

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Environmental Assessment (CEQ / EA) Number: CEQ190167
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): PPT190038
Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department
Address: 4080 Lemon Street 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501
Contact Person: Russell Brady
Telephone Number: 951-955-6646
Applicant's Name: James Arney & Lanny George
Applicant's Address: 30141 Antelope Rd., Ste. 116, Menifee, CA 92584

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Description: The proposed Plot Plan No. 190038 Project will construct 166 RV Storage stalls and 354 pod storage stalls over a 5.94 acre parcel.

Site work on the 5.94 acre RV Storage Yard will consist of spreading existing onsite stockpiles of decomposed granite at grade to provide for a pervious parking surface. There are no proposed structures or utility improvements for the RV Storage Yard.

Site work to provide for the storage pod spaces will require graded fill material over all of the 5.94 acre Project site. Decomposed granite surfacing will also be provided to create a pervious surface. No proposed structures or utility improvements are proposed for the Rocket Shell portable storage area.

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

B. Total Project Area:

Residential Acres:	Lots:	Units:	Projected No. of Residents:
Commercial Acres:	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Industrial Acres: 5.94 gross acres. RV/POD storage 5.94 acres	Lots: 1	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: N/A	Est. No. of Employees: 3
Other:			

C. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 461-140-050

D. Street References: SE Corner of Grand Avenue and Briggs Road

E. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:
T5SR2W SEC 30 NW ¼

F. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the Project site and its surroundings: The site is located about three (3) miles east of I-215, at the southeast corner of the intersection of Briggs Road and Grand Avenue. Grand Avenue is currently a dirt road that is partially graveled. Briggs Road is a major paved road. The general area surrounding the site includes a mix of disturbed open space, active and fallow agricultural lands, low-density rural residential developments, and high-density residential subdivisions.

The parcel consists of two distinct areas separated by fencing. The Project site includes the western approximately two-thirds of the parcel, which is highly disturbed and contains several structures and large piles of rock and other material. The vegetation in this area appears to have been recently disked or mowed. The eastern approximately one-third of the parcel is not a part of the Project.

The site has been disturbed for agricultural and other uses since at least 1967. The site is entirely disturbed and/or developed and vegetation present is mainly ruderal (weedy) or ornamental. There is no native habitat present and no habitat for narrow endemic plants. No federal or state-listed or special status plant species were observed.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. **Land Use:** The proposed Project is consistent with the existing Riverside County General Plan land use designation of Light Industrial (LI). The Project implements Policy LU 4.1, requiring new developments to be located and designed to visually enhance, not degrade the character of the surrounding area. The Project site is located in Highway 79 Policy Area.
2. **Circulation:** Adequate circulation facilities exist to serve the proposed Project. The proposed Project meets with all applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.
3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** The proposed Project does not include any open space areas that would support the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Policies.
4. **Safety:** The proposed Project is not located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zone, fault zone, or area with high landslide, mudslide, or liquefaction potential. The Project site is identified by the CalFire Riverside County (West) Fire Hazard Map as not being within a very fire hazard area. Since the Project site is located within a partially developed area, the Project would be required to comply with California Fire Code Chapter 47 and the Riverside County Municipal Code Chapter 8.32, Fire Code, which provides requirements to reduce the potential of fires to a less than significant impact. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to significant risks related to flooding. The proposed Project has also allowed for sufficient provision of emergency response services to the future residents 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:** The Project will not cause an exceedance of noise standards established in the General Plan or noise ordinance. The Project meets all other applicable Noise Element Policies.
6. **Housing:** The proposed Project meets applicable Housing Element Policies.
7. **Air Quality:** The proposed Project meets all applicable Air Quality policies.
8. **Healthy Communities:** The Project meets all applicable policies of the Healthy Communities Element of the General Plan.

a) Environmental Justice Summary: The Project is not in an Environmental Justice Community.

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

C. Foundation Component(s): Community Development

D. Land Use Designation(s): Light Industrial (LI)

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

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

G. Adjacent and Surrounding:

1. General Plan Area Plan(s): Harvest Valley/Winchester to the north, east, and south, City of Menifee to the west

2. Foundation Component(s): Community Development to the north, east, and south, City of Menifee to the west

3. Land Use Designation(s): Commercial Retail (CR) to the north, Light Industrial (LI) to the east, CR/LI to the south, City of Menifee to the west

4. Overlay(s), if any: North – N/A, East – N/A, South – N/A, West – City of Menifee

5. Policy Area(s), if any: North – Highway 79, East – Highway 79, South – Highway 79, West – City of Menifee

H. Adopted Specific Plan Information

1. Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any: Winchester Hills #293, Area 5

2. Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any: Winchester Hills #293, Area 5

I. Existing Zoning: SP Zone, CZ Number 6013

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: N/A

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: SP Zone, CZ Number 6013 on all sides except City of Menifee to the west (SP Zone)

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

Leslie Irish

Printed Name

7/19/2023

Date

For: Russell Brady *Project Planner*

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
AESTHETICS Would the Project:				
1. Scenic Resources				
a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the Project is in an urbanized area, would the Project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure C-8 “Scenic Highways”, Riverside County Multipurpose Open Space Element, p. OS-52, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Would the Project have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?

There are no officially designated scenic highways in or near the Project site. State Route 74 (SR-74) passes approximately 2 miles of the Project Site running through the northern part of the City of Menifee and is considered an “Eligible State Scenic Highway – Not Officially Designated” by the California Department of Transportation. The nearest designated state scenic highway to the Project area is a portion of SR-74 in the San Jacinto Mountains about 17 miles east of the Project site.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

b) Would the Project 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?

According to the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element, in general, scenic resources include areas that are visible to the general public and considered visually attractive. Scenic resources include natural landmarks and prominent or unusual features of the landscape. For example, scenic backdrops include hillsides and ridges that rise above urban or rural areas or highways. Scenic vistas are points, accessible to the general public, that provide a view of the countryside. The Project site is located in an area that is bordered by Briggs Road on the West; followed by residential development, Grand Avenue to the North; followed by agricultural land, undeveloped land to the south; and industrial buildings to the west as the area is zoned for light industrial. Scenic resources near the Project site are Double Butte Mountain which is approximately 0.85 miles to the northeast and Menifee Mountain 1.25 miles to the southwest.

Impacts to scenic vistas are analyzed from points or corridors that are accessible to the public and that provide a view of a scenic vista. Structures within a viewer's line of sight of a scenic vista may interfere with a public view of a scenic vista, either by physically blocking or screening the scenic vista from view, or by impeding or blocking access to a formerly available viewing position. Those viewers may see the scenic areas prior to development; but would have those views blocked post development. The views of the resources are from the public right-of-way of Briggs Avenue and Grand Avenue. The Project proposes to accommodate the storage of RV's, boat, and moving pods.

The typical height of an RV is 10-12 feet tall , the typical height of a boat on a trailer is 8-10 feet tall, and the typical height of a moving pod is 8-feet. Due to this, the storage of RVs, boats, and moving pods on the site would not obstruct views of Double Bute Mountain or Menifee Mountain. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

c) Would the Project 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?

Currently the Project is highly disturbed with weedy vegetation and contains large piles of rock and other materials. The northern and western most edges of the site support some ornamental trees and bushes. The site does not provide considerable visual character to the area. The applicant proposes to construct boat and RV stalls for storage purposes in the northwest corner of the site and a designated area for a portable storage (POD) yard along the eastern half of the Project area, which primarily consists of adding graded fill where needed and spreading decomposed granite (dg) to create a permeable storage area. Construction activities would be visible from adjacent roads and surrounding properties, but these impacts would be temporary. Menifee Mountain is 1.25 miles away from the Project site. However, due to the residential development west of the Project site, Menifee Mountain is not visible from any public vantage point. The Double Butte Mountain would be the only visible scenic resource from the public vantage point of northbound Grand Avenue. Due to the low elevations of the

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

RVs and boats that are an average from 8-12 feet tall, Double Butte Mountain would still be visible from Grand Avenue. The Project would be consistent with the land use already on the site and its surroundings, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory

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

Source(s): GIS database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution), Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

The Project is located 25.8 miles northwest of Mt. Palomar Observatory and is within Zone B (45-mile radius of Mt. Palomar Observatory) of the designated Special Lighting Area that surrounds the Mt. Palomar Observatory.

The Project is located within the Special Lighting Area; therefore, all development would be required to comply with the provisions of Ordinance No. 655. The ordinance contains approved materials and methods of installation, definitions, general design requirements, requirements for lamp source and shielding, prohibitions and exceptions. The Project would be conditioned to comply with Ordinance No. 655. This is a standard condition of approval (COA) and is not considered a unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. With conformance with Ordinance NO. 655, Project impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No other 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, Riverside County General Plan, Riverside Extended Mountain Area Plan, Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy, Ordinance No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution), and Ordinance No. 915 (Regulating Outdoor Lighting).

Findings of Fact:

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

a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The Project once constructed would introduce new sources of light in the form of security lighting. However, such lights would comply with County lighting standards included being directed downwards and shielded. New glare sources would include windshields reflecting sunlight as they come and go from the site. However, this is not anticipated to occur at a scale or frequency such that glare impacts would be significant due to the Project being a long-term storage facility. All construction activities would occur in daylight hours and would be temporary in nature.

With conformance with Ordinance No. 655 and Ordinance No. 915, Project impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No other mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

There are residential properties located to the west across Briggs Road from the Project site. However, the proposed Project would not create new lighting that would be out of the ordinary for the surrounding area. All Project lighting would be required to comply with County Ordinance No. 655 and Ordinance No. 915. Therefore, the Project would not expose residential properties to unacceptable light levels. With conformance with Ordinance No. 655 and Ordinance No. 915, Project impacts would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No other mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES Would the Project:

4. Agriculture

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?

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

Findings of Fact:

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?

