91
Trip Generation								
Lemon Blossom Lane Project	18	547	25	7	32	27	25	52

Note:

¹ Trip rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, 10th Edition, 2017. ITE Code 430 – Golf Course

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

As shown in Table 7, the project would generate 32 AM peak-hour trips and 52 PM peak-hour trips. Thus, the project would not require an LOS analysis. Additionally, the project would be consistent with the following policies within the General Plan Circulation element focus on the circulation system (County of Riverside 2020b):

- **Policy C 1.7:** Encourage and support the development of projects that facilitate and enhance the use of alternative modes of transportation, including pedestrian-oriented retail and activity centers, dedicated bicycle lanes and paths, and mixed-use community centers.
- **Policy C 3.1:** Design, construct, and maintain Riverside County roadways as specified in the Riverside County Road Improvement Standards and Specifications. The standards shown in Figure C-4 may be modified by Specific Plans, Community Guidelines, or as approved by the Director of Transportation if alternative roadway standards are desirable to improve sustainability for the area.
- **Policy C 3.2:** Maintain the existing transportation network, while providing for future expansion and improvement based on travel demand, and the development of alternative travel modes.
- **Policy C 3.10:** Require private and public land developments to provide all onsite auxiliary facility improvements necessary to mitigate any development-generated circulation impacts. A review of each proposed land development project shall be undertaken to identify project impacts to the circulation system and its auxiliary facilities. The Transportation Department may require developers and/or subdividers to provide traffic impact studies prepared by qualified professionals to identify the impacts of a development.
- **Policy C 3.15:** Provide adequate sight distances for safe vehicular movement at a road's design speed and at all intersections.
- **Policy C 3.24:** Provide a street network with quick and efficient routes for emergency vehicles, meeting necessary street widths, turn-around radius, secondary access, and other factors as determined by the Transportation Department in consultation with the Fire Department and other emergency service providers.
- **Policy C 3.25:** Restrict on-street parking to reduce traffic congestion and improve safety in appropriate locations such as General Plan roadways.
- **Policy C 4.1:** Provide facilities for the safe movement of pedestrians within developments, as specified in the Riverside County Ordinances Regulating the Division of Land of the County of Riverside.
- **Policy C 17.1:** Develop Class I Bike Paths, Class II Bike Lanes and Class I Bike Paths/Regional Trails (Combination Trails) as shown in the Trails Plan (Figure C-7), to the design standards as outlined in the California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, adopted Riverside County Design Guidelines (for communities that have them), the Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space Trails Standards Manual, and other Riverside County Guidelines.

As such, the project is not expected to severely delay, impact, or reduce the service level of transit in the area. Furthermore, bicyclist and pedestrian safety would be maintained at existing levels in the area, as there would be no changes to the existing pedestrian or bicycle circulation system. All pedestrian areas within the project site would meet Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and adhere to County design guidelines. Therefore, impacts would less than significant.

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

b) The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research prepared a comprehensive update to the CEQA Guidelines in 2017 that were approved by the California Natural Resources Agency in December 2018, requiring that lead agencies use VMT for analyzing transportation impacts. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 states that “generally, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts,” and define VMT as “the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project.” Note that “automobile” refers to on-road passenger vehicles, specifically cars and light trucks. Heavy-duty truck VMT could be included for modeling convenience and ease of calculation (for example, where models or data provide combined auto and heavy truck VMT). Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized traveled. A project’s VMT analysis follows the process of first using screening criteria, identifying an efficiency metric, identifying the significance threshold and, lastly, determining requirements for modeling and assessment. Therefore, Dudek reviewed the County’s VMT screening guidance for land use project to determine if the project would be screened-out from conducting a detailed VMT analysis.

