COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (CEQ / EA) Number: 43001
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Plot Plan No. 26240, Change of Zone No. 07932
Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department
Address: 4080 Lemon Street 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501
Contact Person: Brett Dawson
Telephone Number: (951) 955-0972
Applicant's Name: Marwan Alabassi
Applicant's Address: 764 West Ramona Expressway, Suite C, Perris CA 92571

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Description:

Plot Plan No. 26240 is a proposal for a total of 11,826 square feet of commercial buildings on 2.59 gross acres. The buildings include a 4,276 square foot drive thru restaurant and a 7,550 square foot multi-tenant retail building.

Change of Zone No. 7932 is a proposal to change the project site's Zoning Classification from Rural Residential (R-R) to Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S).

The description as included above and as further detailed in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration constitutes the "Project" as further referenced in this staff report.

The project is located south of Highway 74, east of Amanda Avenue, north of Old Highway 74, and westerly of Winchester Road.

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

B. Total Project Area:

Residential Acres: 0	**Lots:** N/A	**Units:** N/A	**Projected No. of Residents:**
Commercial Acres: 2.69	**Lots:** N/A	**Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:** 11,740	**Est. No. of Employees:** 30
Industrial Acres: 0	**Lots:** N/A	**Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:** N/A	**Est. No. of Employees:** N/A
Other:			

C. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 458-103-001,458-103-002, 453-103-042

D. Street References: The project is located at the southeast corner of State Highway 74 and Amanda Avenue, north of Old Highway 74 and west of State Highway 79 (Winchester Road).

E. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description: Section 15, Township 5 South, Range 2 West

F. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The project is located in the Winchester / Harvest Valley Area Plan of Western Riverside County in the community of Green Acres. Currently the surrounding area is rural

residential to the west, north and south. New commercial construction is located adjacent to and east of the project site. The surrounding area is primarily flat.

G. Other Public Agency Involvement and Required Permits: Caltrans District 8

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. **Land Use:** The proposed project meets the requirements of the General Plan Land Use Designation of Community Development: Commercial retail (CD:CR) and all applicable policies. The proposed project would meet the following General Plan and Southwest Area Plan Policies.

2. **Circulation:** Adequate circulation facilities exist and are proposed to serve the project. The proposed project meets with all applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.

3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** The proposed project meets all relevant Multipurpose Open Space Policies.

4. **Safety:** The proposed project is within a State Responsibility High Fire Area. The proposed project is not located within any other special hazard zone (including fault zone, high liquefaction, dam inundation zone, etc.) The proposed project has allowed for sufficient provision of emergency response services to the future users of this project through the project design and payment of development impact fees. The proposed project meets with all other applicable Safety Element policies.

5. **Noise:** Sufficient mitigation against any foreseeable noise sources in the area have been provided for in the design of the project. The project will not generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan or noise ordinance. The project meets all other applicable Noise Element Policies.

6. **Housing:** The proposed project meets all applicable Housing Element Policies of the general Plan including policy 5.1.

7. **Air Quality:** The proposed project has been conditioned to control any fugitive dust during grading and construction activities. The proposed project meets all other applicable Air Quality element policies.

8. **Healthy Communities:** The proposed project meets all applicable Health Community Policies: HC 2.2; HC 3.3; HC4.1; HC 9.2; HC 14.1.

B. General Plan Area Plan(s): Harvest Valley/Winchester

C. Foundation Component(s): Community Development

D. Land Use Designation(s): Commercial Retail (CR)

E. Overlay(s), if any: N/A

F. Policy Area(s), if any: Green Acres, Highway 79

G. Adjacent and Surrounding:

1. **General Plan Area Plan(s):** Harvest Valley/Winchester

2. **Foundation Component(s):** Community Development, Rural Community

3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Commercial Retail, Rural Community – Low Density Residential

4. **Overlay(s), if any:** N/A

5. **Policy Area(s), if any:** Green Acres, Highway 79

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: Rural Residential (R-R)

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S)

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R) and Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S)

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Recreation
☐ Agriculture & Forest Resources	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Transportation
☐ Air Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Utilities / Service Systems
☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Wildfire
☐ Energy	☒ Paleontological Resources	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
☐ Geology / Soils	☐ 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 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

1/28/22
Date

Printed Name

For: John Hildebrand
Planning Director

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure C-8 "Scenic Highways" California Department of Transportation, Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, website visited February 1, 2018.

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located adjacent to SR-74. According to Caltrans, this segment of SR-74 is a State Eligible scenic highway (Caltrans 2019). Riverside County General Plan, Figure C-8 "Scenic Highways", includes the same designation for SR-74 (County of Riverside 2015a).

During construction, the presence of construction equipment would increase activity on the project site, visible from SR-74. Despite the visibility of construction equipment on the project site, these activities would be temporary, and views of the construction activities by vehicles traveling within the public right-of-way on SR-74 would be limited to a relatively brief duration. As such, views of project construction would not have a substantial effect on this scenic corridor.

Travelers on SR-74 eastbound and westbound have a view of hillsides to the north, southeast and southwest. Upon implementation of the proposed project, the structures on-site would be similar in character and scale as the existing gas station and retail development adjacent to the SR-74/SR-79 intersection. The existing commercial development adjacent to SR-74 does not substantially obstruct

the surround hillsides. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial effect on views from SR-74.

b) The County of Riverside General Plan Amendment (2015) and Harvest Valley/Winchester Plan includes the project area and provides planning and policy guidance for development within the County and planning area. No specific visual features are noted in the General Plan or Green Acres/Winchester section of the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan that pertain to the general project area nor do the documents include policy guidance referencing the protection or preservation of visual resources.

The project would be constructed on a vacant, undeveloped site. Development would be consistent with neighboring commercial development to the east. Views into the site are of a disturbed development area. Bare ground with limited ruderal vegetation can be seen from State Highway 74 and Amanda Avenue looking south and east. Views within the area are not designated scenic nor does the site contain any unique visual features.

c) The project site consists of undeveloped disturbed land with minimal vegetation and sparsely located ornamental trees. There are currently no sidewalks, curb-and-gutter, or landscaping improvements along SR-74, SR-79, or Old State Highway within the project site or the public ROW.

The proposed project would be developed in the Green Acres community, adjacent to SR-74 and SR-79 (County of Riverside n.d.). Existing commercial land uses are located northwest and southwest of the SR-74/SR-79 intersection. Existing residential development is located north of SR-74, and south of the project site. The closest residence is located approximately 80 feet south of the project site. The proposed project would be similar, in character and design, as the gas station developed on the parcel directly to the east. The applicant will be responsible with off site roadway improvements on SR-79. Per COA (90- RCTD- Existing Caltrans Maintained) State Highway 74 along the project boundary is a paved Caltrans maintained road and designated as “Expressway” and shall be improved with 58-68 foot half width AC pavement, concrete curb and gutter (project side), 8-inch concrete raised curbed median, and MUST much up asphalt concrete paving; reconstruction or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by Caltrans within the 92 foot half width dedicated right of way in accordance with modified County Standard No. 86, Ordinance 461. (Modified for reduced half-width right-of-way from 110 to 92 feet.) These improvements would aid in defining the roadway along the property boundary, and landscaping would improve the scenic quality of the site.

The project consists of a zone change from Rural Residential (R-R) to Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S). The proposed fast-food restaurant with drive-through and retail commercial building at 22 feet in height is below the maximum permitted height of 35 feet, and no “yard setbacks” are required. In addition, the proposed structure would be similar in height as nearby commercial and residential development.

Upon approval of the Project, development of the proposed project would introduce land uses within the project site that are consistent with the vision of the County’s General Plan and consistent with the commercial land uses at the SR-74/SR-79 intersection. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with the zoning regulations governing scenic quality or substantially degrade the visual quality of the site.

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): GIS database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution)

Findings of Fact: As shown on the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan, Figure 7 *Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area,* the project site is located within Zone B of the Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area. All projects within Zone B are required to adhere to the general and Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 655, which regulates light pollution from outdoor lighting fixtures. More specifically, Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 regulates artificial illumination for buildings and structures, recreational facilities, parking lots, landscape, outdoor advertisements and other signs, and private street lighting and walkway lighting. The proposed project would introduce new light sources on the project site associated with exterior lighting, signage, and storefront lighting. However, the proposed project would be required to comply with Sections 6, 7, and 8 of Ordinance 655, which set requirements for lamp source, shielding, and placement and contain certain lighting prohibitions. Adherence to the applicable provisions of Ordinance No. 655 would ensure project lighting would not interfere with nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory.

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): On-site Inspection, Project Application Description

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed residential land use will necessitate the installation of outdoor lighting for public safety and security. The County of Riverside has established standards for the design, placement, and operation of outdoor lighting. These standards set forth the preferred lighting source, identify maximum lighting intensity, dictate shielding requirements, and establish hours of operation. Because these standards are imposed on all outdoor lighting sources and because they must comply to obtain project approval, they are not considered mitigation. While the proposed development will increase the number and distribution of light sources in the vicinity of the project, compliance with County lighting standards would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES Would the project:				
4. Agriculture	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database, Project Application Materials. RCIP Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources", GIS database and Project Materials and Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Birdseye Planning Group, 2018).

Findings of Fact: a-d) The proposed project is located on property currently zoned for Rural Residential development. It has been heavily disturbed as a result of past residential development and use as a recreational vehicle/outdoor storage area. The site is not zoned for nor has it been used for agricultural purposes. The project is not located within 300 feet of any agriculturally zoned parcel and will not conflict with any existing agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract as no such contracts exist on the property or adjacent sites. No impact would occur under this threshold.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

5. Forest a) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Govt. Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-3a "Forestry Resources Western Riverside County Parks, Forests, and Recreation Areas," Figure OS-3b "Forestry Resources Eastern Riverside County Parks, Forests, and Recreation Areas," Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

a) The project site is not located in an area zoned for forest land. The project would have no impact related to conflict with forest land or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

b-c) the proposed project would not directly result in changes to the existing environment or loss of forest land. The proposed project would be consistent with the existing C-P-S zoning designation and the proposed land uses would be similar to existing commercial land uses near the intersection of SR-74 and SR-79. As such, the proposed project would not introduce land uses that would indirectly affect the operation forest land uses..