The Project is designated as "Area Not Mapped" with properties to the north south designated "Prime Farmland, properties to the east as "Farmland of Local Importance", and properties to the west as "Urban and Built-Up Land" according to Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Department of Conservation¹. As such, the Project site does not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as mapped by the State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.

Mitigation: No other mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

¹ California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, <https://databasin.org/datasets/b83ea1952fea44ac9fc62c60dd57fe48> , accessed July 14, 2023.

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

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?

The Project site is currently zoned as Light Industrial by the County of Riverside General Plan and the Winchester Hills Specific Plan. As such, the current and proposed zoning and land use designations are not considered a primary agricultural zone. The Project will be consistent with the current zoning and will not conflict with the agricultural zoning around the Project. Impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No other mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?

The Project does not propose development of non-agricultural uses 300-feet from agriculturally zoned property.

Mitigation: No other mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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?

The Project does propose changes to the existing environment through the spreading of decomposed granite and the placement of pods, RVs, and boats on the decomposed granite. Even though there are areas designated farmland through the FMMP these areas are not currently zoned for agricultural uses., the Project site is not being used for agricultural purposes and development would not convert existing farmland to non-agricultural use. The impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No other mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

1. Forest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): 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:

- a) Would the Project 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))?

The site is not zoned as forest land or timberland; therefore, the Project does not conflict with existing zoning, nor would it cause the rezoning of forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The Project site is not located within forest land. No impact would occur to zoned forest land, timber land or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

- b-c) Would the Project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use or involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

The Project site is a previously disturbed commercial site in an area with established commercial, agricultural, and residential land uses, and no forest land is present on or near the Project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Climate Action Plan (“CAP”), SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, U.S. E.P.A. *Current Nonattainment Counties for All Criteria Pollutants* (January 31, 2021), Project Application Materials

CalEEMod (2022.1.1.14), PPT190038

Findings of Fact:

a) Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

The Project is located within the jurisdiction of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). SCAQMD is responsible for developing a regional air quality management plan to ensure compliance with state and federal air quality standards. The SCAQMD adopted the 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) on December 2, 2022, which is the AQMP in effect.

To determine if a Project is consistent with the 2022 AQMP, the SCAQMD has established consistency criterion that are defined in Chapter 12, Sections 12.2 and 12.3 of the SCAQMD’s *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* and are discussed below.

Consistency Criterion No. 1: The proposed Project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the Air Quality Management Plan.

Consistency Criterion No. 1 refers to violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). As evaluated under Threshold (b), (c), and (d) below, the Project would not exceed regional or localized significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant during construction or during long-term operation. Accordingly, the Project is determined to be consistent with the first criterion.

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

Consistency Criterion No. 2: The proposed Project does not exceed the growth assumptions in the AQMP.

The growth assumptions used in the 2022 AQMP to Project future air quality emissions levels are based in part on the Projections of the 2016 Regional Transportation Model utilized by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), which incorporates land use data provided by lead agency general plan documentation, as well as assumptions regarding population number, location of population growth, and a regional housing needs assessment. When the 2016 RTP/SCS and the 2022 AQMP were prepared, the General Plan Land Use designation for the Project site was Light Industrial (LI), and this was the land use incorporated into the 2022 AQMP. The Project is not proposing a General Plan amendment, so the growth assumptions are not affected. Additionally, there is no population increases generated by the Project. Accordingly, the Project is determined to be consistent with the second criterion.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The Project is located within the jurisdiction of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). Both the state of California (state) and the federal government have established health-based ambient air quality standards (AAQS) for seven criteria air pollutants. These pollutants include ozone (O3), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), sulfur dioxide (SO2), inhalable particulate matter with a diameter of 10 microns or less (PM10), fine particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less (PM2.5), and lead (Pb). The state has also established AAQS for additional pollutants. The AAQS are designed to protect the health and welfare of the populace within a reasonable margin of safety.

The SCAQMD as established the following thresholds of significance for these criteria pollutants as shown in Table 6-1 below.

**Table 6-1
SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds**

Pollutant	Mass Daily Thresholds	
	Construction	Operation
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	100 lbs./day	55 lbs./day
Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	75 lbs./day	55 lbs./day
Particulate Matter 10 (PM ₁₀)	150 lbs./day	150 lbs./day
Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM _{2.5})	55 lbs./day	55 lbs./day
SO _x	150 lbs./day	150 lbs./day
CO	550 lbs./day	550 lbs./day

Source: South Coast AQMD CEQA Handbook (South Coast AQMD)

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

The Project has the potential to generate pollutant concentrations during both construction activities and long-term operation. Both construction and operational emissions for the Project were estimated by using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod 2022.1.1.14), which is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies to quantify potential criteria pollutant emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use Projects. The model can be used for a variety of situations where an air quality analysis is necessary or desirable such as California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents and is authorized for use by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

Construction Related Impacts

Construction activities associated with the Project will result in emissions of VOCs, NOx, SOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5. Construction-related emissions are expected from the spreading of decomposed granite (DG) on the site to provide a surface for the storage of boats, RVs, and moving pods.

Table 2 summarizes the maximum daily emissions for construction.

Table 6-2. Summary of Peak Construction Emissions

Maximum Daily Emissions	Emissions (pounds/day)					
	VOC/ROG	NOx	CO	SOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Maximum Daily Emissions	0.97	8.9	12.4	.02	0.61	0.45
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas (GHG)/Energy Analysis (Appendix A).

As shown in Table 6-2, emissions resulting from the Project construction will not exceed criteria pollutant thresholds established by the SCAQMD for emissions of any criteria pollutant. Additionally, the Project would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403, which identifies measures to reduce fugitive dust and is mandatory for at all construction sites located within the South Coast Air Basin. SCAQMD Rule 403 is a standard regulatory requirement and condition of approval rather than mitigation. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Long-Term Regional Operation Related Impacts

Long-term emissions are categorized as area source emissions, energy demand emissions, and operational emissions. Operational emissions will result from automobile, truck, and other vehicle sources associated with daily trips to and from the Project site. Area source emissions are the combination of many small emission sources that include use of outdoor landscape maintenance equipment, use of consumer products such as cleaning products, and periodic repainting of the proposed commercial facility. Energy demand emissions result from use of electricity and natural gas. The results of the CalEEMod model for operation of the Project site are summarized in Table 6-3 below.

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

Table 6-3. Summary of Peak Operational Emissions

Maximum Daily Emissions	Emissions (pounds/day)					
	VOC/ROG	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
Maximum Daily Emissions	3.99	6.72	61.9	0.15	12.5	3.26
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas (GHG)/Energy Analysis (Appendix A).

As shown in Table 6-3, Project-related air emissions do not exceed SCAQMD regional thresholds. Therefore, long-term operational emissions from the Project are less than significant.

However, because there is no construction of structures occurring on site and the only preoperational activities occurring on site is the spreading of decomposed granite, and operational emissions would not occur aside from the occasional movement of either boats, storage pods or RVs, no exceedance of thresholds would occur. The storage facility is intended for long term storage, and it is not expected that the site will be frequented by lessors of the site or employees.

The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase of criteria pollutants and therefore impacts would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Populations of people who are particularly sensitive to air pollution include children, the elderly, persons with preexisting respiratory or cardiovascular illness, athletes and others who engage in frequent exercise. Structures that house these persons or places where they gather are defined as “sensitive receptors.” These may include long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers and athletic facilities.

Surrounding land uses include residential homes and Ethan A Chase Middle School is 0.21 mile east of the site.; however, operation of a storage yard for boats and RVs is not expected to generate substantial point source emissions. Once the boats and RVs are dropped off, there will be no further emissions until the RV or boat is retrieved by the owner. The Project will not include major transportation facilities, commercial or manufacturing uses, or generate significant odors. Impacts would therefore be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

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

The SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook identifies certain land uses as sources of odors. These land uses include agriculture (farming and livestock), wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting facilities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Project would not include any of the land uses that have been identified by the SCAQMD as odor sources. Therefore, the Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The Project would have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the Project:

3. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): GIS database, WRCMSHCP, On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Project Biological Study by L&L Environmental 2020

Findings of Fact:

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

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

The site is within the area covered by the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) but is not within an MSHCP Criteria Cell. MSHCP conserved lands within one mile of the site consist of Salt Creek Channel, which is owned by Riverside County Flood Control and designated as public/quasi-public (PQP) conserved land. The MSHCP requires a habitat assessment to address riparian/riverine and vernal pool habitats (along with those species associated with such habitat), burrowing owl, and six (6) narrow endemic plant species (Munz's onion, San Diego ambrosia, many-stemmed dudleya, spreading navarretia, California Orcutt grass, and Wright's trichocoronis).

There are no USGS mapped blue-line streams or natural drainages on the site. No riparian vegetation communities are present on the site and there is no habitat for riparian dependent bird species.

Pools or depressions characteristic of natural vernal pool habitat were not observed onsite. However, evidence of ponding was observed in several areas of the site (e.g., cracked soils in shallow depressions). Potential habitat for fairy shrimp is present and a protocol fairy shrimp survey found the common versatile fairy shrimp in two ponding areas. No listed fairy shrimp were found.

Potentially suitable habitat for burrowing owl is present, but no burrowing owls, occupied burrows, or owl sign were observed. There is suitable habitat for nesting birds, including raptors, on and adjacent to the site.

The site is entirely surrounded by roadways, residential development, active agricultural land, and other development and does not function as part of a wildlife corridor.

A concrete v-ditch is present along the site's western boundary and appears to empty into Salt Creek Channel, designated as public/quasi-public (PQP) conserved land under the MSHCP. Standard Project conditions require Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce or eliminate discharge of untreated surface runoff into Salt Creek Channel via the concrete ditch. This is a standard condition for the County of Riverside and is not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

With mitigation incorporated impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: A preconstruction clearance survey for burrowing owl is required within 30 days prior to the start of site disturbance. If burrowing owls are found during the preconstruction survey, additional mitigation will be required in accordance with the requirements of the MSHCP.