The County uses the following criteria for development projects that can be presumed to cause a less than significant impact:

- **Small Projects:** Project that meets one of the following criteria:
 - Single Family Housing projects less than or equal to 110 Dwelling Units; or
 - Multi Family (low rise) Housing projects less than or equal to 147 Dwelling Units; or
 - Multi Family (mid-rise) Housing projects less than or equal to 194 Dwelling Units; or
 - General Office Building with area less than or equal to 165,000 SF; or
 - Retail buildings with area less than or equal to 60,000 SF; or
 - Warehouse (unrefrigerated) buildings with area less than or equal to 208,000 SF; or
 - General Light Industrial buildings with area less than or equal to 179,000 SF
 - Project GHG emissions less than 3,000 Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (MT CO_{2e}) as determined by a methodology acceptable to the Transportation Department; or
 - Unless specified above, project trip generation is less than 110 trips per day per the ITE Manual or other acceptable source determined by Riverside County.
- **Transit Priority Area:** Project that meet both of the following criteria:
 - Within a ½ mile of an existing major transit stop; and
 - Maintains a service interval frequency of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.
- **Local-serving Retail:** Project that meet both of the following criteria:
 - No single store on-site exceeds 50,000 square feet; and
 - Project is local serving as determined by the Transportation Department
- **Affordable Housing:** Project that includes:
 - A high percentage of affordable housing is provided as determined by the Riverside County Planning and Transportation Departments

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

- **Local Essential Service:**
 - Project is local serving as determined by the Transportation Department; and
 - Local-serving and Day care center; or
 - Police or Fire facility; or
 - Medical/Dental office building under 50,000 square feet; or
 - Government offices (in-person services such as post office, library, and utilities); or
 - Local or Community Parks
- **Map-based Screening:** Project's area of development is under threshold as shown on screening map as allowed by the Transportation Department
- **Redevelopment Project:** Project replaces an existing VMT-generating land use and does not result in a net overall increase in VMT.

A greenhouse gas (GHG) assessment was conducted for the VMT screening analysis and is included as an attachment to the Transportation Memo. As shown in the assessment and summarized in Table 8 below, the project's GHG emissions would be approximately 1,155 MT CO₂e per year.

Table 8. Summary of Estimated Annual Construction and Operational GHG Emissions

Criteria	Emissions
	In Metric Tons
Total Construction GHG Emissions (Year 2021-2023)	546.23
Amortized Construction Emissions (over period of 30 years)	18.81
Annual Operational GHG Emissions	1096.34
Total Emissions (Annual Operational + Amortized Construction)	1,115.34
<i>Exceeds Threshold of 3000 MT CO₂e per year</i>	No

Notes: CO₂e = Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Output Worksheets for VMT Screening Analysis, 2.0 Emissions Summary

The GHG assessment for VMT screening analysis was conducted per guidance provided in the County's TA⁴. The project's GHG emissions are significantly lower than the 3,000 MT CO₂e per year threshold used for screening by the County. Therefore, the project would meet the screening criteria of Small Project and the project would result in a less than significant VMT impact.

c) The project would not include construction of any new roadways, modifications to any existing roadway or intersection geometry. Any and all improvements required within the public right-of-way would be required to comply with design standards set forth by the County to ensure that the project does not introduce an incompatible design feature that would impede operations on project-adjacent roadway facilities. Therefore, the project would not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use. Impacts would be less than significant.

⁴ California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) was used to calculate the annual GHG emissions based on available project specifics. CalEEMod is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to quantify potential criteria pollutant emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. Per Appendix G of the TA, CalEEMod version 2016.3.2 and rural trip lengths were used in estimating project's GHG emissions. However, trip rates were modified to match project's trip generation using the ITE Trip Generation, 10th Edition Manual

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

d) Access to the project site would be provided via a driveway along Lemon Blossom Lane. The project would not construct a maintenance road. No impact would occur.

e) Construction would occur completely within the project site boundaries. As such, the project would not require temporary road closures during construction. Impacts related to circulation during construction of the project would be less than significant.

f) The project would comply with all local, regional, state, and federal guidelines related to emergency access. Emergency vehicles would be able to access the single entrance/exit within the project site. The project site would be accessible to emergency responders during construction and operation of the project. Therefore, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

38. Bike Trails

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

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact:

a) The project would not include construction or expansion of a bike system or bike lanes. No impact would occur.