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors, which are located within one (1) mile of the project site, to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Climate Action Plan ("CAP"), SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook. SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 6-2, EIR No. 380. Hemet Center Phase II Commercial Project, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Study prepared for Al Husn LP, By BPG Birdseye Planning Group June 2018, CalEEMod version 3.2. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Study prepared for Al Husn, LP, 764 West Ramona Expressway, Suite C, Perris CA 92571, by Birdseye Planning Group, June 2018.

Findings of Fact:
The SCAQMD has developed specific quantitative thresholds that apply to projects within the SCAB. The following significance thresholds apply to short-term construction activities:

- *75 pounds per day of ROG*
- *100 pounds per day of NO_X*
- *550 pounds per day of CO*
- *150 pounds per day of SOx*
- *150 pounds per day of PM_{10}*
- *55 pounds per day of $PM_{2.5}$*

The following significance thresholds apply to long-term operational emissions:

- *55 pounds per day of ROG*
- *55 pounds per day of NO_X*
- *550 pounds per day of CO*
- *150 pounds per day of SO_X*
- *150 pounds per day of PM_{10}*
- *55 pounds per day of $PM_{2.5}$*

Construction Emissions

Project construction would generate temporary air pollutant emissions. These impacts are associated with fugitive dust (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) and exhaust emissions from heavy construction vehicles, work crew vehicle trips in addition to ROG that would be released during the drying phase upon application of paint and other architectural coatings. Construction would generally consist of demolition, site preparation, grading, construction of the proposed buildings, paving, and architectural coating (i.e., paint) application.

This analysis assumes that graded soils would be balanced on the project site and that no soil import or export would be required. The project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403, which identifies measures to reduce fugitive dust and is required to be implemented at all construction sites located within the South Coast Air Basin. Therefore, the following conditions, which are required to reduce fugitive dust in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403, were included in CalEEMod for site preparation and grading phases of construction.

1. **Minimization of Disturbance.** Construction contractors should minimize the area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
2. **Soil Treatment.** Construction contractors should treat all graded and excavated material, exposed soil areas, and active portions of the construction site, including unpaved on-site roadways to minimize fugitive dust. Treatment shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, periodic watering, application of environmentally safe soil stabilization materials, and/or roll compaction as appropriate. Watering shall be done as often as necessary, and at least twice daily, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day.

3. **Soil Stabilization.** Construction contractors should monitor all graded and/or excavated inactive areas of the construction site at least weekly for dust stabilization. Soil stabilization methods, such as water and roll compaction, and environmentally safe dust control materials, shall be applied to portions of the construction site that are inactive for over four days. If no further grading or excavation operations are planned for the area, the area shall be seeded and watered until landscape growth is evident, or periodically treated with environmentally safe dust suppressants, to prevent excessive fugitive dust.
4. **No Grading During High Winds.** Construction contractors should stop all clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation operations during periods of high winds (20 miles per hour or greater, as measured continuously over a one-hour period).
5. **Street Sweeping.** Construction contractors should sweep all on-site driveways and adjacent streets and roads at least once per day, preferably at the end of the day, if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent streets and roads.

Construction emissions modeling for demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating application is based on the overall scope of the proposed development and construction phasing which is expected to begin early 2019 and extend through late 2019. The total area disturbed as a result of the project would be 2.69 acres with construction of two commercial buildings. For modeling purposes, it was assumed the maximum area disturbed daily is two acres and the site would be watered three times daily. In addition to SCAQMD Rule 403 requirements, emissions modeling also accounts for the use of low-VOC paint (50 g/L for nonflat coatings) as required by SCAQMD Rule 1113. Table 3 summarizes the estimated maximum mitigated daily emissions of pollutants occurring during 2019.

Table 3

Estimated Maximum Mitigated Daily Construction Emissions

Construction Phase		Maximum Emissions (lbs/day)				
	ROG	**NO_x**	**CO**	**SOx**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
2019 Maximum lbs/day	23.7	10.6	8.4	0.015	1.5	0.7
SCAQMD Regional Thresholds	*75*	*100*	*550*	*150*	*150*	*55*
Threshold Exceeded 2019	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

As shown in Table 3, construction of the proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds. No mitigation in addition to compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 and Rule 1113 would be required to reduce construction emissions to less than significant.

Localized Significance Thresholds. The SCAQMD has published a "Fact Sheet for Applying CalEEMod to Localized Significance Thresholds" (South Coast Air Quality Management District 2011). CalEEMod calculates construction emissions based on the number of equipment hours and the maximum daily disturbance activity possible for each piece of equipment. Construction-related emissions reported by CalEEMod are compared to the localized significance threshold lookup tables. The CalEEMod output in Appendix A shows the equipment assumed for this analysis.

LSTs were devised in response to concern regarding exposure of individuals to criteria pollutants in local communities. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that will not cause or contribute to an air quality exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard at the nearest sensitive receptor, taking into consideration ambient concentrations in each source receptor area (SRA), project size and distance to the sensitive receptor. However, LSTs only apply to emissions within a fixed stationary location, including idling emissions during both project construction and operation. LSTs have been developed for NO_X, CO, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. LSTs are not applicable to mobile sources such as cars on a roadway (Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, SCAQMD, June 2003). As such, LSTs for operational emissions do not apply to the proposed development as the majority of emissions would be generated by vehicles operating on roadways.

LSTs have been developed for emissions within areas up to five acres in size, with air pollutant modeling recommended for activity within larger areas. The SCAQMD provides lookup tables for project sites that measure one, two, or five acres. As referenced, a total of two acres is assumed to be disturbed daily during construction of the proposed project; thus, look up table values for two acres were used to provide a conservative evaluation of potential impacts. The project site is located in Source Receptor Area 24 (SRA-24, Perris Valley). LSTs for construction related emissions in the SRA 24 at varying distances between the source and receiving property are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

SCAQMD LSTs for Construction

Pollutant	**Allowable emissions as a function of receptor distance in meters from a two-acre site (lbs/day)**				
	25	**50**	**100**	**200**	**500**
Gradual conversion of NO_x to NO_2	170	200	264	379	684
CO	883	1,262	2,232	5,136	18,947
PM_{10}	7	20	38	75	186
$PM_{2.5}$	4	6	10	23	91

Source: http://www.aqmd.gov/CEQA/handbook/LST/appC.pdf, October 2009.

As referenced, the nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are located approximately 100 feet (33 meters) south of the property boundary. To provide a conservative evaluation of construction emissions relative to LST thresholds, allowable emissions for 25 meters were used. As shown in Table 3, emissions of NOx, CO, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed the LST thresholds shown in Table 4 for 25 meters.

Project-related construction impacts would be less than significant per thresholds (b) and (d) referenced above.

Construction-Related Toxic Air Contaminant Impacts

The greatest potential for toxic air contaminant emissions would be related to diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during construction of the proposed project. According to SCAQMD methodology, health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of "individual cancer risk". The California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) health risk guidance states that a residential receptor should be evaluated based on a 30-year exposure period. "Individual Cancer Risk" is the likelihood that a person exposed to concentrations of toxic air contaminants over a 70-year lifetime will contract cancer, based on the use of standard risk-assessment methodology. Given the short-term construction schedule, the proposed project would not result in a long-term (i.e., 30 or 70 year) exposure to a substantial source of toxic air contaminant emissions; and thus, would not be exposed to the related individual cancer risk. Therefore, no significant short-term toxic air contaminant impacts would occur during construction of the proposed project.

Construction-Related Odor Impacts

Potential sources of odor during construction activities include equipment exhaust and activities such as paving. The objectionable odors that may be produced during the construction process would occur periodically and end when construction is completed. No significant impact related to odors would occur during construction of the proposed project per threshold referenced above.

Long-Term Regional Impacts

Regional Pollutant Emissions

Table 5 summarizes emissions associated with operation of the proposed project. Operational emissions include emissions from electricity consumption (energy sources), vehicle trips (mobile sources), and area sources including landscape equipment and architectural coating emissions as the structures are repainted over the life of the project. The majority of operational emissions are associated with vehicle trips to and from the project site. Trip volumes were based on trip generation factors for drive-thru restaurants and strip mall retail incorporated into CalEEMod.

As shown in Table 5, the net change in emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO_X, CO, SO_X, PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$. Therefore, the project's regional air quality impacts (including impacts related to criteria pollutants, sensitive receptors and violations of air quality standards) would be less than significant per threshold b. Further, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Impacts relative to threshold c would be less than significant.

Objectionable Odors

The primary source of odors during operation would be operation of the restaurant. During operation, the project would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 1138 which addresses restaurant emissions, specifically from chain-driven char-broilers. Rule 1138 requires the use of a catalytic oxidizer control device to control emission. With the implementation of Rule 1138, odors would be less than significant per threshold (e).

Table 5
Estimated Operational Emissions

	Estimated Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	**NO_X**	**CO**	**SO_X**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Proposed Project						
Area	0.2	0.01	0.01	0.0	0.01	0.01
Energy	0.03	0.3	0.2	0.01	0.02	0.2
Mobile	6.4	39.3	44.5	0.1	8.5	2.4
Maximum lbs/day	**6.63**	**39.61**	**44.71**	**0.11**	**8.03**	**2.61**
SCAQMD Thresholds	**55**	**55**	**550**	**150**	**150**	**55**
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

See Appendix for CalEEMod version. 2013.2.2 computer model output for the demolition of existing development. Summer emissions shown.

AQMP Consistency

A project may be inconsistent with the AQMP if it would generate population, housing, or employment growth exceeding forecasts used in the development of the AQMP. The 2016 AQMP, the most recent AQMP adopted by the SCAQMD, incorporates local city General Plans and the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan socioeconomic forecast projections of regional population, housing and employment growth.