A nesting bird clearance survey is required within three (3) days prior to the start of vegetation clearing, tree removal/trimming, ground disturbance, building demolition, and/or clearing/removal of materials and debris if it will begin within the nesting season (February 1 to September 15). If nesting birds are present, avoidance of nest sites is required and a buffer of 300 to 500 feet (or as determined by a biologist) until juvenile birds are no longer dependent on the nest and/or a biologist has verified that the nest is inactive.

Installation of landscaping plants on MSHCP Table 6-2 shall be avoided.

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

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist in coordination with the County Biologist.

- b) Would the Project 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) Would the Project 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?

Narrow Endemic and Special Status Plants

Narrow endemic plant species (Munz’s onion, San Diego ambrosia, many-stemmed dudleya, spreading navarretia, California Orcutt grass, and Wright’s trichocoronis) were not observed and habitat to support these species is absent from the site. Therefore, these species are considered absent from the site. No federal or state-listed or special status plant species were observed. Smooth tarplant has a low to moderate potential for occurrence but is a covered species adequately conserved under the MSHCP. If this species is present, any Project-related impacts would be covered under the MSHCP.

Listed and Special Status Wildlife

No federal or state-listed endangered or threatened wildlife species were observed and the site is not within USFWS designated critical habitat for any listed wildlife species. Four special status wildlife species were observed: Cooper’s hawk, great egret (fly over), Nuttall’s woodpecker, and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit. Cooper’s hawk and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit are covered species under the MSHCP and considered adequately conserved. Great egret is not a covered species under the MSHCP but was not observed utilizing the site. Nuttall’s woodpecker is also not a covered species under the MSHCP.

The Project site includes structures and trees/palm trees that may provide suitable roosting habitat for bats, including special status bats.

Fairy Shrimp

A protocol fairy shrimp survey (consisting of consecutive wet and dry season surveys) was conducted and found the common versatile fairy shrimp in two of the ponding areas on the site. No listed fairy shrimp species were found.

Burrowing Owl

Potentially suitable habitat and small mammal burrows are present onsite, but no burrowing owls or owl sign were observed.

Nesting Birds

There is suitable habitat for nesting birds, including raptors, on and adjacent to the site.

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

Riparian Birds

There is no riparian habitat on the site. The single willow present is isolated and does not provide the dense riparian habitat required by least Bell’s vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, or western yellow-billed cuckoo. Therefore, there is no suitable habitat for these species on or adjacent to the site and they are considered absent.

With mitigation incorporated impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: If any trees are trimmed/removed, preconstruction bat surveys and measures to protect roosting bats, maternity colonies, and hibernacula (if present) shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist.

A preconstruction clearance survey for burrowing owl is required within 30 days prior to the start of site disturbance. If burrowing owls are found during the preconstruction survey, additional mitigation shall be required in accordance with the requirements of the MSHCP.

A nesting bird clearance survey shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist within three (3) days prior to the start of vegetation clearing, tree removal/trimming, ground disturbance, building demolition, and/or clearing/removal of materials and debris if it will begin within the nesting season (February 1 to September 15). If nesting birds are present, avoidance of nest sites is required and a buffer of 300 to 500 feet (or as determined by a biologist) shall be required until juvenile birds are no longer dependent on the nest and/or a biologist has verified that the nest is inactive.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist in coordination with the County Biologist.

- d) Would the Project 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?

The site is entirely surrounded by roadways, residential development, active agricultural land, and other development and does not function as part of a wildlife corridor(Appendix B). Although there may be limited local movement of wildlife on and across the site, it is not within or adjacent to a wildlife corridor or potential corridor. No avoidance/mitigation measures are recommended. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

- e) Would the Project 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?

The site is entirely disturbed or developed, and vegetation present is primarily ruderal or ornamental. There is no native habitat or sensitive vegetation communities present on or adjacent to the site and no measures to protect sensitive vegetation communities are required. No impacts would occur.

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.

- f) Would the Project 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?

There are no USGS mapped blue-line streams or natural drainages on the site. Pools or depressions characteristic of natural vernal pool habitat were not observed onsite. However, evidence of ponding was observed in several areas (e.g., cracked soils in shallow depressions) and eight (8) ponding areas were identified on the Project site. The ponded areas did not support vernal plant species. No MSHCP species listed for protection associated with riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools were observed during the survey. No additional surveys or avoidance/mitigation measures are recommended; impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

- g) Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Riverside County Oak Tree Management Guidelines (Guidelines) require mapping and evaluation of oak trees with a trunk (or sum of multiple trunks) at least two (2) inches in diameter at 4.5 feet above the ground (known as diameter breast height or DBH) within Project areas. The evaluation must include dead or dying oak trees, as these have value for cavity nesting birds. Project development plans are required to minimize and mitigate impacts to oak trees. The portion of the Project site to be developed does not contain oak trees. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the Project:

4. 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, Riverside County TLMA Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment 2021

Findings of Fact:

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

a-b) Cultural resources of either prehistoric or historical origin were not observed within the boundaries of the subject property. records search completed by staff at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside indicated that one previous cultural resource studies had involved the subject property. The 1990 cultural resources study recorded no cultural resources within the boundaries of the subject property, despite the presence of a ca. 1939 house and an associated structure that existed at that time. Both structures were demolished approximately four years ago. In consideration of the above, the Project site is located in an area that is moderately sensitive for historical resources. The historical sensitivity is further enhanced by the fact that up until relatively recently, one structure that was at least 83 years old and another that was at least 45 years old existed on the property. Typically, this would minimally warrant a recommendation for archaeological grading monitoring in the area where the structures previously existed. However, in this case, such a recommendation would essentially be irrelevant. The historical structures were in the area where the So Cal Mulch mobile home office, parking, and fuel stations are now located, and the proposed Project is limited to spreading decomposed granite at grade to provide a pervious parking surface area. Therefore, neither further research nor mitigation is recommended for the subject property. However, per County standard requirements, should any cultural resources be discovered during the course of earthmoving activities anywhere on the subject property, said activities should be halted or diverted until the qualified archaeologist can evaluate the resources, make a determination of their significance, and recommend appropriate treatment measures to mitigate impacts to the resources from the Project, if found to be significant.

5. Archaeological Resources

a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): On-Site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Riverside County TLMA Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment 2021

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Would the Project alter or destroy an archaeological site? Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?

Cultural resources of either prehistoric or historical origin were not observed within the boundaries of the subject property. A records search completed by staff at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside indicated that one previous cultural resource studies had involved the subject property. The 1990 cultural resources study recorded no cultural resources within the boundaries of the subject property, despite the presence of a ca. 1939 house and an associated structure that existed at that time. Both structures were demolished approximately four years ago. It is clear that the Project site is located in an area that is not sensitive for prehistoric archaeological resources. Therefore, neither further research nor mitigation is recommended for the subject property. However, should any cultural

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

resources be discovered during the course of earthmoving activities anywhere on the subject property, said activities should be halted or diverted until the qualified archaeologist can evaluate the resources, make a determination of their significance, and recommend appropriate treatment measures to mitigate impacts to the resources from the Project, if found to be significant.

Mitigation: CUL-1 Unanticipated Cultural Resource Discovery

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 archaeologis, 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.

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

Based on an analysis of records and archaeological survey of the property, it has been determined that the Project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. Nonetheless, the Project will be required to adhere to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 if in the event that human remains are encountered and by ensuring that no further disturbance occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin of the remains. Furthermore, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 (b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and their disposition has been made. This is State Law, is also considered a standard Condition of Approval and as pursuant to CEQA, is not considered mitigation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ENERGY Would the Project:				
10. Energy Impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a State or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

- a) Would the Project result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?

The Project would result in an increase in the site's demand for energy compared to its existing undeveloped state in the portion of the property proposed for development. Specifically, the proposed Project would increase consumption of energy for lighting and operation of security equipment. 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 lighting and security cameras in new development. Compliance with these energy standards is expected to reduce the amount of electricity consumed as the lighting and cameras will be energy efficient. The Project proposes to use the minimum amount of security lighting and security measures such as an electric keypad and surveillance, with the inclusion of Title 24 requirements, Project impacts would be less than significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

- b) Would the Project conflict with or obstruct a State or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

The Project would not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans nor with state or local renewable energy or energy efficiency plans. The only preoperational activity occurring on site is the spreading of the decomposed granite which is already on the site. The only uses of energy on the site would be to power the security lighting and low voltage security cameras and gate keypad. In addition, the proposed Project will be using solar powered security lighting. The Project is not of a nature or scale that energy consumption would occur at a level that could cause conflict with such plans. The Project would have less than significant impacts.

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
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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?

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 “Earthquake Fault Study Zones,” GIS database, EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application, Riverside County Ordinance No. 457, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

According to the Riverside County Geographic Information System (RCGIS or GIS database) there is potential for strong ground shaking through as the Project site is in a seismically active region however the Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and no known fault lines are present on or adjacent to the Project site. Therefore, there is no potential for rupture of a known fault on the Project site. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

12. Liquefaction Potential Zone

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 “Generalized Liquefaction,” and S-16 “General Ground Shaking Risk”, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Generally, liquefaction can occur if all the following conditions apply: 1) liquefaction-susceptible soil, 2) groundwater within a depth of 50- feet or less, and 3) strong seismic shaking. Within the RCLIS (GIS database) and the Riverside County General Plan the Project site is located outside of the area mapped for liquefaction susceptibility. However, the site is mapped in the Riverside County General Plan as having a “Very High” Ground Shaking Risk (Figure S-16).