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

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

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:

Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)

Source(s): Native American Consultation

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Changes in the California Environmental Quality Act, effective July 2015, require that the County address a new category of cultural resources – tribal cultural resources – not previously included within the law’s purview. Tribal Cultural Resources are those resources with inherent tribal values that are difficult to identify through the same means as archaeological resources. These resources can be identified and understood through direct consultation with the tribes who attach tribal value to the resource. Tribal cultural resources may include Native American archaeological sites, but they may also include other types of resources such as cultural landscapes or sacred places. The appropriate treatment of tribal cultural resources is determined through consultation with tribes.

In compliance with Assembly Bill 52 (AB52), notices regarding this project were mailed to all requesting tribes on September 21, 2021. No response was received from Ramona Band of Cahuilla, Morongo Band of Mission Indians Cahuilla Band of Indians, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, Colorado River Indian Tribes (CRIT), Quechan Indian Nation, Twenty- Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians or the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians.

Consultation was requested by the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians and the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. Consultation was held with Agua Caliente on November 2, 2021. Specific information was provided regarding twelve documented traditional villages located in the vicinity and one that the project is located within. There are also trails crossing through the area that link all these villages as well as lead to gathering areas and sacred areas used for initiation ceremonies.

Agua Caliente expressed concerns that the project has the potential for as yet unidentified subsurface tribal cultural resources. The tribe requests that a Native American monitor be present during ground disturbing activities so any unanticipated finds will be handled in a timely and culturally appropriate manner. Thus, **MM-TCR-1** would be implemented and would require a Native American monitoring during construction. The tribe also recommended specific measures to mitigate direct and indirect impacts to the Traditional Cultural Landscape of the area. This TCR is composed of nearby villages, trails and associated resource procurement and sacred areas. As such, **MM-TCR-2** would be implemented to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Prior to the Grading Final, the applicant would provide evidence that **MM-TCR-2** has been completed. **MM-TCR-2** would ensure that only native plants are used in certain designated landscaped areas of the project site as indicated on the Landscape Plan prepared for the project. No invasive, fountain or ornamental grasses shall be used within these designated landscaped areas. In addition, an interpretive panel that discusses the native plants and Native presence in the area is to be developed in coordination with the consulting tribes. The panel shall be in placed in a common area where guests can be educated and learn about

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

the people who lived and survived in this area for centuries and that these people have survived and adapted and are still living nearby.

Torres Martinez requested consultation via email on October 22, 2021. The cultural report and the conditions of approval were provided to the tribe on the same day. On November 03, 2021 a meeting was held in which this project was discussed. Torres expressed concerns that the project has the potential for as yet unidentified subsurface tribal cultural resources. Per section 21074 of the Public Resources Code, a "Tribal Cultural Resource" are either of the following:

- (1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
 - (a) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.
 - (b) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.
- (2) 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 Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Under section 5024.1 of the Public Resources Code, a "historical resource" includes, among other things a resource that "has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history."

The tribes request that a Native American monitor be present during ground disturbing activities so any unanticipated finds will be handled in a timely and culturally appropriate manner. The Tribe also concurred with the mitigation measures recommended by Agua Caliente.

Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the developer/permit applicant shall enter into agreement(s) for Native American Monitor(s).

The project will also be required to adhere to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 in the event that human remains are encountered and by ensuring that no further disturbance occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin of the remains. Furthermore, 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.

With the inclusion of these Conditions of Approval/ mitigation measures, impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation:

MM-TCR-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the developer/permit applicant shall enter into an agreement with the consulting tribe(s) for a Native American Monitor. 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, the Native American Monitor(s) shall be on-site during all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of each

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

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. The developer/permit applicant shall submit a fully executed copy of the agreement to the County Archaeologist to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Archaeologist shall clear this condition. Monitoring: Native American Monitoring will be conducted by a representative from the consulting tribe(s).

All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resource shall be halted and the applicant 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 (or other appropriate ethnic/cultural group 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.

MM-TCR-2 Prior to Grading Final the applicant shall provide evidence that the following mitigation measure has been completed. Only native plants are to be used in certain designated landscaped areas of the project as indicated on the Landscape Plan. No invasive, fountain or ornamental grasses shall be used within these designated landscaped areas. In addition, an interpretive panel that discusses the native plants and Native presence in the area is to be developed in coordination with the consulting tribes. This panel shall be placed in a common area where guests can be educated and learn about the people who lived and survived in this area for centuries and that these people have survived and adapted and are still living nearby.