The proposed project involves the construction of two commercial buildings; one for use as a fast-food drive-thru restaurant and the other for retail purposes, which may include a restaurant. The proposed project would not create housing and jobs are expected to be filled by local or regional residents. The proposed project would be consistent with neighboring properties and the transition of properties along SR 74 to commercial uses. Vehicle trips

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

associated with the project would be consistent with similar uses in the area and as discussed herein, project-related emissions would not exceed thresholds recommended by the SCAQMD. Thus, the project would be consistent with the AQMP and not cause an adverse impact under threshold (a).

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source(s): Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (Adopted June 2003), Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, site observations (October 24, 2019) and Riverside County Parcel Report review.

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation San Jacinto Area Plan. The project site is not located within or adjacent to any Criteria Cells or MSHCP Conservation Areas. In addition the project site is not located within any MSHCP required survey areas. The project site is currently vacant other than the presence of non native grasses, The site was previously graded, disturbed land and contains minimal vegetation.

6.1.2 Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools
The project site does not contain MSHCP Riparian/Riverine/Vernal Pool habitat or species associated with these habitats. The project is consistent with Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP.

6.1.3 Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species
The project site is not located within a Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area. Therefore, no surveys were required. The project is consistent with Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP.

6.1.4 Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface
The project site is not located adjacent to an MSHCP Conservation Area. Therefore, the project is not subject to the MSHCP Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines. The project is consistent with Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP.

6.3.2 Additional Survey Needs and Procedures
The project site is not located within a Criteria Area Species Survey Area. Therefore, no surveys were required. The project is consistent with Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP.

The proposed project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan. Impacts will be less than significant with adherence to Riverside County Conditions of Approval.

b) No impacts to any endangered, or threatened species will occur.

c) The Riverside County Planning Department, Environmental Programs Division determined that a nesting bird survey is not required due to the parcel is completely denuded.

d) The project site is not located within or adjacent to an existing or proposed MSHCP Core or Linkage, Conservation Area, or wildlife nursery.

The project will not 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 with adherence to Riverside County Conditions of Approval.

e-f) No impacts to 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 or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act will occur.

g) The proposed project is subject to the Riverside County Oak Tree Management Guidelines. No oak trees are located on the project site. No impacts will occur.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required

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

Source(s): On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, RCIP Figure OS-7 "Historic Resources", site visit, Project Application Materials, Plot Plan 24260, Phase I Archaeological Assessment (Birdseye Planning Group, April 2018).

Findings of Fact: Based on an information center record search and a survey of the property by a qualified archaeologist, it has been determined that there are no historic resources present on this property. Because there are no historic resources identified, there will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): On-Site Inspection, Project Application Materials, RCIP Figure OS-6 "Archaeological Sensitivity", Project Application Materials, Phase 1 Archaeologial Site Assessment (Birdseye Planning Group, February 2018).

Source(s Phase I Cultural Resources Study for the Plot Plan 26240 Change of Zone No. 07932 Project, Winchester, Riverside County, California. Report on file at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.

Findings of Fact: The cultural resource records search, Native American scoping, and pedestrian survey identified no cultural resources within the project site and the site exhibits tremendous previous disturbance. No further cultural resources work is recommended. Because there are no archaeological resources present, there will be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Climate Action Plan ("CAP"), Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The project would result in an increase the site's demand for energy compared to its existing undeveloped state. Specifically, the proposed project would increase consumption of energy for space and water heating, air conditioning, lighting, and operation of miscellaneous equipment and appliances. The project will be required to comply with all Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards developed by the California Energy Commission. These standards apply to energy consumed for heating, cooling, ventilation, water heating, and lighting in new residential and non-residential buildings. With the inclusion of Title 24 requirements, project impacts would be less than significant.

b) The project would not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans. The project would be developed in conformance with all applicable energy conservation regulations including but not limited to Title 24 energy conservation standards. The project would be constructed to achieve the building energy efficiency standards set forth in the California Code of Regulations Title 24 requirements in effect at the time of building permit issuance. The building design will incorporate energy efficient appliances and heating units as feasible. Adherence to these efficiency standards would result in a "maximum feasible" reduction in unnecessary energy consumption. Project impacts due to wasteful consumption of energy resources would be less than significant and no impact would occur due to conflicts with an adopted energy conservation plan.

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): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, Geologist Comments, Geology Report

Findings of Fact: The project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone nor is there any evidence of faulting within or projecting towards the site. Therefore, the potential for this site to be affected by surface fault rupture is considered low. During the life of the proposed improvements, the property will likely experience moderate to occasionally high ground shaking from known faults, as well as background shaking from other seismically active areas of the Southern California region. However, site preparation and construction of building foundations consistent with the geotechnical report and current California Building Code (CBC) requirements would address seismic concerns and related structural impacts associated with ground shaking.

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): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction," LGC Inland Soils Report, October 2009.

Findings of Fact: Liquefaction typically occurs within the upper 50 feet of the surface, when saturated, loose, fine- to medium-grained soils (sand and silt) are present. Earthquake shaking suddenly increases pressure in the water that fills the pores between soil grains, causing the soil to lose strength and behave as a liquid. When liquefaction occurs, the strength of the soil decreases which reduces the ability of the underlying soil to support foundations for buildings and other structures. The type of geologic process that created a soil deposit has a strong influence on its liquefaction susceptibility. Saturated soils that have been created by sedimentation in rivers and lakes can be susceptible to liquefaction.

The soils report prepared by LGC Inland "Response and Supplemental Investigation for the Proposed Hemet Center: APN 453-103-008 -014 Located on the Southwest Corner of State Highway 79 and State Highway 74, Green Acres Area, Riverside County, California (October 2009) is representative of the project site. Groundwater was encountered approximately 48 feet below the ground surface; however, the report found that the potential for liquefaction on the site is low with the exception induced dry sand settlement. Up to ½ inch of settlement can be expected. However, site preparation and construction of building foundations consistent with the geotechnical report and current California Building Code (CBC) requirements would address seismic concerns and related structural impacts associated with ground shaking.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), Geology Report. RCIP Figure S-18 "Inventory of Hazardous Materials", LGC Inland, October 2009

Findings of Fact: As referenced, there are no known active or potentially active faults that traverse the site and the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The principal seismic hazard that could affect the site is ground shaking resulting from an earthquake occurring along several major active or potentially active faults in southern California. Uniform Building Code (UBC) requirements pertaining to residential development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As UBC requirements are applicable to all residential development they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source(s): On-site Inspection, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope," LGC Inland, October 2009

Findings of Fact: The project site is located in an area that is relatively flat and is surrounded by generally flat land. The site does not have the potential for landslide.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 "Documented Subsidence Areas Map," Geology Report. RCIP Figure S-7 "Documented Subsidence Areas", LGC Inland, October 2009

Findings of Fact: Land subsidence is defined as the sinking or settling of land to a lower level. Causes can include: (1) earth movements; (2) lowering of ground water level; (3) removal of underlying supporting materials by mining or solution of solids, either artificially or from natural causes; (4)

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

compaction caused by wetting (hydro-compaction); (5) oxidation of organic matter in soils; or (6) added load on the land surface. The 2007 California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to commercial development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all residential development they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

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): On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Geology Report. Site visit, Project Application, LGC Inland, October 2009

Findings of Fact: The LGC Inland October 2009 report did not find any evidence that the project site is subject to any further geological hazard such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): Riv. Co. 800-Scale Slope Maps, Project Application Materials, Slope Stability Report. Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan, LGC Inland, October 2009, Site Plan

Findings of Fact: The project area is relatively flat and will not require an extensive amount of grading, except for the southerly portion of the project site. The project will connect to the sewer system; thus, grading will not negate or affect subsurface sewage disposal systems. Standard conditions of approval will be provided by Riverside County Planning regarding slopes that will further ensure protection of public health, safety, and welfare upon final engineering of the project and are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

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
18. Soils				
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source(s): U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection, Soils Report. Staff Review, application materials, site visit

Findings of Fact: The site is greater than one acre in size and individual improvements would disturb more than one acre; thus, the project would be subject to State Water Resources Control Board General Construction Permit during construction to minimize soil erosion. For additional information, see Section IX, *Hydrology and Water Quality*. With implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) specified in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared for the project, soil erosion hazard impacts would be less than significant. Standard conditions of approval have been issued regarding soils that will further ensure protection of public health, safety, and welfare upon final engineering of the project and are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

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): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. No. 460, Article XV & Ord. No. 484

Findings of Fact: The project site lies within an area subject to wind erosion. However, the project will decrease the amount of exposed dirt, which is subject to wind erosion, with the incorporation of concrete, asphalt, and landscaping. This project will be required to reduce all foreseeable impacts to air quality including standard dust control and grading mitigation issued by the Department of Building and Safety-Grading Division as conditions of approval.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project:				
20. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Climate Action Plan ("CAP"), Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) GHG emissions associated with construction and operation of the proposed project and existing development have been estimated using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2.

Construction Emissions

Construction of the proposed project would generate temporary GHG emissions primarily associated with the operation of construction equipment and truck trips. Site preparation and grading typically generate the greatest emission quantities because the use of heavy equipment is greatest during this phase of construction. Emissions associated with the construction period were estimated based on the projected maximum amount of equipment that would be used onsite at one time. Air districts such as the SCAQMD have recommended amortizing construction-related emissions over a 30-year period to calculate annual emissions. Complete CalEEMod results and assumptions can be viewed in the Appendix.

Operational Emissions

Default values used in CalEEMod version 2016.3.2 are based on the California Energy Commission (CEC) sponsored California Commercial End Use Survey (CEUS) and Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS) studies. CalEEMod provides operational emissions of CO_2, N_2O and CH_4. This methodology has been subjected to peer review by numerous public and private stakeholders, and in particular by the CEC; and therefore, is considered reasonable and reliable for use in GHG impact analysis pursuant to CEQA. It is also recommended by CAPCOA (January 2008).