Based on the Project description, no structures are proposed. There will be individuals visting the site to drop off and pickup their RVs and boat but there will be no employees on site regularly and no habitable structures on the site. Therefore, the potential for liquefaction to impact the proposed development should be considered nil. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

13. Ground-shaking Zone

a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 “Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map,” and Figures S-16 “Inventory of Communication Facilities” (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), Riverside County Ordinance No. 457, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

The Project site is located within the seismically active region of southern California and may be subject to ground-shaking events. The Project site is not mapped in an earthquake fault zone, but the site is mapped in the Riverside County General Plan as having a “Very High” Ground Shaking Risk (Figure S-16). No habitable structures are proposed for the Project site. There would be some individuals coming to drop off or pick up RVs, boats, and moving pods but there would not be employees on site regularly. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

14. Landslide Risk

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

Source(s): On-site Inspection, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 “Earthquake Induced Slope Instability,” and S-5 “Regions Underlain by Steep Slope”, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Seismically induced landslides and other slope failures are common occurrences in areas of significant ground slopes, especially during or soon after earthquakes. The Project site is flat, as is the surrounding terrain. There are no slopes in the vicinity that are steep enough such that slope instability could occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

15. Ground Subsidence

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

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 “Documented Subsidence Areas Map,” Riverside County Ordinance No. 457, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

According to the RCGIS (GIS database) the Project site is located within a ground subsidence zone. However, proposed structures or utility improvements are proposed for the Project area. Individuals would be on the site periodically to pickup or drop off RVs, boats, or moving pods, but no employees would regularly be on the site and there would be no habitable structures on site either. The impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

16. Other Geologic Hazards

a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source(s): On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Based on the elevation of the proposed Project site with respect to sea level, and its distance from any large open bodies of water, the potential for seiche and/or tsunami waves is considered to be absent. In addition, the Project site is not located in an area susceptible to mudflows, or volcanic hazards. Based on this information, the Project would not be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

17. Slopes

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riv. Co. 800-Scale Slope Maps, Riverside County Ordinance No. 457, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Would the Project change topography or ground surface relief features?

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

The Project site is flat and no grading is proposed. The only site improvements would be the dispersal of decomposed granite over the site. The impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the Project create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?

The Project site is flat. No slopes greater than 2:1 or 10 feet in height would be created by grading activities. No impact would occur under this threshold.

c) Would the Project result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?

There is no grading that is proposed for the site. In addition, there are no habitable structures on the site so there would be no sewage disposal systems needed. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

18. Soils	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code (2019), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, Riverside County, California. Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

a) Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Erosion is a large-scale impact caused by human activity and disturbance of surface soil, wind, and water. Site grading is not proposed to occur on the site or any other removal of soil. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Would the Project 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?

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

Expansive soils contain certain types of clay minerals that shrink or swell as the moisture content changes; the shrinking or swelling can shift, crack, or break structures built on such soils. Based on the U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, the site is not located on expansive soils.

There is no grading or construction of any structures proposed for the site. The County of Riverside did not require a geotechnical report as there is no grading or structures proposed for the site.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

c) Would the Project have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

. The Project does not propose any structure to be on the Project site. Therefore, there is no need for the disposal of wastewater. There are no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

19. Wind Erosion and Blows and from Project either on or off site.

a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blows and, 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, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

The Project site is in an area designated “high wind erodibility” as defined identified in Figure S-8 in the County of Riverside General Plan.. In addition, wind erosion and fugitive dust emissions from the Project site would be minimized with implementation of SCAQMD Rule 403’s Best Available Control Measures 19-1 and 19-2 for unpaved roads. 19-1 is a measure to stabilize the soil to meet applicable performance standards. This will be completed when the decomposed granite on site is spread over the Project. 19-2 is a control measure to limit vehicular travel to establish unpaved roads and parking lots. This will be accomplished as there will be a very low volume of daily traffic using the parking lot as the parking lot is for storage. site disturbing activities. The Project site would not be a source of windblown dust post-construction. Impacts would be less than significant under this threshold.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

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

CalEEMod 2022.1.1.14, PPT190038.

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The purpose of the County’s Climate Action Plan (CAP) and the 2019 CAP Update is to provide guidance on how to analyze GHG emissions and determine significance during the CEQA review of proposed development Projects within the County. To address the state’s requirement to reduce GHG emissions, the County prepared its CAP with the goal of reducing GHG emissions within the County by 15% below “existing” 2008 levels by the year 2020. The 2019 CAP Update reevaluates GHG reduction targets and strategies in an effort to meet the new two-step goal of reducing emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050, based on new state laws and policies. SB 97 allows climate action plans and other greenhouse gas reduction plans to be used for determining whether a Project has significant impacts, based upon its compliance with the plan.

The CAP identifies a two-step approach in evaluating GHG emissions starting with a screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year to determine if additional analysis is required. Projects that exceed the 3,000 MTCO₂e per year are required to achieve at least a 25% reduction of GHG emissions from a 2011-year level of efficiency compared to the mitigated Project buildout year. The CAP Update Appendix C, Land Use Development Tables (LSA 2019) provides the following Table of Sample Project Sizes from which to make the initial evaluation.

**Table 20-1
Sample Project Sizes by Land Use Category that are Below 3,000 MT CO₂e**

Project Type	Project Size that Generate 3,000 Metric Tons of CO ₂ e
Single Family Residential (Single Family Detached)	80 units
Apartments/Condominiums/Townhouse	120 units
Retirement Community (Senior Housing Age 50 or older)	150 units
General Commercial/Retail/Office (refrigeration not to exceed 10% of total square footage)	160,000 square feet
Supermarket/Grocery/Discount Club (refrigeration exceed 10% of total square footage)	36,000 square feet
Restaurants (sit down)	8,200 square feet
Fast-Food Restaurants (Fast Food with or without /drive thru)	5,300 square feet
Gas Station	7,200 square feet
Industrial	53,000 square feet
Wireless Communication Towers	2,400 kw
Passive Park	200 acres
Active Park	60 acres

- Copy of Table C-A in LSA’s 2019 Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Screening Tables

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

The Project would result in an increase in the site’s generation of greenhouse gases compared to its existing undeveloped state. A summary of the projected annual operational greenhouse gas emissions, including amortized construction-related emissions associated with the development of the Project is provided in Table 20-2.

Table 20-2 Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions

SOURCE	MTCO2e/Year
Mobile Sources	2,449
Area	0
Energy	0
Solid Waste	0
Water/Wastewater	0
30-year Amortized Construction GHG	0.14
TOTAL	2,449.14
SCAQMD Threshold	3,000
Exceed Threshold?	NO

The Project is estimated to generate an average 14,791 lbs/day or 2,449 MT/year of CO2e (CalEEMod). Using Table 20-1 Sample Project Sizes by Land Use the proposed Project lot is only 5.94 acres and the most similar land use would be an active park as there would be some vehicular travel and lighting. For an Active Park to generate 3,000 metric tons of CO2e the park size would need to be 60 acres and the proposed Project site is 5.94 acres. Therefore, compared to the development Projects listed on Table 20-1, the proposed Project development would not generate 3,000 metric tons of CO2e.

The Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases as the Project does not include construction of any structures and operations will consist of intermittent traffic and employees to the site as the site will be used for storage. Additionally, lighting and the security panel on the Project site would comply with the Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards.

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

Source(s): Project Application Materials, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor Data Management System (<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov>), Perris Valley Unified School District, California State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker (<https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map>)

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? Would the Project 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 proposed Project is a boat, RV, and POD storage facility. The Project does not include the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The following prohibited materials shall not be stored in mini-warehouse facilities: 1) Flammable or explosive matter or materials. 2) Matter or material which create obnoxious dust, odor, or fumes. 3) Hazardous or extremely hazardous waste, as defined by applicable provisions of the Hazardous Waste Control Law (Health and Safety Code Section 25100, et. seq.)

Accordingly, the Project would not expose people or the environment to significant hazards associated with the disposal of hazardous materials at the Project site. Long-term operation of the Project would not expose the public or the environment to significant hazards associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Project-related impacts associated with the hazardous materials would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

- c) Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?

The Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. During construction the Project allows for emergency access and is large enough to allow construction equipment to be kept onsite and not on or within the road or right of way. Due to the relatively small size of the development and its consistency with Riverside County planned land use on site, the Project would not interfere with or impact emergency response or evacuation plans. No lane closures would occur during construction.

During operations of the Project access is proposed from Grand Avenue via Briggs Road. The Project site does not contain any emergency facilities, nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route. During construction and long-term operation, the Project would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles.

Project development and improvements will not result in a substantial alteration to the design or capacity of any public road that would impair or interfere with the implementation of evacuation procedures. As such there would be no impact to Emergency Response or Evacuation Plans.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The Project is located within one-quarter of a mile of Ethan A Chase Middle School. The Project does not propose to transport substantial amounts of hazardous materials. There would be no impact of hazardous emissions or materials to schools.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

- e) Would the Project 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?

A search on the EnviroStor search engine on the California Department of Toxic Substance Control's website (accessed on April 1, 2022) revealed that the Project is not on a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. There would be no impact as a result of the Project being located on a hazardous materials site.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
22. Airports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two (2) miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-20 "Airport Locations," GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a-c) Would the Project result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan? Would the Project require review by the Airport Land Use Commission? If the Project is within an airport land use plan or within two 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?

According to March Air Reserve Base / Inland Port Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Airport Plan), The Project is located within Zone E, *Other Airport Environs*. This analysis focuses on the Project's consistency with the safety criteria identified in Table 22-1, *Basic Compatibility Criteria*, of the Airport Plan as shown in Table 22-1 below.

Table 22-1. March Air Reserve Base Basic Compatibility Criteria Analysis

Criteria	Consistency Analysis
Density/Intensity Standards (1)	Consistent. The Project is not located below or near the principal arrival and departure flight tracks according to Map MA-1, <i>Compatibility Map</i> , of the Airport Plan. Additionally, the Project does not attract high concentrations of people in confined areas or is a land use identified in Countywide Policy 4.3.7.
Prohibited Uses (2)	Consistent. The Project does not include physical (e.g., tall objects), visual, and electronic forms of interference with the safety of aircraft operations, or a land use development that may cause the attraction of birds
Other Development Conditions (3)	Consistent. The height of RVs is typically 10-12 feet, boat trailers with a boat are typically 8-10 feet, and moving pods typically are less than 8-feet. As such, airspace review for objects over 35-feet tall is not required.

