



(951) 296-6900

POST OFFICE BOX 9017  
TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA 92589-9017

42135 WINCHESTER ROAD  
TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA 92590

**RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT  
INITIAL STUDY AND  
DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
FOR THE  
JOAQUIN RANCH PUMP STATION DISINFECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS  
[PROJECT NO. D2199]**

**OCTOBER 2024**

Prepared by



(951) 684-6900

Office: 3602 University Ave, Riverside, CA 92501  
Mailing: 3890 Orange St #1509, Riverside, CA 92502

592-227  
(REPORTS/CEQA/592-227)  
VEM/WGH/blt

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>PAGE</u>
<b>PART 1 - PROJECT INFORMATION</b>	
A. INTRODUCTION.....	1
B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	1
C. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING.....	3
D. COMPLIANCE WITH CEQA.....	4
E. LEAD AGENCY.....	4
F. PUBLIC INFORMATION DOCUMENT .....	5
<b>PART 2 – ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND CHECKLIST</b>	
A. PROJECT INFORMATION .....	6
B. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED .....	8
C. DETERMINATION .....	9
D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS .....	10
E. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST .....	12
<b>PART 3 - REFERENCES AND SOURCES .....</b>	<b>57</b>

**FIGURES**

- FIGURE 1 PROJECT VICINITY
- FIGURE 2 PROJECT AREA

**APPENDICES**

- A. DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
- B. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT  
*Biological Resources Assessment Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Project, Murrieta, Riverside County, California; by LSA Associates, Inc., April 2024*
- C. CULTURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT  
*Cultural Resource Assessment for the Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Disinfection System Improvements Project; by CRM TECH, April 2, 2024*
- D. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT  
*Paleontological Resources Assessment for the Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Disinfection System Improvements Project; by CRM TECH, April 2, 2024*
- E. AIR QUALITY CALCULATIONS  
*Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Disinfection System Improvements Summary Report, dated 05/22/2024*

**PART 1**  
**PROJECT INFORMATION**



## **PART 1 - PROJECT INFORMATION**

### **A. RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT**

Rancho California Water District (the District) is located in southwestern Riverside County, approximately 40 miles south of the City of Riverside and approximately 65 miles north of the City of San Diego. The District's total service area encompasses approximately 99,000 acres (154.7 square miles) and is comprised of the City of Temecula, portions of the City of Murrieta, and unincorporated areas in Riverside County. The District provides retail water service to a variety of residential, commercial, and agricultural customers. The District was formed in 1965 and merged with the adjacent Santa Rosa Ranches Water District in 1977. The mission of the District is to deliver reliable, high-quality water and reclamation services to its customers and communities in a prudent and sustainable manner.

The District currently serves a residential population of approximately 151,400 as well as about 9,000 acres of agriculture and ranch lands, primarily vineyards and citrus and avocado orchards. Land use planning within the District's service area is governed by the City of Temecula General Plan (2005), the City of Murrieta General Plan 2035 (adopted in 2011 and updated in 2020), and the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP, as amended through September 28, 2021) of the County of Riverside General Plan (2015). The Project site is located within the planning area covered by the City of Murrieta General Plan 2035 (2020).

### **B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

#### **1. Proposed Project**

The District's Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Disinfection System Improvements Project (the Project) generally consists of construction and operation of chloramination disinfection facilities at the existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station. Construction of the Project is anticipated to include the following:

- Demolition of the existing chlorine injection facilities that include a fabricated steel enclosure, sodium hypochlorite generation equipment, salt and sodium hypochlorite storage tanks, fiberglass generation shed, metering pumps, and associated piping and controls.



- Site preparation and grading;
- Construction of site access improvements to accommodate tanker trucks for chemical deliveries;
- Construction of a masonry equipment building with a chlorine room, an ammonia room, and electrical/analyzer room. The chlorine room and the ammonia room will each have the capacity to contain 110% of the total storage volume of each chemical;
- Within the chlorine room, installation of a polyethylene storage tank for 12.5% bulk sodium hypochlorite solution (SHS), including an antioxidant inner surface that is designed to resist oxidation from the SHS, and SHS metering pumps and piping to replace the existing onsite sodium hypochlorite generation equipment, salt tank, day tank, and associated metering pumps;
- Within the ammonia room, installation of a polypropylene storage tank for 40% liquid ammonium sulfate (LAS) storage tank and LAS metering pumps and piping;
- Installation of a split air conditioning system that includes a common outdoor unit (compressor) and individual ductless indoor units in each chemical room and the electrical/analyzer rooms;
- Installation of a chemical fume odor scrubber on the sodium hypochlorite tank vent;
- Installation of chemical dosing controls and equipment, including reconfiguration of the existing pump station programmable logic controller (PLC) and installation of water quality analyzers for monochloramines and free chlorine to control the metering pumps;
- Installation of chemical injection equipment, including injection quills, double containment site piping for SHS, and a static mixer.