Emissions associated with area sources (i.e., consumer products, landscape maintenance, and architectural coating) were calculated in CalEEMod based on standard emission rates from CARB, USEPA, and district supplied emission factor values (CalEEMod User Guide, 2016). Emissions from waste generation were also calculated in CalEEMod and are based on the IPCC's methods for quantifying GHG emissions from solid waste using the degradable organic content of waste (CalEEMod User Guide, 2016). Waste disposal rates by land use and overall composition of municipal solid waste in California was primarily based on data provided by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle).

Emissions from water and wastewater usage calculated in CalEEMod were based on the default electricity intensity from the CEC's 2006 Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California

using the average values for Northern and Southern California. Emissions from mobile sources were quantified based on trip generation estimates included in CalEEMod version 2016.3.2 for commercial projects.

Estimate of GHG Emissions

Construction Emissions

Construction activity is assumed to occur over a period of approximately 12 months beginning in early 2019 and conclude in late 2019. Based on CalEEMod results, construction activity for the project would generate an estimated 79 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2E), as shown in Table 6. Amortized over a 30-year period (the assumed life of the project), construction of the proposed project would generate 2.6 metric tons of CO_2E per year.

Table 6
Estimated Construction Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Year	Annual Emissions (metric tons CO_2E)
2019	79.2
Total	**79.2**
Amortized over 30 years	**2.6 metric tons per year**

See Appendix for CalEEMod software program output for new construction.

Operational Indirect and Stationary Direct Emissions

Long-term emissions relate to energy use, solid waste, water use, and transportation. Each source is discussed below and includes the emissions associated with existing development and the anticipated emissions that would result from the proposed project.

Energy Use. Operation of onsite development would consume both electricity and natural gas (see Appendix for CalEEMod results). The generation of electricity through combustion of fossil fuels typically yields CO_2, and to a smaller extent, N_2O and CH_4. Natural gas emissions can be calculated using default values from the CEC sponsored CEUS and RASS studies which are built into CalEEMod. As shown in Table 7, the overall net increase in energy use at the project site would result in approximately 165 metric tons of CO_2E per year.

Water Use Emissions**.** The CalEEMod results indicate that the project would use approximately 1.9 million gallons of water per year. Based on the amount of electricity generated to supply and convey this amount of water, as shown in Table 8, the project would generate approximately 10 metric tons of CO_2E per year.

Solid Waste Emissions. For solid waste generated onsite, it was assumed that the project would be involved in a municipal recycling program that would achieve a 50% diversion rate, as required by the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939). The CalEEMod results indicate that the project would result in approximately 15 metric tons of CO_2E per year associated with solid waste disposed within landfills.

Table 7
Estimated Annual Energy-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emission Source	Annual Emissions (CO_2E)
Proposed Project	
Electricity	100 metric tons
Natural Gas	65 metric tons
Total	**165 metric tons**

See Appendix for CalEEMod software program output (demolition and new construction).

Table 8
Estimated Annual
Solid Waste and Water Use Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emission Source	Annual Emissions (CO_2E)
Water	10 metric tons
Solid Waste	15 metric tons
Total Water and Solid Waste	**25 metric tons**

See Appendix for CalEEMod software program output (demolition and new construction).
[1]Based on a 50% diversion rate, as required by the California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939).

Transportation Emissions. Mobile source GHG emissions were estimated using the average daily trips calculated by CalEEMod for commercial drive-thru restaurant and strip mall retail projects. Table 9 shows the estimated mobile emissions of GHGs for the project based on the estimated annual VMT of 3,044,273. CalEEMod does not calculate N_2O emissions related to mobile sources. As such, N_2O emissions were calculated based on the project's VMT using calculation methods provided by the California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol (January 2009) and fleet mix percentages calculated by CalEEMod. As shown in Table 9, the project would generate approximately 1,881 metric tons of CO_2E associated with new vehicle trips.

Table 9
Estimated Annual Mobile Emissions of Greenhouse Gases

Emission Source	Annual Emissions (CO_2E)
Proposed Project	
Mobile Emissions (CO_2 & CH_4)	1,819 metric tons
Mobile Emissions (N_2O) [1]	62 metric tons
Total	**1,881 metric tons**

See Appendix for CalEEMod software program output (demolitions and new construction). [1] California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol, Reporting Entity-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Version 3.1,January 2009, page 30-35. See Appendix for calculations.

Combined Construction, Stationary and Mobile Source Emissions

Table 10 combines the net new construction, operational, and mobile GHG emissions associated with the proposed project. As discussed above, temporary emissions associated with construction activity (approximately 76.2 metric tons CO_2E) are amortized over 30 years (the anticipated life of the project).

Table 10
Combined Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emission Source	Annual Emissions (CO_2E)
Construction	2.6 metric tons
Operational Energy Solid Waste Water	 165 metric tons 15 metric tons 10 metric tons
Mobile	1,881 metric tons
Total	**2,073.6 metric tons**

See Appendix for CalEEMod software program output (demolition and new construction).

For the proposed project, the combined annual emissions would total approximately 2,073.6 metric tons per year in CO_2E. This total represents less than 0.001% of California's total 2015 emissions of 440.4 million metric tons. The majority (70%) of the project's GHG emissions are associated with motor vehicular travel. The proposed project is evaluated based on the threshold of 3,000 MT CO_2E annually (County of Riverside, 2015). Project-related annual GHG emissions would not exceed the threshold of 3,000 metric tons per year; therefore, impacts from GHG emissions would be less than significant per threshold a.

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

b) The Climate Action Team Report identifies a recommended list of strategies that the State could pursue to reduce GHG emissions. The CAT strategies are recommended to reduce GHG emissions at a statewide level to meet the goals of the Executive Order S-3-05. These are strategies that could be implemented by various State agencies to ensure that the Governor's targets are met and can be met with existing authority of the State agencies. In addition, in 2008 the California Attorney General published The California Environmental Quality Act Addressing Global Warming Impacts at the Local Agency Level (Office of the California Attorney General, Global Warming Measures Updated May 21, 2008). This document provides information that may be helpful to local agencies in carrying out their duties under CEQA as they relate to global warming. Included in this document are various measures that may reduce the global warming related impacts of a project. Tables 11 and 12 illustrate that the proposed project would be consistent with the GHG reduction strategies set forth by the 2006 CAT Report as well as the 2008 Attorney General's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures.

As referenced, specific goals and actions included in the County of Riverside Climate Action Plan that pertain to the proposed project include those addressing energy and water use reduction, promotion of green building measures, waste reduction, and reduction in vehicle miles traveled. The proposed project would also be required to implement all mandatory green building measures for new commercial development under the CALGreen Code. This would require the project be designed to reduce water consumption, increase building system efficiencies, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant emitting finish materials. Implementation of these building and appliance standards would result in water, energy, and construction waste reductions for the proposed project.

Further, the project is expected to generate less than 3,000 metric MT CO_2e annually; and thus, are defined as small projects with less than significant GHG emissions. These projects do not require evaluation per the screening tables provided in CAP. Based on the fact that the project is consistent with the CAP and GHG reduction strategies set forth by the 2006 CAT Report as well as the 2008 Attorney General's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. This would be a less than significant impact under threshold b.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter (1/4) mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source(s): Project Application Materials, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Birdseye Planning Group, February 2018).

Findings of Fact:

a-e) The project would entail construction of two commercial buildings. One would be used for a drive-thru restaurant; the other for retail which may include a restaurant use. The project would not store or use hazardous materials or 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. The project will not impact State Route 74; and thus, not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. The nearest school is Heritage High School located in the Romoland School District approximately 3.5 miles west of the project site. The project will have no impact on emitting or handling hazardous waste within one-quarter of an existing or proposed school. The project is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites.

The proposed subdivision will not create or require the transport of hazardous materials. However, common household and commercial cleaning products would be used on-site. The nature and volume of such substances associated with the proposed use would not present the potential to create a significant public or environmental hazard. Therefore, hazard material impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-20 "Airport Locations," GIS database. RCIP Figure S-19 "Airport Locations", Hemet-Ryan Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (adopted February 9, 2017).

Findings of Fact: Hemet-Ryan Airport is located approximately 3 miles southeast of the site and is the closest public airport. The Hemet-Ryan Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Figure HR-1, indicates the project site outside the Airport Influence Area Boundary; and thus, the project would not be adversely affected by airport operations. The project would not require review by the Riverside Airport Land Use Commission. The project site is not located in proximity to a private airport/airstrip; thus, operation of the project would not affect the safety of people visiting or employed by the project.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "Special Flood Hazard Areas," Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/ Condition, GIS database

Findings of Fact:
a, c, f) The property is bounded by Amanda Avenue on the west and State Hwy 74 on the north and Old State Hwy 74 on the south. The only tributary drainage area to this site is from the centerline of State Hwy 74 which sheet flows off the street and drains through the subject property to the south. Once off-site, the water flows across Old Hwy 74 where these flows enter properties to the south. The total tributary area is 2.17 acres which results in a 100 year 1-hour storm peak runoff of 7.25 cubic feet per second (cfs).

As referenced, the subject property will be improved with one fast food restaurant and a commercial building, a parking lot and a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) basin. With the perimeter street improvements constructed, off-site flows will be collected and conveyed south in Amanda Avenue where they will be captured by a catch basin and then conveyed to the WQMP basin for treatment. The onsite flows will be conveyed around each building, through the parking lot and collected in catch basins near the site entrance at Amanda Avenue and then conveyed through an underground storm drain to outlet into the WQMP basin. Post-construction, the developed tributary area would remain 2.17 acres; however, 100-year 1-hour storm peak runoff would increase to 8.46 cfs. The on-site WQMP basin would be constructed with a layer of permeable soil that will filter and treat the runoff from the impervious surfaces. Once treated, flows would be conveyed across the street through a storm drain system which outlets to a drainage channel that conveys flows to the south.