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

Criteria	Consistency Analysis
Notes:	<p>(1) Although no explicit upper limit on usage intensity is defined for Zone D and E, land uses of the types listed—uses that attract very high concentrations of people in confined areas—are discouraged in locations below or near the principal arrival and departure flight tracks.</p> <p>(2) Hazards to flight include physical (e.g., tall objects), visual, and electronic forms of interference with the safety of aircraft operations. Land use development that may cause the attraction of birds to increase is also prohibited. Man-made features must be designed to avoid heightened attraction of birds. In Zones A, B1, and B2, flood control facilities should be designed to hold water for no more than 48 hours following a storm and be completely dry between storms (see FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B). Additionally, certain farm crops and farming practices that tend to attract birds are strongly discouraged. These include: certain crops (e.g., rice, barley, oats, wheat – particularly durum – corn, sunflower, clover, berries, cherries, grapes, and apples); farming activities (e.g., tilling and harvesting); confined livestock operations (i.e., feedlots, dairy operations, hog or chicken production facilities, or egg-laying operations); and various farming practices (e.g., livestock feed, water, and manure). Fish production (i.e., catfish, trout) conducted outside of fully enclosed buildings may require mitigation measures (e.g., netting of outdoor ponds, providing covered structures) to prevent bird attraction. Also see Countywide Policy 4.3.7 which states <i>“Other Flight Hazards: New land uses that may cause visual, electronic, or increased bird strike hazards to aircraft in flight shall not be permitted within any airport’s influence area. Specific characteristics to be avoided include: (a) Glare or distracting lights which could be mistaken for airport lights; (b) Sources of dust, steam, or smoke which may impair pilot visibility; (c) Sources of electrical interference with aircraft communications or navigation; and (d) Any proposed use, especially landfills and certain agricultural uses, that creates an increased attraction for large flocks of birds. (Refer to FAA Order 5200.5A, Waste Disposal Sites on or Near Airports and Advisory Circular 150/5200-33A, Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports.)”</i></p> <p>(3) Airspace review req’d for objects >35 ft. tall (This height criterion is for general guidance. Airspace review requirements are determined on a site-specific basis in accordance with Part 77 of the Federal Aviation Regulations. Shorter objects normally will not be airspace obstructions unless situated at a ground elevation well above that of the airport. Taller objects may be acceptable if determined not to be obstructions. The Federal Aviation Administration or California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics may require marking and/or lighting of certain objects. See Countywide Policies 4.3.4 and 4.3.6 for additional information.</p> <p>Avigation easement dedication and disclosure * 4 As part of certain real estate transactions involving residential property within any compatibility zone (that is, anywhere within an airport influence area), information regarding airport proximity and the existence of aircraft overflights must be disclosed. This requirement is set by state law. See Countywide Policy 4.4.2 for details. Easement dedication and deed notice requirements indicated for specific compatibility zones apply only to new development and to reuse if discretionary approval is required. Except within Zone A (Clear Zone), avigation easements are to be dedicated to the March Inland Port Airport Authority. See sample language in www.marchjpa.com/docs_forms/avigationeasement.pdf. Any avigation easements required within Zone A shall be dedicated to the United States of America.</p>

Source: March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Area, Land Use Compatibility Plan, November 13, 2014, Available at: <https://www.rcaluc.org/Portals/13/17%20-%20Vol.%201%20March%20Air%20Reserve%20Base%20Final.pdf?ver=2016-08-15-145812-700>

As detailed in Table 22-1 above, the Project would not impact result in a safety hazard with regards to public airports for the people residing or working in the Project area.

d) If the Project is 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
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The Project is not within 2 miles of a private airstrip or heliport. The Project would not impact private airstrips or heliports and the property would not result in a safety hazard with regards to private aviation for the people residing or working in the Project area.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the Project:

23. Water Quality Impacts

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

Source(s): 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, https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.html, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

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

The Project proposes to spread decomposed granite (dg) over the existing landscape (5.94 ac) to create the proposed storage areas. Because this surface is permeable the Project would not substantially reduce infiltration of rainfall and increase stormwater runoff volumes. No hardscape areas are currently proposed.

As the Project is more than one acre a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit is required. In addition, Best Management Practices (BMP's) to minimize and eliminate surface runoff on or off-site during operation and stormwater and waste discharge will be managed via conformance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbook will be implemented. One BMP the Project proposes to implement is to state within their lease, a requirement for all motor homes/motorized vehicles and boats to provide a drip pan to store on our property. Drip pan size shall be a minimum of 26x18x1 with a capacity of 6 quarts. Weekly inspections will be conducted to look for leaks and if found a 72hr notice will be issued to have motorized vehicle/boats removed for repairs. During weekly inspections for leaks if found the material will be collected and recycled at local oil recycling center. This required BMP will reduce the risk of pollutants from leaking RVs and boats. Requiring BMPs is a standard condition for the County of Riverside and is not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. With implementation of these BMPs the proposed Project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The Project site is currently disturbed but not developed. The Project proposes permeable surfaces for the storage areas. No new wells or additional water infrastructure are proposed. Due to the relatively small nature of the proposed development and the fact that no structures are proposed, it is not anticipated that the Project would substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management. The Project will be designed for compliance with existing federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations related to groundwater and would have less than significant impact on groundwater supplies.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

- c) Would the Project 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?

The Project site is currently undeveloped, the land is flat and there are no USGS mapped blue-line streams or natural drainages on the site. Development of the proposed Project would alter the current drainage patterns of the Project site. However, since the site is not going to be graded and the

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

decomposed granite is a pervious surface, but the Project has been designed to minimize impacts to the natural terrain and landscaping where at all possible.

Due to the existing site topography and drainage, the site will generally join the existing drainage patterns. The Project would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMP's) to minimize and eliminate surface runoff on or off-site. Additionally, stormwater and waste discharge will be managed via conformance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbook. A BMP the Project proposes to implement is to have the storage pods lifted off the ground by metal supports to allow for more pervious surface on the Project property. The decomposed granite that will be spread over the site will provide a pervious surface. In addition, when the storage pods are not in use they will be collapsed and stored. Requiring BMPs is a standard condition for the County of Riverside and is not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. With implementation of these BMPs the proposed Project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Impacts to drainage patterns in the area would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

d) Would the Project result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?

The Project would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMP's) to minimize and eliminate erosion and/or siltation. Additionally, stormwater and waste discharge will be managed via conformance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbook. The decomposed granite that will be spread over the site will result in stabilizing the soil resulting in less erosion. Requiring BMPs is a standard condition for the County of Riverside and is not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. Therefore, the proposed Project would not violate water quality standards. Impacts to water quality from erosion and siltation would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The Project proposes to incorporate permeable surfaces to prevent increased surface runoff on the site. The grading plan would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize additional surface runoff and flooding. Additionally, stormwater and waste discharge will be managed via conformance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbook. As previously discussed a BMP the Project proposes to implement is to have the storage pods lifted off the ground by metal supports to allow for more pervious surface on the Project property. The decomposed granite that will be spread over the site will also provide a pervious surface. In addition, when the storage pods are not in use they will be collapsed and stored. With these BMPs there would not be expected to have any increase in surface runoff that would result in on or off-site flooding. Requiring BMPs is a standard condition for the County of Riverside and is not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

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

High rates of surface runoff and flooding of the site and/or adjacent area is not expected as a result of this Project due to the ground remaining pervious. Impacts from flooding would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The proposed Project will incorporate permeable surfaces in the Project development. No additional water sources are proposed on-site so increased runoff is not expected. Additionally, stormwater and waste discharge will be managed via conformance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbook. A BMP that will be used for the Project would be to have the storage pods lifted off the ground by metal supports to allow for more pervious surface on the Project property. The decomposed granite that will be spread over the site will also provide a pervious surface. In addition, when the storage pods are not in use they will be collapsed and stored. The Project also proposes to implement BMPs within their lease requiring all motor homes/motorized vehicles and boats to provide a drip pan to store on the property. Drip pan size shall be a minimum of 26x18x1 with a capacity of 6 quarts. Weekly inspections will be conducted to look for leaks and if found a 72hr notice will be issued to have motorized vehicle/boats removed for repairs. During weekly inspections for leaks if found the material will be collected and recycled at local oil recycling center. Requiring BMPs is a standard condition for the County of Riverside and is not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

Due to the relatively small nature of the proposed development, and the BMPs that will be implemented, it is not anticipated that the Project would contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of the stormwater drainage system or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The Project will be designed for compliance with existing federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations related to runoff and would have less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

g) Would the Project impede or redirect flood flows?

The Project site is currently undeveloped, and the land is relatively flat. Although the site will be altered, the Project proposes the use of permeable surfaces for the storage areas. During and after construction, the Project would be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) consistent with both State and County stormwater regulations. Therefore, the proposed Project would not impede or redirect flood flows. A BMP that will be used for the Project would be to have the storage pods lifted off the ground by metal supports to allow for more pervious surface on the Project property. The decomposed granite that will be spread over the site will also provide a pervious surface. In addition, when the storage pods are not in use they will be collapsed and stored. Requiring BMPs is a standard condition for the County of Riverside and is not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. Impacts to drainage in the area would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

h) Would the Project, in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk the release of pollutants due to Project inundation?

Based on the elevation of the proposed Project site with respect to sea level, potential for tsunami waves is considered to be absent. Additionally, according to the California Department of Conservation, California Official Tsunami Inundation Maps², the site is not located within a tsunami inundation zone.