Project operation consists of operating the Joaquin Ranch Pump Station continuously with the new disinfection facilities in place. Approximately one daily vehicle trip to the site for routine operation and maintenance purposes is currently taking place and is expected to continue with the operation of the new disinfection facilities. Additionally, operation includes one monthly tanker truck delivery of 12.5% bulk SHS and one monthly tanker truck delivery of 40% LAS.



**2. Purpose**

The existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station (Pump Station) conveys water from the 1305 Pressure Zone to the 1500 Pressure Zone. The District's water supply comes from groundwater and from water imported from The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). MWD currently disinfects its water with chloramines, while the District currently uses chlorine disinfection.

The District uses imported MWD water during the summer months to meet increased water demand. The proposed disinfection facilities will allow the District to switch their winter month disinfection operations from chlorination to chloramination to provide their customers with chloraminated water year-round.

**C. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

**1. Location**

The Project is located on District-owned property at 42581 Vineyard Parkway, which is situated along Vineyard Parkway near the intersection of Vineyard Parkway and Whitaker Way, southwest of Interstate 15, northeast of Murrieta Creek, in the City of Murrieta, in Riverside County, California. Refer also to **Figures 1 and 2** herein.

**2. Climate**

Climate in the Project area is characterized by low humidity, high summer temperatures, and mild winters. Summer high temperatures are often 90 or more degrees Fahrenheit (°F). Fall, winter, and spring high temperatures are typically in the 60s and 70s. The area normally receives an average annual rainfall of approximately 15 inches, most of which occurs during December through February.



**3. Land Use**

The Project site contains the District's existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station. The site is surrounded by residential development to the north and east and by open space and Murrieta Creek to the west and south.

**D. COMPLIANCE WITH CEQA**

This document has been prepared in compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, codified in California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Section 21000 *et seq* (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq*), and the District's *Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)*, adopted by the District on June 8, 2023 by Resolution No. 2023-6-5. Pursuant to CEQA, this Initial Study has been prepared to determine whether the Project may have a significant effect on the environment.

This Initial Study for the District's Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Disinfection System Improvements has been prepared by Krieger & Stewart, Incorporated under contract with the District to comply with the provisions of CEQA.

**E. LEAD AGENCY**

The District is lead agency for the Project, as it is the public agency with the primary responsibility for preparing CEQA documents and for carrying out and approving the Project. Since the District is responsible for the Project, it must comply with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines issued by the State of California.

The District routinely constructs new facilities, maintains them, and replaces them as necessary to maintain adequate, reliable, and safe service to its customers. The Project is a continuation of the authority that the District has exercised in the past.





**F. PUBLIC INFORMATION DOCUMENT**

This is a public information document prepared in compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, codified in California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Section 21000 et seq (CEQA), the California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq (State CEQA Guidelines), and the District's *Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)*, adopted by the District on June 8, 2023 by Resolution No. 2023-6-5. This Initial Study for the Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Disinfection System Improvements has been prepared by Krieger & Stewart, Incorporated under contract with the District to comply with the provisions of CEQA.

The purposes of this Initial Study are to provide the District with information to use as a basis for identifying the potential environmental impacts of the Project, for determining the appropriate CEQA document to prepare for the Project, to facilitate environmental assessment of the Project, and to provide documentation of the factual basis for the finding in the Project's CEQA document. Additionally, this document identifies mitigation intended to avoid or reduce any adverse environmental impacts of the Project.