The project would alter drainage; however, flows would be captured, retained and treated on-site prior to release into a storm drain. The project would not contribute to substantial erosion or siltation off-site. All water would be treated to applicable standards prior to release; thus, it would not violate waste discharge standards. The WQMP basin would be designed to retain and treat flows from the project and within the drainage tributary. Post-construction flows would not exceed the capacity of the stormwater system.

b) The project will obtain potable water from Eastern Municipal Water District. No on-site groundwater would be used. The project site is not located over a groundwater recharge area. However, as noted, all precipitation would be collected, treated and conveyed off-site where groundwater recharge resulting from percolation could occur.

d) Construction of the proposed project would result in grading and ground disturbance, which could alter the current drainage pattern of the project site. Erosion during construction would be related primarily to disturbed soils and sediments that may enter the storm water during rainfall events or winds. Implementation of the SWPPP, including erosion control and sediment control BMPs (described in response to Section 21(a-b) would reduce erosion on and off site. Therefore, compliance with existing water quality regulations would ensure short-term construction impacts would be less than significant.

Development of the proposed project would alter existing ground contours of the project site and increase the impervious surface area on the site, all of which would result in changes to the existing drainage patterns interior to the site. Proposed grading within the project site would not change the general southeasterly gradient of the project site. By increasing the area of impervious surfaces on the site, more surface runoff would be generated, and the rate and volume of runoff would increase.

Although installation of impervious surfaces would increase surface runoff, sedimentation within the runoff would be reduced with due to site development, landscaped areas, and implementation of BMPs. Thus, on-site erosion would be reduced with development of the proposed project. To manage surface runoff, the proposed project incorporates a drainage basin to capture storm water from the site. Thus, impacts associated with the alteration of drainage patterns and erosion would be less than significant with adherence to applicable local, regional, and State requirements.

e) Development of the proposed project would result in the conversion of on-site permeable surfaces to impermeable surfaces, which would alter the current drainage pattern of the project site. Stormwater runoff within the project site would be directed the stormwater drainage basin located in the southeastern portion of the project site. The proposed project's on-site storm drain systems would adequately convey storm water flows and control the release of stormwater to the public ROW. In addition, the proposed on-site storm drain and water quality system would adequately treat on-site flows. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in on-site or off-site flooding.

g) The project site is located within Zone X of the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map panel 06065C2080H, dated April 19, 2017 (FEMA 2017). Zone X represents areas of minimal flood hazard. Construction of the proposed project would not impede or redirect flood flows within a designated 100-year flood plain. Stormwater captured on-site would be treated, and control-released via surface flow to the public ROW south of the project site, similar to existing conditions.

h) As discussed in Section 23(g), the proposed project is not within a 100-year flood zone (FEMA 2017). The project site is not located near a levee or dam, nor is the project located near a body of water that would pose potential seiche or tsunami impacts. As such, the proposed project would not pose risk of release of pollutants within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone

i)The project site is under the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana RWQCB. The RWQCB sets water quality objectives and beneficial uses in the Santa Ana River Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Perris-South Management Zone, which includes the project site. These water quality objectives are intended to protect the present and probable beneficial uses of California inland water bodies including bays, estuaries, and groundwater.

To address the potential for urban pollutants, such as oil, grease, sediment, and trash, discharged in stormwater during operation, the project applicant would implement a site-specific Water Quality Management Plan to capture stormwater runoff within the project site and operate a low impact development (LID) BMP bioretention system and underground retention chambers to ensure the proposed project site does not increase runoff volume when compared to the existing, undeveloped condition. Each of the proposed LID BMPs are designed to perform at a "high" level of pollutant removal efficiency in accordance with the most current edition of the RWQCB Design Handbook for Low Impact Development Best Management Practices (RWQCB 2016), and therefore are not anticipated to obstruct implementation of the Santa Ana River Basin Plan.

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project applicant has applied for a change of zone from RR to C-P-S to accommodate the proposed use. The project site is designated Commercial Retail (CR) in the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan. The project site is not located within a city sphere of influence. The change of zone would ensure project compliance with the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan. The project would be consistent with uses allowed in the Riverside County C-S-P zoning designation. Whereby impacts would be less than significant.

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): Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-6 “Mineral Resources Area”

Findings of Fact: The project site is located in an area designated Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ)-3. This designation indicates that available geologic information shows that mineral deposits are likely to exist, however the significance has not been determined. No abandoned, existing, or proposed quarries or mines are within the immediate project vicinity and current RCIP land uses preclude mining in the area.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

NOISE Would the project result in:				
26. Airport Noise	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-20 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map

Findings of Fact: The proposed project is not located within 2 miles of a public use or private airport. As referenced, the nearest public airport is Hemet-Ryan Airport located approximately 3.5 miles east of the site. Customers, vendors and employees would not be exposed to excessive noise from airport operations.

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Table N-1 ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure"), Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed project site is located adjacent to and south of State Highway 74. The nearest sensitive properties (i.e., residences) are located approximately 100 feet to the south of the site. These residences are at a lower elevation of approximately 10 feet than the pad elevation. Neighboring receivers would experience noise from the project during both construction and operation. Noise levels (or volume) are generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The A-weighting scale is an adjustment to the actual sound power levels consistent with the human hearing response, which is most sensitive to frequencies around 4,000 Hertz (about the highest note on a piano) and less sensitive to low frequencies (below 100 Hertz).

Equipment that would be in use during construction would include, in part, graders, backhoes, rubber tired dozers, cranes, forklifts, cement mixers, pavers, rollers, and air compressors. The typical maximum noise levels for various pieces of construction equipment at a distance of 50 feet are presented in table A. Note that equipment noise levels presented in Table A are maximum noise levels. Usually

construction equipment operates in alternating cycles of full power and low power, producing an average noise levels over time that are less than the maximum noise level. The average sound level of construction activities during that time.

Aggregate noise emissions from project construction activities, broken down by sequential phase, was predicted at two distances to the nearest existing noise-sensitive receptor: 1) from the nearest position of the construction site boundary, and 2) from the geographic center of the construction site, which serves as the time-averaged location or geographic *acoustical centroid* of active construction equipment for the phase under study. The intent of the former distance is to help evaluate anticipated construction noise from a limited quantity of equipment or vehicle activity expected to be at the boundary for some period of time, which would be most appropriate for phases such as site preparation, grading, and paving. The latter distance is used in a manner similar to the general assessment technique as described in the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) guidance for construction noise assessment, when the location of individual equipment for a given construction phase is uncertain over some extent of (or the entirety of) the construction site area. Because of this uncertainty, all the equipment for a construction phase is assumed to operate, on average, from the acoustical centroid. Table B summarizes these two distances to the apparent closest noise-sensitive receptor.. At the site boundary, this analysis assumes that up to only one piece of equipment of each listed type per phase would be involved in the construction activity for a limited portion of the 8-hour period. In other words, at such proximity, the operating equipment cannot “stack” or crowd the vicinity and still operate. For the acoustical centroid case, which intends to be a geographic average position for all equipment during the indicated phase, this analysis assumes that the equipment may be operating up to all 8 hours per day.

Table A. Typical Construction Equipment Maximum Noise Levels

Equipment Type	Typical Equipment (L_{max}, dBA at 50 Feet)
Air compressor	78
Backhoe	78
Concrete pump truck	81
Grader	85
Crane	81
Dump Truck	76
Dozer	82
Paver	77
Roller	80

Note: L_{max} = maximum sound level; dBA = A-weighted decibels.

Table B. Estimated Distances between Construction Activities and the Nearest Noise-sensitive Receptors

Construction Phase (and Equipment Types Involved)	Distance from Nearest Noise-Sensitive Receptor to Construction Site Boundary (Feet)	Distance from Nearest Noise-Sensitive Receptor to Acoustical Centroid of Site (Feet)
Grading (grader, dozer, excavator, backhoe)	100	350
Building construction (crane, man-lift, welder)	100	350
Paving (paver, roller, backhoe, concrete mixer truck)	100	350
Architectural Coating (compressor)	100	350

Table A. Typical Construction Equipment Maximum Noise Levels

Equipment Type	Typical Equipment (L_{max}, dBA at 50 Feet)

Source: Appendix D

A Microsoft Excel–based noise prediction model emulating and using reference data from the Federal Highway Administration Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM) was used to estimate construction noise levels at the nearest occupied noise-sensitive land use. Input variables for the predictive modeling consist of the equipment type and number of each (e.g., two graders, a loader, a tractor), the duty cycle for each piece of equipment (e.g., percentage of time within a specific time period, such as an hour, when the equipment is expected to operate at full power or capacity and thus make noise at a level comparable to what is presented in Table A), and the distance from the noise-sensitive receiver. The predictive model also considers how many hours that equipment may be on site and operating (or idling) within an established work shift. Conservatively, no topographical or structural shielding was assumed in the modeling. The RCNM has default duty-cycle values for the various pieces of equipment, which were derived from an extensive study of typical construction activity patterns. Table C summarizes these two distances to the apparent closest noise-sensitive receptor for each of the sequential construction phases.

Table C. Predicted Construction Noise Levels per Activity Phase

Construction Phase (and Equipment Types Involved)	8-Hour L_{eq} at Nearest Noise-Sensitive Receptor to Construction Site Boundary (dBA)	8-Hour L_{eq} at Nearest Noise-Sensitive Receptor to Acoustical Centroid of Site (dBA)
Grading (grader, dozer, excavator, backhoe)	79	73
Building construction (crane, man-lift, welder)	69	67
Paving (paver, roller, backhoe, concrete mixer truck)	79	70
Architectural Coating (compressor)	66	63

Source: Appendix D

Notes: L_{eq} = equivalent noise level; dBA = A-weighted decibels.