Monitoring: See above.

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 the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?

Source(s):

UWMP (Urban Water Management Plan). 2021. Coachella Valley Water District 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. Accessed August 2021. <http://www.cvrwmg.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Final-Coachella-Valley-RUWMP.pdf>.

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage systems. Under existing conditions, the project site requires irrigation. The project would also require irrigation and would receive water for irrigation from two wells owned by Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD). However, water use would be reduced by approximately 40% as compared to water used on the project site today. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

b) As an urban water supplier, CVWD is required to assess the reliability of its water supply service under the multiple-dry year scenario. As such the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) prepared for CVWD, contains projected water supply and demand for normal year, single dry year, and multiple-year dry year scenarios. According to the 2020 UWMP, a normal year, single dry year, and multiple dry year are shown to be fully reliable until 2045 (UWMP 2021). Additionally, under the project, water use would be reduced by approximately 40%. Therefore, because the project would require less water than under existing conditions and water is anticipated to be met during normal year, single dry year, and multiple dry year scenarios, impacts would be 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
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

UWMP (Urban Water Management Plan). 2021. Coachella Valley Water District 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. Accessed August 2021. <http://www.cvrwmg.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Final-Coachella-Valley-RUWMP.pdf>.

Findings of Fact:

a) The project would largely be open space and would not develop any buildings. Two trailers would be positioned onsite for members and staff and would satisfy bathroom requirements. The project would not provide connections to sewer lines or contain a septic system. As such, the project would not result in construction of new wastewater treatment facilities nor connect to wastewater utilities. No impact would occur.

b) It is anticipated that a maximum of 25 individuals would use the golf course a day. Additionally, the project would employ 4 golf staff members and three maintenance staff members. As previously mentioned, two trailers would be positioned onsite for members and staff and would satisfy bathroom requirements. As such, the project would generate wastewater; however, wastewater generated would be nominal. Wastewater would be transported from the trailer sewage tanks to the CVWD Sanitation System. Wastewater Reclamation Plant (WRP)-No. 4 is located in the community of Thermal and would treat wastewater produced by the project. WRP-No. 4 has the capacity to treat 9.9 million gallons of wastewater per day. Per the 2020 UWMP, wastewater collected at WRP-No. 4 is under the daily capacity (UWMP 2021). Thus, because the project would generate nominal wastewater and WRP-No. 4 has capacity to treat wastewater produced from the project, impacts would be 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
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s):

Cal Recycle (California Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery). 2021. Solid Waste Information System Facility/Site Search [Database search applying filters: 'County: Riverside'; 'Regulatory Status: Permitted'; 'Operational Status: Active'; 'Facility Type: Disposal']. Accessed February 2021. <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/swfacilities/Directory/>.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Riverside County Waste Management Department manages Riverside County's solid waste system through the provision of facilities and programs that meet or exceed all applicable local, state, federal, and land use regulations. The department manages several Riverside County Sanitary Landfills: Badlands, Blythe, Desert Center, El Sobrante, Lamb Canyon, and Oasis. Each of these landfills has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's minimal solid waste disposal needs and are permitted to receive non-hazardous municipal solid waste (Cal Recycle 2021). Construction of the project would include development of a new golf course. The project would largely be open space and does not propose to introduce new buildings. Waste generated from the project would occur during construction and would include green waste from the agriculture located onsite. Any number of local landfills typically utilized by the County have sufficient capacity to accommodate this volume of non-hazardous waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) The project would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local agency regulations related to solid waste. Under AB 939, the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, local jurisdictions are required to develop source reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting programs to reduce the amount of solid waste entering landfills.

In addition, the state has set an ambitious goal of 75% recycling, composting, and source reduction of solid waste by 2020. To help reach this goal, the state has adopted AB 341 and AB 1826. AB 341 is a mandatory commercial recycling bill, and AB 1826 is mandatory organic recycling. Waste generated by the project would enter the County's waste stream but would not adversely affect the County's ability to meet AB 939, AB 341, or AB 1826, since the project's waste generation would represent a nominal percentage of the waste created within the County. Therefore, impacts would be 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
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact:

a-f) The project involves the development of a golf course and practice facilities. The project would largely be open space and would not develop any buildings that would require electricity, natural gas, or communication services. Additionally, the project would not include improvements outside the project site. As such, the project would not require or result in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities regarding electricity, natural gas, communications systems, street lighting, public facilities, or other governmental services. Impacts would not occur.