**PART 2**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND CHECKLIST**



## **PART 2 - ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND CHECKLIST**

### **A. PROJECT INFORMATION**

**1. Project Title:**

Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Disinfection System Improvements

**2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**

Rancho California Water District  
42135 Winchester Road  
Temecula, CA 92590

**3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Dan Ruiz  
Senior Director of Engineering and Planning  
Rancho California Water District  
(951) 296-6900

**4. Project Location:**

Refer to **Part 1.C(1)** on **Page 3** herein. Refer also to **Figures 1 and 2** herein.

**5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

Rancho California Water District  
42135 Winchester Road  
Temecula, CA 92590

**6. General Plan Designation:**

Civic/Institutional (C/I)

**7. Zoning:**

Civic/Institutional (C/I)

**8. Description of Project:**

Refer to **Part 1.B**, beginning on **Page 1** herein.

**9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

Refer to **Part 1.C(2)** and **Part 1.C(3)**, beginning on **Page 3** herein.

**10. Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

- State Water Resources Control Board Division of Drinking Water (Amendment to Domestic Water Supply Permit)
- Murrieta Fire Department (permit for storage of hazardous materials)



11. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

On May 10, 2024, the District sent formal notification letters to the following Native American tribes:

- Pechanga Band of Indians
- Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians
- Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
- Morongo Band of Mission Indians

In response to said formal notification letters, the District received written responses from Pechanga Band of Indians (Pechanga) and Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians (Rincon).

Pechanga has requested to consult with the District on the Project. The District provided additional Project information and documents to Pechanga, and consultation was initiated on July 25, 2024. The District and Pechanga participated in virtual consultation meetings on July 25, 2024 and September 19, 2024. Consultation was closed with consensus of Pechanga on September 26, 2024. The District and Pechanga have developed mitigation measures intended to avoid or reduce the potential impacts of the Project on tribal cultural resources. Said mitigation measures are described in **Issues V and XVIII** of the Environmental Checklist herein and are set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in **Appendix A**.

Rincon requested additional information and documents pertaining to the Project in order to make a determination as to whether they would request consultation. Available requested documents were provided to Rincon, and Rincon replied with a recommendation that the District work with Pechanga pertaining to tribal cultural resources that may be discovered on the Project site.



**B. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Forestry Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems          | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None                |



C. **DETERMINATION** (To be completed by the Lead Agency):

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- 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 have been made by 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.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

---

William G. Huffman  
KRIEGER & STEWART, INCORPORATED  
District Consulting Engineer  
RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT

October 29, 2024

---

Date



**D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses", as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. 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. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.







**E. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

**Issue I. Aesthetics**

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the Project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project and its associated features and appurtenances will be located on the District's existing property, as described in **Part I.C** of this Initial Study. The Project consists of belowground and low-lying structures and facilities, including site access improvements; a disinfection building housing chemical storage tanks, electrical controls, and analyzers; and appurtenant disinfection system equipment. The Project site is not located within a designated scenic vista, and the proposed facilities will not obstruct public views of a scenic vista, including the hills to the south and west of the Project site. For these reasons, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*There are no "Officially Designated State Scenic Highways" within close proximity to the Project Site. Interstate 15, which is located approximately 1.4 miles northeasterly of the Project site, is listed as an "Eligible State Scenic Highway". The Project consists of low-lying and belowground facilities and would not substantially damage any scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Refer also to **Issue I(a)** above.*



**Issue I. Aesthetics (continued)**

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 a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project site is a developed site containing an existing pump station and is surrounded by roadways, residential development, and open space. The Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Further, the Project would not conflict with the zoning designation of the Project site, which is Civic/Institutional.*

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*The Project includes both indoor and outdoor lighting for safety and security. Outdoor lights will be directed downward and contained within the Project site, and would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. For these reasons, the Project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.*



**Issue II. Agriculture and Forest Resources**

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in forest protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

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

*Based on maps available from the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resources Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, online at <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF>, the Project site is located within an area of land categorized as "Urban and Built-Up Land", and adjoins an area to the northwest and west that is categorized as Farmland of Local Importance". These two designations are defined below.*

***Urban and Built-Up Land** is occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. Common examples include residential, industrial, commercial, construction, institutional facilities, public administration, railroad and other transportation yards, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, water control structures, and other developed purposes.*

***Farmland of Local Importance** is land of importance to the local agricultural economy as determined by each county's board of supervisors and a local advisory committee.*