As presented in Table C, the estimated construction noise levels are predicted to be 80 dBA L_{eq} or less over an 8-hour period (consistent with what the FTA recommends as a daytime threshold for construction noise exposure over an 8-hour period at a residential receptor) at the nearest existing residences (as close as 60 feet away) when grading activities take place near the southern project site boundary. Note that these estimated noise levels at a source-to-receiver distance of 100 feet would only occur when noted pieces of heavy equipment would each operate for a cumulative period from up to 5 hours a day. By way of example, a grader might make multiple passes on site that are this close to a receiver; but, for the remaining time during the day, the grader is sufficiently farther away, performing work at a more distant location, or simply not operating. Under these conditions, predicted operation of construction equipment and processes do not exceed noise levels of 80 dBA Leq.

Although nearby off-site residences would be exposed to elevated construction noise levels, the increase to existing outdoor noise levels would typically be relatively short term during the construction period. Pursuant to Section 9.52.020 of the Riverside County Code of Ordinances, construction activities associated with the proposed project would take place within the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., during the months of June through September, and 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., during the months of October through May.

In summary, daytime construction noise would not exceed the FTA guidance-based standard and construction activities would be limited to permitted construction hours pursuant to the County's Code of Ordinances. Thus, temporary construction-related noise impacts would be considered less then significant.

Long-Term Operational

Roadway Traffic Noise

The proposed project would result in the creation of additional vehicle trips on local roadways (i.e., Old State Highway, SR-74 and SR-79), which could result in increased traffic noise levels at adjacent noise-sensitive land uses. In particular, the proposed project would create additional traffic along Old State Highway, which according to the Traffic Impact Assessment prepared for the proposed project would add 1,903 average daily trips to the adjacent roadways surrounding the project site.

Potential noise effects from vehicular traffic were assessed using the Federal Highway Administration's Traffic Noise Model version 2.5. Information used in the model included the roadway geometry, posted traffic speeds, and traffic volumes for the above roadway segments with the following scenarios: existing (year 2017), existing plus ambient, existing plus ambient plus project, existing plus ambient plus cumulative, and existing plus ambient plus cumulative plus project.

The County of Riverside Noise Ordinance is codified in Title 9 of the Riverside County Code of Ordinances. Section 9.52.040 establishes the exterior noise level criteria for residential properties affected by operational (stationary) noise sources. For residential properties the exterior noise level shall not exceed 55 dBA Leq during daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) and 45 dBA Leq during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.).

Section 9.52.020 of the County's Noise Ordinance states that noise sources associated with any private construction activity located within one-quarter of a mile from an inhabited dwelling is permitted between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., during the months of June through September, and 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., during the months of October through May. While the County of Riverside limits the hours of construction activity, it does not specifically address construction noise limits. Thus, construction activities occurring between the prescribed hours are considered exempt from the ambient noise standards of the ordinance.

The Riverside County General Plan, Noise Element, establishes a policy for exterior sensitive areas to be protected from high noise levels. The Noise Element sets 65 dBA CNEL for the outdoor areas and 45 dBA CNEL for interior areas as the normally acceptable levels. However, existing levels from traffic already exceed this threshold. For the purposes of this noise analysis, such impacts are considered significant when they cause an increase of 3 dB over the existing noise levels. An increase or decrease in noise level of at least 3 dB is required before any noticeable change in community response would be expected. The receivers were modeled to be 5 feet above the local ground elevation. The noise model results are summarized in Table 13.

For the sensitive receptors to the south, due to the culmination of the higher elevation and the proposed buildings on the south end of the property, the expected traffic noise levels are predicted to decrease due to introduction of the proposed new building associated the with proposed project. For example, traffic noise from SR-74 would be reduced at some residences south of the project because the project structures would act as a noise buffer. Thus, a less-than-significant impact is expected, related off-site traffic noise increases affecting existing residences in the vicinity of the project site.

Stationary Operations Noise

The incorporation of new facilities attributed to development of the proposed project would add a variety of noise-producing mechanical equipment. Most of these noise-producing equipment or sound sources would be considered stationary, or limited in mobility to a defined area. Using a Microsoft Excel–based outdoor sound propagation prediction model, project-attributed operational noise at nearby community receptors was predicted using several assumptions:

- The southerly retail building and the drive-through fast food restaurant would both likely feature a packaged air-conditioner on its roof, which we could assume would be something like a 5-ton (refrigeration) air-cooled condensing unit resembling a Carrier CA16NA 060 and thus having a reference sound power level of 78 dBA (or 76 dBA if equipped with a "sound shield" [Carrier 2012]). These two rooftop HVAC units would also operate during some or all nighttime hours.
- Four (4) idling vehicles in line for the fast food restaurant drive-through window. Conservatively, a pick-up truck is considered idling with Leq = 79 dBA at 3 feet
- Point-source sound propagation (i.e., 6 dB per doubling of distance) that conservatively ignores acoustical absorption from atmospheric and ground surface effects; and,
- Conservative treatment of potential noise path occlusion due to intervening building locations having no effect on emitted sound levels. Hence, should the proposed project position these condenser units at-grade level; the predictive analysis would still be considered accurate.

Stationary noise sources associated with project operations would result in noise levels up to 45 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptors located south of the project site. As such, noise levels generated by stationary sources during project operations would not exceed the County's daytime threshold of 65 dBA hourly L_{eq} and nighttime threshold of 45 dBA hourly L_{eq}. Therefore, the on-site operations would result in less-than-significant noise impacts.

b) Construction activities may expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise, causing a potentially significant impact. Caltrans has collected groundborne vibration information related to construction activities. Information from Caltrans indicates that continuous vibrations with a PPV of approximately 0.2 inches per second (ips) is considered annoying. For context, heavier pieces of construction equipment, such as a bulldozer that may be expected on the project site, have peak particle velocities of approximately 0.089 ips or less at a reference distance of 25 feet.

Groundborne vibration attenuates rapidly, even over short distances. The attenuation of groundborne vibration as it propagates from source to receptor through intervening soils and rock strata can be estimated with expressions found in FTA and Caltrans guidance. By way of example, for a bulldozer operating on site and as close as the southern project boundary (i.e., 60 feet from the nearest receiving sensitive land use) the estimated vibration velocity level would be 0.024 ips per the equation as follows:

$PPV_{rcvr} = PPV_{ref} * (25/D)^{1.5} = 0.023 = 0.089 * (25/60)^{1.5}$;

Where PPV_{rcvr} is the predicted vibration velocity at the receiver position, PPV_{ref} is the reference value at 25 feet from the vibration source (the bulldozer), and D is the actual horizontal distance to the receiver. Therefore, at this predicted PPV, the impact of vibration-induced annoyance to occupants of nearby existing homes approximately 100 feet away 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.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES:				
28. Paleontological Resources a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity," Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program ("PRIMP") Report

Findings of Fact:

Findings of Fact:

a)The Riverside County General Plan, Figure OS-8, identifies the project site as having a high paleontological sensitivity (County of Riverside 2015b. Pursuant to General Plan Policy OS 19.7, the proposed project would be required to implement MM-PAL-1 in the event a fossil is encountered during ground disturbing activities, to ensure proper treatment of unanticipated paleontological resources.

Mitigation:

MM-PAL-1 This site is mapped in the County's General Plan as having a High potential for paleontological resources (fossils). Proposed project site grading/earthmoving activities could potentially impact this resource. HENCE:

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS:

1. The applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist approved by the County to create and implement a project-specific plan for monitoring site grading/earthmoving activities (project paleontologist).

2. The project paleontologist retained shall review the approved development plan and grading plan and conduct any pre-construction work necessary to render appropriate monitoring and mitigation requirements as appropriate. These requirements shall be documented by the project paleontologist in a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP). This PRIMP shall be submitted to the County Geologist for approval prior to issuance of a Grading Permit. Information to be contained in the PRIMP, at a minimum and in addition to other industry standards and Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards, are as follows:

3. A corresponding and active County Grading Permit (BGR) Number must be included in the title of the report. PRIMP reports submitted without a BGR number in the title will not be reviewed.

4. PRIMP must be accompanied by the final grading plan for the subject project.

5. Description of the proposed site and planned grading operations.

6. Description of the level of monitoring required for all earth-moving activities in the project area.

7. Identification and qualifications of the qualified paleontological monitor to be employed for grading operations monitoring.

8. Identification of personnel with authority and responsibility to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for recovery of large specimens.

9. Direction for any fossil discoveries to be immediately reported to the property owner who in turn will immediately notify the County Geologist of the discovery.

10. Means and methods to be employed by the paleontological monitor to quickly salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays.

11. Sampling of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates.

12. Procedures and protocol for collecting and processing of samples and specimens.

13. Fossil identification and curation procedures to be employed.

14. Identification of the permanent repository to receive any recovered fossil material. *Pursuant the County "SABER Policy", paleontological fossils found in the County should, by preference, be directed to the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet. A written agreement between the property owner/developer and the repository must be in place prior to site grading.

15. All pertinent exhibits, maps and references.

16. Procedures for reporting of findings.

17. Identification and acknowledgement of the developer for the content of the PRIMP as well as acceptance of financial responsibility for monitoring, reporting and curation fees. The property owner and/or applicant on whose land the paleontological fossils are discovered shall provide appropriate funding for monitoring, reporting, delivery and curating the fossils at the institution where the fossils will be placed, and will provide confirmation to the County that such funding has been paid to the institution.

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

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

Safeguard Artifacts Being Excavated in Riverside County (SABER)

Monitoring: Mitigation will be implemented and monitoring through the conditions of approval for the project.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:				
29. Housing a) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source(s): Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element

Findings of Fact: There are no existing residences on the site; thus, the project will not displace existing housing or groups of people necessitating the construction of housing elsewhere. No housing would be constructed as part of the project and it is assumed that future employees already reside in the general area. As referenced, the project would employ up to 30 people when fully operational. No housing would be required to accommodate the work force.

The Riverside County Board of Supervisors approved the original Redevelopment Project Area 1-1986 on December 23, 1986, via Ordinance No. 635. It was subsequently amended, most recently on July 20, 1999. The project site is located east of the County Redevelopment Project Area.

Based on the scope of the project, it would not exceed local or regional population projections or induce substantial population growth.