There are open storage ponds of water 0.4 miles east of the Project site which could potentially cause a seiche wave in the event of an earthquake. However, no hazardous material is allowed to be stored on the Project site and the most likely pollutant would be motor oil if an RV or boat had a leak. The Project also proposes to implement BMPs within their lease requiring all motor homes/motorized vehicles and boats to provide a drip pan to store on the property. Drip pan size shall be a minimum of 26x18x1 with a capacity of 6 quarts. Weekly inspections will be conducted to look for leaks and if found a 72hr notice will be issued to have motorized vehicle/boats removed for repairs. During weekly inspections for leaks if found the material will be collected and recycled at local oil recycling center. This BMP will reduce the risk of pollutant from leaking RVs and boats stored onsite. The Project is not mapped in a flood hazard zone as indicated in the Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 and S-10. The Project does not risk the release of pollutants due to Project inundation. The Project would have less than significant impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

i) Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Best Management Practices (BMPs) assure that the Project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan or violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Additionally, stormwater and waste discharge will be managed via conformance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbook.

With the relatively small nature of the proposed development, conformance with General Plan land uses and implementation of BMPs. . The Project also proposes to implement BMPs within their lease requiring all motor homes/motorized vehicles and boats to provide a drip pan to store on the property. Drip pan size shall be a minimum of 26x18x1 with a capacity of 6 quarts. Weekly inspections will be conducted to look for leaks and if found a 72hr notice will be issued to have motorized vehicle/boats removed for repairs. During weekly inspections for leaks if found the material will be collected and recycled at local oil recycling center

It is not anticipated that the Project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts are less than significant impact.

² California Department of Conservation, *California Official Tsunami Inundation Maps*, <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps#:~:text=Coordinated%20by%20Cal%20OES%2C%20California,considered%20sunamis%20for%20each%20area.>, accessed July 15 2023.

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.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the Project:

24. Land Use

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

a) Would the Project physically divide an established community?

The Project area's land use designation and zoning are consistent with adjacent properties. Adjacent properties include residential, light industrial and commercial. The Project would maintain the existing commercial character of the site. An example of a Project that has the potential to divide an established community includes the construction of a new freeway or highway through an established neighborhood. No development such as a roadway, channel, easement, etc. is proposed that would have the potential to divide an existing community. There are no impacts to the physical arrangement of an established community.

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

The Project site is located in the Harvest Valley/ Winchester Area Plan (HVWAP), one of nineteen (19) planning areas within the County of Riverside's General Plan. As set forth in Map My County, the HVWAP, and the Project site's underlying General Plan land use designation is Light Industrial within the Community Development Foundation Component. The existing zoning of the site is Light Industrial. The Project is allowed use the Light Industrial land use designation in the HVWAP and the General Plan. The Project area is located in a semi-rural area that is largely surrounded by suburban residential tracts developed in recent decades. Existing land uses in the Project vicinity include several industrial uses, commercial retail uses, single family homes, mixed with other parcels of vacant land. The Project area was historically used for fish farming, but vacant land is currently bare with no structures. In terms of consistency with surrounding land uses, area to the south is light industrial land use but appears to be currently used for agriculture. The east has a designated land use as light industrial which is consistent with the actual land use. The commercial retail uses to the north appear to be used for agriculture currently (across from Grand Avenue). The proposed Project is consistent with these surrounding uses as well as the zoning of the area, including Light Industrial to the east, Low Density Residential to the west (across Briggs Road in Menifee), Light Industrial to the south, and commercial retail to the north (across Ground Avenue). Even though there are current uses to the north and the south that appear to be agricultural, the land isn't currently zoned for that. The Project's proposed development plan is consistent with the existing zoning of the Project site and is compatible with the

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

land uses in and zoning of the surrounding area. The Project site is located within the Winchester Hills Specific Plan area. The proposed Project is consistent with the land use designations within the Winchester Hills Specific Plan as the Project site and surrounding areas are zoned the same in the Specific Plan as they are in the Riverside County General Plan. Additionally, the Project site is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). As is discussed in the Section 7 (Biology) of this Initial Study, the Project is consistent with the requirements of the MSHCP. Based on the above information, the Project will not 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. Impacts will be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Potentially expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-6 "Mineral Resources Area"

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Would the Project 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? Would the Project 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?

The State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB) has established Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ). The Project site has been designated as MRZ-3 which is defined as Areas containing mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance. This area is designated as light industrial by the County of Riverside Land Use and Zoning and was not zoned for mining. Based on the site's designation by SMGB the Project site does not contain known mineral resources; therefore, no impacts are expected to valuable regional resources or locally important mineral resources.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

c) Would the Project potentially expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines?

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

No proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines are known on the Project site. There would be no impacts to people or property from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines.

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-20 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b)
 The Project is not within an airport land use area, but it is within the Riverside County adopted airport influence area (approximately 2 miles of small general aviation airports or 3 miles of major general aviation, airline and military airports). The Project is within the March Reserve Air Base Master Plan. The Airport Land Use Commission (ALCU) had no comment on noise and the Project was consistent with the ALCU. In addition, the Project is not proposing to have any habitable structures or employees on the Project so there will not be any individuals regularly exposed to the noise. The Project site is within Zone E inside the Airport Influence Area Boundary of the March Reserve Air Base Master Plan. This designates this area is in a low noise impact zone and the site is beyond the 60CNEL contour. Therefore, the Project development would not be exposed to excessive noise levels related to airports.

There would be no impacts as a result of airport noise.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

27. Noise Effects by the Project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

- a) Would the Project generate 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?

County Noise and Vibration Standards

General Plan Noise Element Policy N 4.1: The exterior noise limit is not to be exceeded for a cumulative period of more than ten minutes in any hour of 65 dBA Leq for daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., and 45 dBA Leq during the noise-sensitive nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

General Plan Noise Element Policy N 16.3: Prohibit exposure of residential dwellings to perceptible ground vibration. Perceptible motion shall be presumed to be a motion velocity of 0.01 inches/second over a range of 1 to 100 Hz.

Ordinance No. 847 Regulating Noise Section 2i, Construction Noise: Noise associated with any private construction activity located within one-quarter of a mile from an inhabited dwelling I considered 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.

Under CEQA, consideration must be given to the magnitude of the increase and the existence of noise-sensitive receptors in order to determine if the noise increase is a significant adverse environmental effect. Stationary noise sources within the Project area are residential uses, as well as ambient environmental noise and consist of wind, birds chirping, insects, household appliances, lawn mowers, mechanical equipment, parking lot activity, etc. The noise associated with these sources may represent a single-event noise occurrence or short-term noise.

Construction Noise Impacts

Short term construction related noise impacts would from the spreading of existing onsite stockpiles of decomposed granite to provide for a pervious parking surface over a 5.94 acres site. Noise levels generated by heavy construction equipment can range from approximately 72 dBA to 77 dBA when measured at 50 feet, as shown on Table 27-1, Construction Reference Noise Levels.

Table 27-1. Construction Reference Noise Levels

Equipment	Duty Cycle (%) (1)	Noise Level at 50 ft. (dBA)
Front Loader	40	72
Backhoe	40	74

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

(1) Duty cycle information was provided by the Federal Highway Administration, Ellar Associates Inc., No Worries! RC and Boat Storage Environmental Assessment/Mitigated Negative Declaration, February 2023.

These noise levels would decrease rapidly with distance from the construction site at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling distance. For the purposes of this analysis, the closest off-site sensitive receiver to the Project site are the existing homes to the west, located approximately 500-feet from the center of the Project site. Thus, the highest noise level of 75 dBA would be reduced to 55 dBA. As construction noise levels would be less than the 65 dBA noise limit for exterior residential land use compatibility, noise impacts during Project construction would be less than significant.

Additionally, all construction activities associated with future development would be subject to compliance with Ordinance No. 847. According to Ordinance No. 847, construction activity located within one-quarter of a mile from an inhabited dwelling is considered exempt between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., June through September, and 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., October through May. In addition,

Finally, the Project is required to comply with the following General Plan Temporary Construction Policies:

- N 13.1 Minimize the impacts of construction noise on adjacent uses within acceptable practices. (AI 105, 108)
- N 13.2 Ensure that construction activities are regulated to establish hours of operation in order to prevent and/or mitigate the generation of excessive or adverse noise impacts on surrounding areas. (AI 105, 108)

Operational Noise Impacts

The primary noise sources in the Project’s vicinity are from mobile traffic noise along local and regional roadways. Existing roadway noise levels were calculated for the roadway segments in the Project area. This task was accomplished using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108) and existing traffic volumes from the most current version of Riverside County’s travel demand model, RivTAM (referred to as the “RivTAM Model”). The noise prediction model calculates the average noise level at specific locations based on traffic volumes, average speeds, roadway geometry, and site environmental conditions. The average vehicle noise rates (also referred to as energy rates) used in the FHWA model have been modified to reflect average vehicle noise rates identified for California by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The Caltrans data indicates that California automobile noise is 0.8 to 1.0 dBA higher than national levels and that medium and heavy truck noise is 0.3 to 3.0 dBA lower than national levels. The average daily noise levels along roadway segments in within and near the Project area are described in Table 27-2, Existing Traffic Noise Levels.

Table 27-2. Existing Traffic Noise Levels

Roadway Segment	ADT	dBA Ldn (1)
Briggs Road-Grand Avenue to Simpson Road	2,202	61.4
Grand Avenue-Briggs Road to Matthews Rd/Case Rd.	530	53.6

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

Source: Winchester Community Plan, Environmental Impact Report, Draft July 2022, Table 4.13-3.

Once the Project is operational, the site would house a long-term RV, boat, trailer, and moving pod storage facility. During operation the only sounds being emitted from the Project site would be the sound of vehicles dropping off or retrieving their property during the business hours of 9am to 5pm. These noise emissions would occur during the daytime and infrequently as the Project will be used for long-term storage.