*There is no land categorized as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (collectively, Farmland) located on or adjacent to the Project site. For these reasons, construction and operation of the Project would not convert Farmland to non-agricultural use.*



**Issue II. Agriculture and Forest Resources (continued)**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project site is zoned Civic/Institutional by the City of Murrieta. The Project site is not zoned for agricultural use, and there are no Williamson Act contracts in effect on the Project site. For these reasons, the Project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act Contract.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) 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 Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project site consists of a District-owned property in the City of Murrieta with a zoning designation of Civic/Institutional. There are no lands zoned for forest land or timberland located on or adjoining the Project site. For these reasons, construction and operation of the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Would the project 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"/>

*The Project site does not contain nor adjoin any forest land. Therefore, construction and operation of the Project will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Refer also to **Issue II(c)** above.*



**Issue II. Agriculture and Forest Resources (continued)**

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

*The Project does not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, as there are no such resources located on the Project site. Refer also to **Issues II(a) through II(d)**, above.*

**Issue III. Air Quality**

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which encompasses all of Orange County, and the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties. Air quality conditions within the SCAB are under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).*

*A project is considered to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan if it would result in population or employment growth that would exceed the estimates for such growth that are set forth in the applicable air quality plan.*

*Project facilities will be operated as part of the District's existing water system, and the Project does not have the potential to result in population or employment growth in the area beyond temporary employment for construction of Project facilities. For these reasons, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct any applicable air quality plan.*

*Potential impacts related to greenhouse gases are described in **Issue VIII** herein.*



**Issue III. Air Quality (continued)**

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

*As described in **Issue III(a)** above, the Project is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). Air quality conditions in the SCAB are under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).*

*State and federal designations based on the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for the project area are listed below. "Attainment" is the category given to an area that has had no CAAQS or NAAQS violations in the past 3 years. "Non-Attainment" is the category given to an area that has had one or more such violations in the past 3 years. An area is considered "Unclassified" when there is insufficient data.*

*Under the CAAQS, the Project area is classified as Non-Attainment for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), for particulate matter measuring 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and for particulate matter measuring greater than 2.5 microns and up to 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>). The Project area is classified as Attainment for carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), sulfates (SO<sub>4</sub>), and lead. The Project area is unclassified for hydrogen sulfide (H<sub>2</sub>S) and visibility reducing particles. Additional information about each of these pollutants and the CAAQS is available at the California Air Resources Board website at [www.arb.ca.gov/resources/california-ambient-air-quality-standards](http://www.arb.ca.gov/resources/california-ambient-air-quality-standards).*

*Under the NAAQS, the Project area is classified as Non-Attainment for O<sub>3</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, as Attainment for PM<sub>10</sub>, and as Unclassified/Attainment for CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and lead. Additional information about these pollutants and the NAAQS is available on the United States Environmental Protection Agency's website at [www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants](http://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants).*

*Project construction air pollutant emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod, 2022.1.1.22). A copy of the CalEEMod report for the Project is included in **Appendix E** herein. Peak day air pollutant emissions estimated to be generated during construction are set forth in **Table 1** below.*



Table 1 Estimated Peak Day Construction Equipment Exhaust Emissions for Construction of Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Disinfection System Improvements						
	Pollutants (pounds/day <sup>(1)</sup> )					
	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Project Construction Emissions</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.66</b>
<b>SCAQMD Significance Thresholds<sup>(2)</sup></b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>55</b>

(1) Peak day

(2) Mass Daily Thresholds for Construction (SCAQMD, March 2023)

Construction activities will result in a temporary increase in quantities of air pollutants in the Project area, including airborne dust, resulting from operation of construction vehicles and equipment. Dust will be mitigated to the extent possible using dust palliatives (such as water) and best management practices (BMPs) specified in the construction contract documents for the Project. Air pollutant emissions resulting from Project construction are well below the significance thresholds established by SCAQMD and will be short-term.

Ongoing operation of the Project will generate small quantities of air pollutant emissions resulting from once-daily District vehicle trips to the Project site for routine operation and maintenance and two tanker truck trips per month for chemical deliveries. The daily District vehicle trips are already taking place as part of operation and maintenance of the existing Pump Station; however, they are included in the calculations shown in **Table 2** below to provide a conservative estimate of total operation emissions. Therefore, Project operation would not result in an increase in vehicle trips or air pollutant emissions over existing conditions.