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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
30. Fire Services	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact: The project area is serviced by the Riverside County Fire Department. The nearest station is located in Winchester approximately 2.5 miles south of the site. The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. Any significant affects will be mitigated by the payment of fees to the County of Riverside. This project will be conditioned to comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to fire services.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

31. Sheriff Services	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact: The project area is served by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department Perris station. The proposed project would have an incremental effect on the level of law enforcement services needed in the vicinity of the project area. The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. This project will be conditioned to comply with County Ordinance No. 659 mitigate the potential impacts to law enforcement services.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

32. Schools	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source(s): School District correspondence, GIS database

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will not result in a residential population increase; and thus, will have no impact on schools. The proposed project is located within the Hemet Unified School District. Impacts to school services will be mitigated in accordance with state law. This project will be conditioned to pay School Mitigation Impact fees in order to mitigate the potential impacts on school services.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

33. Libraries	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

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

Findings of Fact: Library services for existing residences on the project site are provided by the Riverside County Public Library System. The nearest library is located at 26001 Briggs Road in Menifee. The project will not result in an increase in the residential population; thus, it will have no effect on demand for library services. Development fees required by the Riverside County Public Library System. The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. Development fees required by the Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 may be used at the County's discretion to provide additional library facilities. This project will be conditioned to comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential impacts to library services.
Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

34. Health Services	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact: The proposed project would not increase the residential population; and thus, will have no impact on health services. The site is located within the service parameters of County health centers. The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. The presence of medical communities generally corresponds with the increase in population associated with the new development. As such, no mitigation is necessary.

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

Source(s): GIS database, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications), Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees), Parks & Open Space Department Review

Findings of Fact: The project includes two commercial buildings; one for use as a drive-thru fast food restaurant and the other for strip mall retail. The scope of the project does not include recreational facilities for customers nor would the project affect demand for recreational services in the community. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, or upon building permit final inspection prior to use

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

or occupancy for cases without final inspection or certificate of occupancy (such as an SMP)], whichever comes first, the applicant would comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 810, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance. The amount of the fee will be based on the "Project Area" as defined in the Ordinance and the Conditions of Approval.

As referenced, the proposed use would increase demand for recreational services or otherwise affect that may result in the physical deterioration of the existing recreational facilities. The project is not located within a CSA for recreation or park district.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

36. Recreational Trails a) Include the construction or expansion of a trail system?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure C-6 Trails and Bikeway System, Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan: Trails and Bikeway System (Figure 9).

Findings of Fact: A community trail is shown along SR 74 in the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan: Trails and Bikeway System (Figure 9). The project does not incorporate a trail nor would it affect the implementation of the Area Plan trail system.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Project Application Materials, Plot Plan No. 26240 Project Traffic Impact Analysis March 28, 2018, Kunzman Associates

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy that establishes measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, based on the TIA prepared for the proposed project. The project driveway on Highway 74 will be stop controlled and restricted to right turns in/out only access. The project driveway on Amanda will be stop controlled and is required to be right in right out. Highway 74 along the project boundary should be constructed at the ultimate half-section width as an expressway, including landscaping and parkway improvements in conjunction with development, or as otherwise approved by the County of Riverside Transportation Department. The projected eastbound right turn movement on State Highway 74 turning into the proposed driveway is approximately 31 vehicles. The proposed project will widen Highway 74 and sufficient length is provided to accommodate the project eastbound right turning vehicles between Amanda Avenue and the proposed driveway.

The General Plan states that peak hour intersection operations of Level of Service C or better are generally acceptable along all County maintained roads and conventional state highways. As an exception, Level of Service D may be allowed in Community Development areas, only at intersections of any combination of Secondary Highways, Major Highways, Arterial highways, urban arterial highways, expressways, conventional state highways or freeway ramp intersections.

A project results in a significant impact if the addition of project generated trips to a study intersection causes the operating Level of Service (Level of Service D or better) to a deficient Level of Service (Level of Service E or F) during either the morning peak hour or the evening peak hour.

As detailed in Table 2 of the TIA, the project is forecast to generate a total of approximately 1,903 daily trips, 149 net trips of which will occur during the morning peak hour and 145 net trips of which will occur during the evening peak hour. With the below recommended improvements, the traffic conditions would achieve an acceptable level of service.

The project is conditioned per the below conditions to make the following improvements:

(Trans 80 Caltrans Letter)- The applicant shall comply with the recommendations provided in the Caltrans letter, dated February 5, 2021 (File No. Riv-74-PM34.17, C/S: SR-74 at Amanda Avenue).

The CALTRANS letter states:

- At such time that an application for a Caltrans Encroachment permit is received for review and approval, we anticipate a need for submittal of an updated TIA, to include:
- Page 3 Opening Year – Cumulative (2019). The proposed center's opening years is anticipated in 2019. Revise to show updated opening year throughout.
- Verify and update all traffic volumes, intersection turning counts, geometrics, level of service calculations and/or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as applicable.

The proximity of SR-74 to the proposed full turn access drive at the Amanda Avenue frontage may result in queuing affecting the highway at this intersection. To alleviate this concern, we suggest restricting this entrance to right in/out only. The need for this change may be re-evaluated with review of an updated TIA at the time of future Caltrans encroachment permit review. "

(RCTD 90 Caltrans Encroachment Permit) Prior to issuance of a building permit or any use allowed by this permit, and prior to doing any work within the State Highway right-of-way, clearance and/or an encroachment permit must be obtained by the applicant from the District 08 Office of the State Department of Transportation in San Bernardino.

(RCTD Existing Caltrans 90 Transportation) - Approval of the Street Improvement plans by the Transportation Department will clear this condition. The Project shall provide the following improvements:

SH 74 along project boundary is a paved Caltrans maintained road and designated as EXPRESSWAY and shall be improved with 58-68 foot half width AC pavement, concrete curb and gutter (project side), 8-inch concrete raised curbed median, and MUST much up asphalt concrete paving; reconstruction or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by the CALTRANS within the 92 foot half width dedicated right of way in accordance with modified County Standard No. 86, Ordinance 461. (Modified for reduced half-width right-of-way from 110 to 92 feet.)

NOTE:

An 8 foot concrete sidewalk shall be constructed 7 feet from the curb line within the 29 foot modified parkway per Standard No. 401 parkway as approved by CALTRANS.

A 14 foot wide raised curb landscaped median shall be constructed at the centerline per Standard No. 113, Ordinance 461 and as directed by CALTRANS.

All curb to curb required street improvement plans within the CALTRANS jurisdiction shall be submitted to CALTRANS.

All parkway improvement plans within the CALTRANS jurisdiction shall be submitted for review and approval to County Transportation Department.

(RCTD – Part Width – 90- Transportation) - Old State Highway 74 along project boundary is designated as a Collector road and shall be improved with 34 foot part-width AC pavement, (22 on the project side and 12 on the opposite side of the centerline), 6-inch concrete curb and gutter, and sidewalk within a 67 foot part-width dedicated right-of-way (37 feet on project side and 30 feet on opposite side of the centerline) in accordance with County Standard No. 103, Section "A", Ordinance 461.

NOTE:
1. A 5 foot sidewalk shall be constructed 7 feet from the curb line within the 15 foot parkway.

2. Driveway shall be constructed per County Standard No. 207A.

3. The retaining wall footing shall be outside the public road right-of-way.

Amanda Avenue along project boundary is designated as a LOCAL ROAD and shall be improved with 32 foot part-width AC pavement, (20 on the project side and 12 on the opposite side of the centerline), 6-inch concrete curb and gutter, and sidewalk within a 60 foot full-width dedicated right-of-way (30 feet on project side and 30 feet on opposite side of the centerline) in accordance with County Standard No. 105, Section "C", Ordinance 461.

NOTE:
1. A 5 foot sidewalk shall be constructed adjacent to the property line within the 10 foot parkway.

2. Driveway shall be constructed per County Standard No. 207A.

1. The retaining wall footing shall be outside the public road right-of-way.

With these required improvements, the project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system.

b) In the fall of 2013, Senate Bill (SB) 743 was passed by the legislature and signed into law. Delay-based metrics such as roadway capacity and level of service is no longer be the performance measures used for the determination of the transportation impacts of projects in studies conducted under CEQA. Vehicle miles travelled (VMT) is now the applicable method for evaluation transportation impacts under CEQA.

The Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled and Level of Service Assessment (County of Riverside 2020) have been utilized in screening the proposed project's VMT analysis. Local-serving retail projects less than 50,000 square feet may be presumed to have a less than significant impact absent substantial evidence to the contrary. The TIA guidelines for VMT and LOS do not require local-serving retail projects to prepare a VMT analysis. This is due to local serving retail generally improving the convenience of shopping close to home and reducing vehicle travel instead of increasing or inducing vehicular travel.