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 response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Source(s):

CAL FIRE (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2021. Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps. Accessed July 2021. <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/wildfire-planning-engineering/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/>.

County of Riverside. 2015. County of Riverside General Plan - Multipurpose Open Space Element. Revised December 8, 2015. Accessed August 2021. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/general_Plan_2017/elements/OCT17/Ch05_MOSE_120815.pdf?ver=2017-10-11-102103-833.

Findings of Fact:

a) The project must comply with the County’s EOP for both construction and operation. Construction activities would be required to implement adequate and appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through and around any required road closures in accordance with the County’s EOP. Operation of the project would not interfere with the County’s EOP because the entrance to the project site would remain accessible for emergency vehicles. The project applicant would be required to design, construct, and maintain the project to comply with applicable local, regional, state, and federal requirements related to emergency access and evacuation plans. Adherence to these requirements would ensure that potential impacts related to this issue remain insignificant. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) A review of CAL FIRE maps show that the project site is located in an SRA and is within a moderate fire hazard severity zone (CAL FIRE 2021). Construction of the project would comply with Section 8.32.040 of the County’s Municipal Code, which adopts the 2019 California Fire Code (CFC). Under existing conditions, the project site is disturbed land used for commercial agricultural purposes. Upon completion of construction, the project would introduce a new golf course. The project would largely consist of open space and does not propose new buildings. In the event of a wildfire in the areas proximate to the project site, any visitors at the project site would evacuate the area, as directed by local fire officials. Additionally, the project site topography is relatively flat and as shown in the County’s General Plan, the project site would not be located in an area susceptible to landslides (County of Riverside 2015). As such, the project would not exacerbate wildfire risks due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) The project would not require installation or maintenance of other associated infrastructure such as fuel breaks, power lines, or other utilities that would exacerbate fire risk. As such, the project would not expose people or structures to significant risk involving wildland fires, exacerbate wildfire risks, or otherwise result in wildfire-related impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) The project site is located in a FEMA-designated flood hazard zone, Zone AO, which is a regulatory floodway area, the project does not propose any new buildings. Further, per the County General Plan, Figure S-10 Dam Failure Inundation Zones, the project site is located outside of a dam inundation area. Additionally, the project site topography is relatively flat and as shown in the County’s General Plan, the project site would not be located in an area susceptible to landslides (County of Riverside 2015). Therefore, it is unlikely that the project would expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire stability, or drainage change. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Does the Project:

<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact: As discussed in Section 7, Biological Resources, the project would potentially result in significant impacts to biological resources. As such, the project would incorporate MM-BIO-1 through MM-BIO-5, to reduce all biological resource impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, as discussed in Section 8, Cultural Resources, no historic sites were identified within the records search area of the project site or the 1-mile radius. No newly or previously recorded historic sites were identified within the project site as a result of the CHRIS records search, archival research, or the intensive-level pedestrian survey. There is no evidence to demonstrate that the project would alter, destroy or adversely affect a historic site. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation, the project would not substantially degrade the quality 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. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

<p>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)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact: As concluded throughout this IS/MND, the project would result in either no impact, less-than-significant impact, or a less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated with respect to all environmental impact areas outlined in the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Checklist. For all resource areas analyzed, the project's individual-level impacts would be at less-than-significant levels, which, in turn, would reduce the potential for these impacts to be considered part of any cumulative impact. Therefore, the project would not result in individually limited but cumulatively considerable impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Source(s): N/A

Findings of Fact: As evaluated throughout this document, the project would have no impact, less-than-significant impact, or a less-than-significant with mitigation incorporated with respect to all environmental impact areas. Therefore, the project would not directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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: N/A

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

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

Revised: 11/8/2021 3:25 PM
Y:\Planning Master Forms\Templates\CEQA Forms\EA-IS_Template.docx