According to Caltrans³, the human ear is able to begin to detect sound level increases of 3 decibels (dB) in typical noisy environments. A doubling of sound energy (e.g., doubling the volume of traffic on a highway) that would result in a 3-dBA increase in sound, would generally be barely detectable. Given the small size of the storage facility and the low level of vehicle traffic generated, the Project will not double the existing traffic volumes as shown in Table 27-2, above.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Would the Project generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

Short term construction related ground-borne vibration or ground borne noise levels occur during clearing, grading and construction and would likely be generated by heavy machinery and trucks. Increases in noise and vibrations would be localized to the immediate area and are expected to be intermittent. The only pre-operational tasks occurring on site are the clearing of some trees and brush and spreading out the decomposed granite which is already on the Project site. These impacts would be temporary and would cease once the site is operational. Pre-operational impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Once the Project site is operational, it is not expected to produce ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. The RV pods and boats can be moved using trucks, trailers and a battery-operated dolly will be on site when pods are being loaded or unloaded. They The RV pods and boats will also be stored on the site so it is not expected there will be regular noise or vibrations regularly as the Project will be used as a long-term storage facility. The Project is proposing to have business hours from 9am-5pm which is the time window when pods, RVs, and boats would be periodically moved to and from the site.

During operations, the Project's primary source of vibrations would be from truck traffic. The typical vibration level from light truck activity at normal speeds is less than 0.004 in/sec PPV at 25 feet away based on the FTA's Transit Noise Impact and Vibration Assessment⁴. Trucks on site would be travelling at low speeds and it is expected that the vibrations produced from the trucks would not exceed the 0.2 in/sec PPV threshold.

Due to the rapid drop-off rate of ground-borne vibrations and the short duration of the vehicular movement, traffic induced ground-borne vibrations are rarely perceptible beyond the roadway and rarely result in vibrations levels that would cause annoyance or damage to buildings in the vicinity. The impacts would be less than significant.

³ Caltrans, Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol, April 2020, p.7-1.

⁴ <https://www.transit.dot.gov/research-innovation/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-report-0123>.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation in addition to compliance with County noise ordinances is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

28. Paleontological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 “Paleontological Sensitivity,” GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a) Would the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature?

This site is mapped in the County’s General Plan as having a High potential for paleontological resources (fossils). The proposed Project site grading/earthmoving activities could potentially impact paleontological resources.

According to the Riverside County GIS “Map My County” the Project site has a high potential for paleontological sensitivity. The proposed Project includes limited grading of the DG material, but no construction of structures or additional utilities, therefore impacts to paleontological resources may occur during the movement and placing the DG material on grade. However, if the Project does encounter fossils inadvertently, impacts will be less than significant with the implementation of the following mitigation:

Mitigation: 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:

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

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

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

Monitoring: Monitoring is only required if fossil materials are identified on site during construction as stated above under 28.a.5.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the Project:

29. Housing	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The proposed Project site is previously disturbed and vacant. There are no structures or housing on the site, therefore, implementation of the Project would not displace existing people or housing. The Project would have no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The Project does not propose housing, nor does it have the ability to generate new employment at levels such that additional housing would be required. The Project is a proposed boat and RV storage facility and a portable storage yard with an estimated total of three employees. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The construction and operation of a boat and RV storage facility and portable storage yard will not induce or initiate any population growth in the area. The Project does not have the ability to create existing jobs at levels such that new housing would be required. The Project is also proposing to have very no more than 3 employees who will not regularly be on the Project site. No housing is proposed by the Project itself. It is not expected that expansion of infrastructure would be required to service a long-term storage yard and the site is well-served by existing roads. The Project would only generate a minor number of truck trips as the site will not have regular employees going to the site and the site itself will be used for long-term storage. Less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

30. Fire Services

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Safety Element, Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

The Riverside County Menifee Lakes – Fire Station #76 is the nearest Fire Station to the Project site. located at 29950 Menifee Rd. approximately 2.9 miles southwest of the Project site. Development of the Project would impact fire protection services by placing additional demand on existing fire protection resources if its resources are not augmented. To offset the increased demand for fire protection services, the Project would be conditioned by the County to provide a minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities, including compliance with state and local fire codes. Additionally, the Project was reviewed by the Fire Department and they did not require the construction or alteration of fire facilities in order to serve the Project. Therefore, the Project would not result in the need to construct new or physically altered fire facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

31. Sheriff Services

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Ordinance No. 659

Findings of Fact:

Sheriff services to the Project area are provided by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. The nearest Sheriff's Station is 10miles north at 137 N Perris Blvd, Perris, CA 92573. The County collects a Development Impact Fee to assist the County in providing for capital improvement costs for sheriff protection facilities. Payment of the Development Impact Fee would be applied to sheriff facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand for sheriff protection services that would be created by the Project. Therefore, the Project would not result in the need to construct new or physically altered police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection. . .

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

32. Schools

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

Source(s): School District correspondence, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

The Project site is located within the Romoland School District & Perris Union High School District. The Project site is serviced by Mesa View Elementary School, Ethan A. Chase Middle School, and Heritage High School. The Project proposes a storage yard, which is not expected to impact the School Districts. As a part of the normal Project approval the Project would be required to pay school mitigation fees as established by state and local laws which would fully mitigate potential impacts the Project may have on public school facilities. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

33. Libraries

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

The Menifee Library is the closest library to the Project site. The Project would not increase demand for library facility use and book borrowing. Given the small Project size and use, the Project would not significantly impact service ratios and performance objectives. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

34. Health Services

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

The Riverside County General Plan EIR includes a Mitigation Measure that requires the County to reevaluate medical needs based on the current medical demand and level of medical service provided within each Area Plan every three years. As the County's population grows, new medical facilities will be required to provide health and medical services for an expanded population. The Project may increase demand for health services; however, the Project is consistent with the land use designation for the site and would not increase the population.

Medical offices, urgent care clinics, local medical services, hospital beds and major facilities, such as trauma units and emergency rooms are available within proximity of the Project site, including in the City of Menifee. This along with the Periodic Medical Needs Assessment required by Mitigation Measure

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

4.15.7A of the County General Plan EIR, can ensure that adequate health and medical services are available to the Project residents and guests. Based on this analysis and the Project size, the potential impacts related to health services are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

RECREATION Would the Project:

35. Parks and Recreation

a) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Would the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? Would the Project 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?

The proposed Project would be on previously disturbed land that is currently vacant. The proposed use, a boat and RV storage facility and portable storage yard, would not create new housing or generate employment such that there would be an increased use of neighborhood or regional parks. No new or renovated recreational facilities would be necessary in the Project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The proposed Project is not currently within the Community Service Area that would require the payment of Quimby fees. There will be no impacts to CSA or Quimby fee recreation or park districts.

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.

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure C-6 Trails and Bikeway System, Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space District Comprehensive Trails Plan (Draft), Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: There are currently no trails identified on the Project site and no trails are proposed as a part of the Project development. The Project is not required to construct or expand the existing trail systems in the Project vicinity.

There would be no construction or expansion of recreational trails. There are no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, REMAP Figure 7 Trails and Bikeway System, 2021 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statute and Guidelines, Riverside County Ordinance No. 461, Project Application Materials, RDS and Associates Traffic Memorandum, 2022.

Findings of Fact:

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

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

A significant impact would occur if the development of the Project would conflict with programs, plans, or ordinances that support transit services, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, and trails.

For CEQA purposes, the performance of the circulation system is viewed in the context of how the Project may conflict with programs, plans, and policies which support a reduction in the amount of vehicle miles traveled by promoting the use of non-motorized modes of travel such as transit, bicycle, and pedestrian.

The Project is not proposing roadway improvements will promote a reduction in VMT by constructing sidewalks to facilitate pedestrians and by improving roadway to allow access for transit service.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no bicycle or pedestrian Projects located or proposed adjacent to the Project site. Thus, the Project would not interfere with current or proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities planned elsewhere in the area. ~~However, the Project would construct streets that meet Town standards and would provide sidewalks and pavement that would accommodate bicycle travel.~~

Public Transit Facilities

Public transportation services near the Project site are provided by Riverside Transit Authority (RTA). The closest connection points of the RTA system to the Project are Route 74 which covers Hemet Valley Mall, Winchester, Menifee, Sun City, and Perris. The Project is not proposing any improvements that would conflict with Route 74 or any future transit routes in the area.

~~Public transportation services within the Town of Apple Valley and near the proposed Project are provided by the Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA). The closest connection points to the VVTA system are Route 40, which covers North Apple Valley. The Project is not proposing any improvements that would conflict with Route 40, or any future transit route in the area.~~

Conclusion

As detailed above, the Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 (b) outlines Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts. The passage of Senate Bill -743 revised the method for assessing transportation impacts under CEQA by requiring a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis. The County of Riverside Transportation Department produced *Transportation Analysis Guidelines for Level of Service Vehicle Miles Traveled*, December 2020, to provide guidance for VMT analysis.

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

The County of Riverside Transportation Department, *Transportation Analysis Guidelines for Level of Service Vehicle Miles Traveled* (December 2020), Projects that propose a mini-storage use such as the one proposed by this applicant are exempt from a traffic analysis. Appendix B of the traffic study memorandum cited above lists Mini Storage Facilities as an exemption from a traffic analysis. Therefore, the storage pod facility portion should be considered as exempt. Although ITE does not have trip rates for RV/Boat storage use, the trip generating characteristics of RV/Boat storage use closely resembles those of mini-storage use. Therefore, the RV/Boat component should also be considered a small Project and exempt from a Traffic Analysis.

As this Project qualifies as exempt from a Vehicle Miles Traveled Impact Analysis, the Project does not conflict and is not inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 (b). Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The proposed Project would develop a boat and RV storage facility and portable storage yard on an existing disturbed parcel and would not require any new road infrastructure. The use is consistent with both the General Plan and the zoning ordinance. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

- d) Would the Project cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?

The proposed Project is consistent with adjacent and area land uses. The Project is not proposing any new roadways being constructed and there will be little traffic during the spreading of the decomposed granite as it is already on site. Additionally, the site will be used for long-term storage with no employees regularly on site. There would be no cause for a new road to be constructed or altered maintenance as a result of the proposed Project. Impacts to road maintenance are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

- e) Would the Project cause an effect upon circulation during the Project's construction?