The project proposes construction and operation of approximately 6,550 sf of local-serving retail uses which include a fast-food restaurant with drive-through and 24-hour convenience market. The proposed retail development is well below the 50,000 sf VMT screening threshold. The project is under the 3K TTCO2e values so it is classified as an exempt project. Therefore, the proposed project meets the County's screening criteria for presumption of less-than-significant VMT impacts for local-serving retail land uses whereby impacts would be less than significant.

c) The proposed project would be accessible from SR-74 and Amanda Avenue. The project would include on-site circulation improvements (driveways and internal drive aisles), frontage improvements along the project site boundary, and roadway improvements to SR-79. These on-site and adjacent improvements would be designed in accordance with all applicable design standards set forth by the County and Caltrans. The design will undergo County and Fire Department review before approval to ensure that the local development standards for roadways are met without resulting in traffic safety impacts including hazardous design features. Due to high speed limits along SR-74, there is potential for safety hazards for right-turning vehicles leaving the through traffic along SR-74 to enter the northern project driveway. As such, the driveways are required to be right in right out prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy, through implementation of (RCTD Existing Caltrans 90 Transportation). Based on the above analysis, the proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses.

d) The proposed project would be served by existing roads (Amanda Avenue, State Highway 74 and adjacent property). As such, the proposed project would not cause an effect upon or require new or altered maintenance of roads.

e) Project construction would occur over an approximate 7-month duration. Construction activities are estimated to require up to 10 worker vehicle trips daily to access the site and up to 2 vendor trips daily

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

to deliver building materials (Appendix A). These trips would occur during the temporary construction phase only and would result in a negligible increase in traffic on existing roadways. Project construction would require off-site roadway improvements adjacent to the project site, within existing roadways. To ensure that impacts associated with temporary lane closures are minimized, the project applicant must prepare a traffic control plan. This construction traffic plan would include measures designed to reduce the impact of temporary construction traffic and any necessary lane closures. Such measures may include but are not limited to providing early notification of closures to the fire and police services, residents, and nearby businesses; the use of signage before and during construction activities that clearly delineates detour routes around the lane and street closures; and flaggers to direct traffic in the vicinity of the closure. With the incorporation of this plan, the proposed project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system whereby impacts would be considered less than significant.

f) The project site would be accessible to emergency responders during construction and operation activities. As discussed in Section 37(e) above, construction of off-site improvements is not anticipated to require any full road closures. As such, adequate emergency access to the project site and vicinity would be maintained during construction activities.

During project operations, the project site would be accessible via driveways on SR-74, Amanda Avenue and through the adjacent property's access. Each of the proposed driveways would be designed and constructed to County standards and comply with County width, clearance, and turning-radius requirements. The project site would be designed with adequate space for an emergency vehicle to enter the driveways. Development of two driveway access points and compliance with all applicable local requirements related to emergency vehicle access and circulation would ensure the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact: A community trail is shown along SR 74 in the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan: Trails and Bikeway System (Figure 9). The project does not incorporate a trail nor would it affect the implementation of the Area Plan trail system.

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
TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is:				
39. Tribal Cultural Resources a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? (In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source(s): County Archaeologist, AB52 Tribal Consultation

Findings of Fact: 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 April 7, 2017. The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians requested to consult in a letter dated April 24, 2017, the Morongo Band of Mission Indians requested to consult in a letter dated April 24, 3017 and the Pala Band of Indians deferred to closer tribes.

No response was received from the Cahuilla Band of Indians, Colorado River Indian Tribes (CRIT), Ramona Band of Cahuilla Indians, Temecula Band of Luiseño Indians (Pechanga [late]), the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians or the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians.

This project was discussed with Morongo during a video conference on October 17, 2017. All project documentation was provided to the tribe and consultation was concluded by the tribe on April 28, 2018. Consultation was completed with Soboba during a meeting held November 22, 2017. All project documentation was provided to Soboba and consultation was concluded by the tribe on June 13, 2018. No Tribal Cultural Resources were identified by either of the consulting tribes. As such, there will be no impacts to any Tribal Cultural Resources.

The project has been conditioned with the County standard Human Remains and Unanticipated Resources conditions of approval that dictate the procedures to be followed should any unanticipated cultural resources or human remains be identified during ground disturbing activities has been placed

on this project. With the inclusion of these Conditions of Approval, impacts to any previously unidentified Tribal Cultural Resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation:

Planning-CUL. 1 If Human Remains found

If human remains are found on this site, the developer/permit holder or any successor in interest shall comply with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5.

Planning-CUL. 2 Unanticipated Resources

The developer/permit holder or any successor in interest shall comply with the following for the life of this permit.

If during ground disturbance activities, unanticipated cultural resources* are discovered, the following procedures shall be followed:

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.

* A cultural resource site is defined, for this condition, as being a feature and/or three or more artifacts in close association with each other.

** If not already employed by the project developer, a County approved archaeologist shall be employed by the project developer to assess the significance of the cultural resource, attend the meeting described above, and continue monitoring of all future site grading activities as necessary.

Monitoring: Mitigation will be implemented and monitoring through the conditions of approval for the project.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

Source(s): Project Application Materials, Water Company

Findings of Fact:

a)The project will be served by Eastern Municipal Water District with existing water facilities pursuant to the arrangement of financial agreements. The proposed project would include construction of an on-site network of water, wastewater, and stormwater facilities that would connect to existing facilities adjacent to or within the project site. Minimal off-site ground disturbance within the public ROW would be required to connect the proposed on-site water and wastewater infrastructure to the existing points of connection in SR-79 and Old State Highway, respectively. Currently, there is not storm water infrastructure present within or adjacent to the project site. The proposed project would include installation of an on-site subsurface bioretention basin to capture and treat on-site storm water flows. Treated flows would be control-released from the underground basin to the public ROW, consistent with current storms flows from the project site. In addition, curb-and-gutter would be installed along the project frontage, thus improving containment of storm flows within the existing roadway. The impacts associated with proposed utility connections are considered to be part of the project's construction phase and are evaluated throughout this Initial Study accordingly. As identified throughout this Initial Study, no significant impacts have been identified for the project's construction phase. The construction of on-site water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure necessary to serve the project would not result in any significant physical effects on the environment that are not already identified and disclosed as part of this Initial Study.

b)The project site would be served by Eastern Municipal Water District. According to the 2015 Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), during a multiple dry-year period, EMWD's total water supply is projected to be 198,600 acre-feet (AF) by 2040, while the total water demand is projected to be 198,600 AF in the same year, resulting in neither surplus or deficit. Therefore, EMWD's supplies are sufficient to meet demand within the district's service area. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the Commercial Office land use area and therefore would result in a water supply demand that was anticipated by the Riverside County General Southwest Plan Area and evaluated in the UWMP. There are no groundwater recharge facilities in the area; the Proposed Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede substantial groundwater management of the basin. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

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

Source(s): Department of Environmental Health Review, Eastern Municipal Water

Findings of Fact: Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) will serve the project with existing sewer facilities pursuant to the arrangement of financial agreements. The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence

Findings of Fact:

The project will be served by Riverside County Waste Management Department with solid waste removal pursuant to the arrangement of financial agreements. The proposed project will not require nor result in the construction of new landfill facilities, including the expansion of existing facilities.
Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

43. Utilities				
Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?				
a) Electricity?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Natural gas?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Communications systems?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Street lighting?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Other governmental services?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source(s): Project Application Materials, Utility Companies

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

Findings of Fact: Letters to the applicable servicing entities did not elicit any responses indicating that the proposed project would require substantial new facilities or expand facilities.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility", GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the County's General Plan Figure S-14, *Inventory of Emergency Response Facilities*, the project site does not contain any emergency facilities and does not occur adjacent to an emergency evacuation route (County of Riverside 2019b). During construction the contractor would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles as required by the County. Project operations would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. In addition, the project site would be accessible from two driveways and the adjacent property, so emergency vehicles could access the site even if one of the access driveways were blocked during an emergency. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair implementation of an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan whereby impacts would be less than significant.

b) The project site is within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in the Western Riverside County Local Responsibility Area (CAL FIRE 2007). Although the project site is located in a rural community west of the San Bernardino National Forest, the project site is adjacent to paved roadways to the north, west and south. The nearest open space area with natural vegetation is a hillside located approximately 0.3 miles east of the project site. As identified in the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan, Figure 14 *Steep Slopes*, the proposed project and vicinity contain slopes less than 15 percent (County of Riverside 2016a).

The proposed project is required to comply with applicable provisions of the CBC, California Fire Code (County Ordinance 787), and Riverside County Fire Department Standards pertaining to human health and safety. The County will review all project plans to ensure compliance with these regulations. For example, the plan check process includes County Fire Department review of proposed fire hydrant spacing and incorporation of automatic sprinkler systems in accordance with applicable Sections of Ordinance 787 .1 (e.g., Sections 901.6.1, 903.2, 903.4.2.1, 4.3, 3, 5, and 8603.1), proper roadway turning radii (minimum 38 feet), fire lane widths (minimum 24 feet), etc. Additionally, the project site layout includes provisions for emergency vehicle access, which also would be reviewed for adequacy by the County Fire Department. Through proper site design and compliance with standard and emergency County access requirements, the proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risk, or expose the project site to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire whereby impacts would be considered less than significant.

c) The proposed project would not require installation or maintenance of infrastructure that could exacerbate fire risk. Nevertheless, to ensure the project site is designed to minimize potential wildfire risk, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable provisions of the CBC, California Fire Code, Riverside County Ordinance 460, Riverside County Ordinance 787, and Riverside County Fire Department Standards pertaining to human health and safety. The County will review all project plans to ensure compliance with these regulations.

d) The project site is relatively flat. As identified in the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan, Figure 14, *Steep Slopes*, the proposed project and vicinity contain slopes less than 15 percent. As such, the project site would not be exposed to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes, whereby impacts would be less than significant.

e) As described above in Section 37(a-d), although the proposed project is within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2007), the project site and proposed land uses do not contain specific attributes or factors that would exacerbate wildfire risk. To ensure the project site is designed to minimize potential wildfire risk, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable provisions of the CBC, California Fire Code, Riverside County Ordinance 460, Riverside County Ordinance 787, and Riverside County Fire Department Standards pertaining to human health and safety whereby impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Does the Project:

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

Source(s): Staff Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: Implementation of the proposed 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.

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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source(s): Staff Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: As analyzed throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts or no impact to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, energy, Geology and Soils GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, utilities and service systems, and wildfire. Mitigation would be required to reduce potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources, paleontological resources, transportation and Tribal Cultural Resources. As such, cumulatively considerable impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

47. Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source(s): Staff Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The proposed project would not result in environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

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:

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any: LGC Inland: Response and Supplemental Investigation for the Proposed Hemet Center: APN 453-103-008 -014 Located on the Southwest Corner of State Highway 79 and State Highway 74, Green Acres Area, Riverside County, California (October 2009)

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

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

Revised: 1/31/2022 8:03 AM
Y:\Planning Master Forms\Templates\CEQA Forms\EA-IS_Template.docx