The Project would not cause an effect upon circulation during the Project's construction as all equipment and materials needed for construction would be staged within the Project site. The Project construction would require the transport of heavy equipment to the site. Construction vehicles accessing the site would be minimal and are not expected to cause traffic issues for the current vicinity circulation system. No temporary lane closures would be necessary. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

f) Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?

The Project would not alter existing emergency access routes or emergency access to nearby uses. After construction emergency service vehicles would be able to access the property via existing streets. Prior to construction, the Project would be subject to review by the County's Fire and Sheriff's Departments to assure that adequate emergency access is provided. Following the County's standard review Project impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

38. Bike Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Include the construction or expansion of a bike system or bike lanes?				

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County General Plan Figure C-6 Trails and Bikeway System, REMAP Figure 7 Trails and Bikeway System, Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space District Comprehensive Trails Plan (Draft), Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The Project is not located adjacent to or nearby designated bike trails. There are currently no bike lanes established on adjacent roads. The Project is not required to construct or expand the existing bike trail systems in the Project vicinity or incorporate construction of bike lanes on the access road. The Project would not impact the bike system or bike lane construction.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

39. Tribal Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

Source(s): Native American Consultation, County Archaeologist

Findings of Fact:

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

In compliance with Assembly Bill 52 (AB52), notices regarding this Project were mailed to all requesting tribes on March 06, 2020. No response was received from the Cahuilla Band, Colorado River Indian Tribes or the Ramona Band. The Morongo Band deferred to Soboba and the Pala Band deferred to closer tribes.

The Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians requested to consult in a letter dated April 3, 2020. Agua Caliente provided information that the Project might be within an ethnographic village. The Project cultural report and the Project conditions were provided to the Tribe and consultation was concluded on July 23, 2021.

The Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians requested to consult in an emailed letter dated March 20, 2020. The Project cultural report and the Project conditions were provided to the Tribe and consultation was concluded on July 23, 2021. Pechanga provided information that the Project was close to a Traditional Cultural Property and recommended monitoring during any ground disturbing activities.

The Rincon Band requested consultation in an emailed letter dated March 13, 2020. The Project cultural report and the Project conditions were provided to the Tribe and consultation was concluded on June 18, 2021.

The Soboba Band requested to consult in a letter dated March 24, 2020. This Project was discussed during a meeting with Soboba on February 1, 2021. Soboba did not identify any tribal cultural resources. The Project cultural report and the Project conditions were provided to the Tribe and consultation was concluded on July 23, 2021.

All of the consulting tribes expressed concerns that the Project has the potential for unidentified subsurface tribal cultural resources. The Tribes requested that a Native American monitor be present during ground disturbing activities so any unanticipated finds will be handled in a timely and culturally appropriate manner.

Based on information provided by the consulting Tribes, this Project will require a condition of approval for a Native American Monitor to be present during ground disturbing activities. The Project will also be required to adhere to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 in the event that human remains

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

are encountered and by ensuring that no further disturbance occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin of the remains. Furthermore, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 (b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and their disposition has been made. CEQA requires the Lead Agency to address any unanticipated cultural resources discoveries during Project construction. Therefore, a condition of approval (TCR-3) that dictates the procedures to be followed should any unanticipated cultural resources 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: TCR-1

Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the developer/permit applicant shall enter into agreement(s) with the consulting Tribe(s) for Native American Monitor(s). In conjunction with the Archaeological Monitor(s), the Native American Monitor(s) shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to provide Cultural Sensitivity Training for all construction personnel. In addition, an adequate number of Native American Monitor(s) shall be on-site during all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of each portion of the Project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading and trenching. In conjunction with the Archaeological Monitor(s), the Native American Monitor(s) have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and potential recovery of cultural resources. The developer/permit applicant shall submit a fully executed copy of the agreement(s) to the County Archaeologist to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Archaeologist shall clear this condition.

This agreement shall not modify any condition of approval or mitigation measure.

Monitoring: Monitoring is required.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the Project:

40. Water	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Project Application Materials

- a) Would the Project 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?

The Project proposes a long-term storage yard, it does not have the ability to generate new wastewater or stormwater such that existing facilities need to be expanded or new ones constructed. There will not be any connection to wastewater services as no wastewater will be created on the site. The decomposed granite that will be

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

spread over the site will maintain the current pervious ground surface. In addition to this, the storage pods will be raised off the ground on metal support and collapsed when not in use. This will help maintain the amount of pervious surface on the Project site and would not result in the need for relocation or construction of new storm water drainage systems. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

The proposed Project development is consistent with the General Plan and zoning ordinance. Development. The Project is not proposing on-site water use and therefore would not significantly increase water demand such that new sources would be necessary. There are no structures proposed for the site and therefore would not be using any water resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
41. Sewer				
a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's Projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Department of Environmental Health Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b) . No septic system is required for Project implementation. Because the Project proposes a storage yard, it does not have the ability to generate new wastewater or stormwater such that existing facilities need to be expanded or new ones constructed. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Department of Waste Resources, Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Would the Project 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?

The closest landfill to the Project site that is permitted to operate into the future is the Lamb Canyon Landfill, which is located at 16411 Lamb Canyon Rd, Beaumont, CA 92223 and is approximately 20.5 miles from the Project site. The landfill is permitted to accept 5,000 tons per day of solid waste and is permitted to operate through 2032 (CalRecycle 2023).

The CalEEMod solid waste generation rate for the Project (spreading the decomposed granite and Other non-Asphalt Surfaces/Parking Lot) was estimated to be de minimis. The proposed RV parking

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

and storage facility would generate a de minimis amount of solid waste which is within the available permitted capacity of the Lamb Canyon Landfill. Therefore, the existing landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal need, and impacts would be less than significant.

Form D ? Mandatory Commercial Recycling and Organics Recycling Prior to final building inspection, applicants shall complete a Mandatory Commercial Recycling and Organics Recycling Compliance form (Form D). Form D requires applicants to identify programs or plans that address commercial and organics recycling, in compliance with State legislation/regulation. Once completed, Form D shall be submitted to the Recycling Section of the Department of Waste Resources for approval. To obtain Form D, please contact the Recycling Section at 951-486-3200, or email to: Waste-CompostingRecycling@rivco.org

Impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Would the Project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?

It is not anticipated that the Project would generate solid waste (except for perhaps users of the property discarding litter. The waste hauler is required to comply with the with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP, The proposed Project is a long-term storage facility with no employees regularly on site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

43. Utilities

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

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

Source(s): Project Application Materials, Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, Utility Companies

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

Findings of Fact:

a-d) 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? Electricity? Natural gas? Communication systems? Street Lighting?

The Project will require electricity.

The proposed Project would connect to existing electricity infrastructure that is adjacent to the site on Briggs Road and Grand Avenue. The Project would be required to comply with the conditions of the service provider terms and connection and specifications prior to service connections. Therefore, all utility infrastructures currently exist, and the Project would not result in the construction of new utility facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

e-f) Would the Project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects? Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? Other government services?

Implementation of the Project would result in an incremental increase in use of public facilities, including roads and other governmental services. As a part of Project approval, standard conditions require the Project to comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, establishing a Developer Impact Fee (DIF) to mitigate the cost of public facilities, including roads and other government facilities. Payment of the DIF is required and is not considered unique mitigation under CEQA. Impacts would be less than significant.

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose Project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 “Wildfire Susceptibility”, Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, California Building Code, California Fire Code, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Would the Project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

According to Cal Fire, the Project is not located in a designated “Very High” fire area and a State Fire Responsibility Area. Because it is not located within a State Responsibility Area, or a “Very High” fire area, or any areas designated as hazardous fire areas by the Fire Chief, the following questions do not apply.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

b) Would the Project, 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?

N/A

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

c) Would the Project 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?

N/A

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
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

d) Would the Project 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?

N/A

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

N/A

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Does the Project:

45. Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Source(s): Staff Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

A preconstruction clearance survey for burrowing owl is required within 30 days prior to the start of site disturbance. If burrowing owls are found during the preconstruction survey, additional mitigation will be required in accordance with the requirements of the MSHCP.

A nesting bird clearance survey is required within three (3) days prior to the start of vegetation clearing, tree removal/trimming, ground disturbance, building demolition, and/or clearing/removal of materials and debris if it will begin within the nesting season (February 1 to September 15). If nesting birds are present, avoidance of nest sites is required and a buffer of 300 to 500 feet (or as determined by a biologist) until juvenile birds are no longer dependent on the nest and/or a biologist has verified that the nest is inactive.

Installation of landscaping plants on MSHCP Table 6-2 shall be avoided.

If any trees are trimmed/removed, preconstruction bat surveys and measures to protect roosting bats, maternity colonies, and hibernacula (if present) shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist.

Although the Project area is not anticipated to contain paleontological or archaeological resources, previously undetected subsurface archaeological resources may be discovered during grading and/or excavation. Mitigation Measures would mitigate impacts associated with the discovery of previously undetected subsurface cultural resources during excavation activities. With mitigation, potential impacts to these resources would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Staff Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: As demonstrated in Sections 1 - 44 of this Environmental Assessment, the proposed Project would not have impacts that cannot be reduced to less than significant with appropriate mitigation with respect to all environmental issues. Thus, while the Project would have direct and indirect environmental effects, the Project along with other cumulative Projects is expected to result in a less than significant cumulative impact with respect to environmental issues.

47. Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Source(s): Staff Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

As demonstrated in Sections 1 - 44 of this Environmental Assessment, the proposed Project would not have substantial adverse effects directly or indirectly on human beings. In addition to mitigation measures, standard conditions will apply to the proposed Project. Therefore, potential direct and indirect impacts on human beings that result from the Project are less than significant with mitigation.

V. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any: N/A

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

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

Revised: 7/18/2023 11:07 PM