Table 2 Estimated Peak Day Operation Emissions for the Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Disinfection System Improvements Project						
	Pollutants (pounds/day <sup>(1)</sup> )					
	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Maintenance Vehicle and Chemical Delivery Trucks</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>4.76</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.16</b>
<b>SCAQMD Significance Thresholds<sup>(2)</sup></b>	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>55</b>

(1) Peak day

(2) Mass Daily Thresholds for Operation (SCAQMD, March 2023)





*For the reasons described above, air pollutant emissions generated by construction and operation of the Project will be less than significant and will not result in an increase in O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, or PM<sub>2.5</sub>, for which the Project area is designated Non-Attainment under the CAAQS and/or the NAAQS.*

**Issue III. Air Quality (continued)**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Sensitive receptors nearest the Project site are residences on adjacent properties to the north, east, and southeast, with the nearest residence located approximately 50 feet northeasterly of the Project site. Quantities of air pollutant emissions, including dust, will temporarily increase during Project construction; however, as described in **Issue III(b)** herein, said increases will be less than significant and short-term. Ongoing operation of the Project will result in an insignificant increase in air pollutant emissions over current conditions as a result of two monthly tanker truck trips to the site for chemical deliveries. For these reasons, construction and operation of the Project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Would the project 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"/>

*Project construction may result in some odors during placement of asphalt at the site. These asphalt odors will be less than significant and short-term. Both chemicals (SHS and LAS) that will be stored and used onsite during Project operation have the potential to release unpleasant odors, particularly during chemical delivery. The delivery process includes pumping the chemicals from a truck into the storage tanks. The tanks are vented to allow the displaced air to escape. To mitigate the potential for this vented air to cause objectionable odors at nearby residences, the tank vents will be routed to an odor control system that will scrub the vented air of chemical odors. Because of the odor control system incorporated into the Project design, chemical odors are unlikely to be detected at nearby properties during Project operation. For these reasons, the Project will not result in other emissions, such as those leading to odors, adversely affecting a substantial number of people.*





**Issue IV. Biological Resources**

<p>a) 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. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p>
---	---	--	---	--

*Certain species of plants and animals have low populations, limited distributions, or both. Such species are vulnerable to further declines in population and distribution and may be subject to extirpation as the human population grows and the habitats these species occupy are converted to urban or other uses. State and federal laws, particularly the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) provide the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) with mechanisms for conserving and protecting native plant and animal species. Many plants and animals have been formally listed as "Threatened" or "Endangered" under FESA, CESA, or both, while many others have been designated as candidates for such listing. Additionally, others have been designated as "Species of Special Concern" by CDFW, as "Species of Concern" by USFWS, or are on lists of rare, threatened or endangered plants developed by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). Collectively, all of these listed and designated species are referred to as "special status species".*

*The Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), codified in 50 CFR Section 10.13, makes it unlawful to "take" (i.e. harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect) migratory birds or their nests, eggs, feathers, or any part thereof. With few exceptions, all native bird species are protected by the MBTA. Birds protected under the MBTA are also referred to as "special status species".*

*LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) performed a biological resources assessment of the Project Site, the methods, findings, and recommendations of which are set forth in the report titled, Biological Resources Assessment, Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Project, Murrieta, Riverside County, California, dated April 2024 (Biological Report). A copy of the Biological Report is included in **Appendix B** herein. The following summary is based on the Biological Report.*



Special status species that may occur on the Project site include burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*), Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), and nesting birds protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, which are described in additional detail below.

➤ **Burrowing Owl**

Burrowing owl is designated as a California Species of Special Concern. Potential burrowing owl habitat is limited to approximately one acre of the Project site and is bordered by trees that serve as perching habitat for raptors that prey on burrowing owl; therefore, burrowing owl is not expected to occur on the Project site. Although not expected, burrowing owl requires special consideration at construction sites; therefore, to avoid or reduce potential impacts on burrowing owl, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is included in the Project. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is summarized below and is set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in **Appendix A** herein.

➤ **Cooper's Hawk**

Cooper's hawk is a raptor species of bird that is protected under both the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code. The existing ornamental trees on the Project site provide low-quality nesting habitat for this species, which has a low probability of occurring on the site. Any Project effects to Cooper's hawk would not be significant with implementation of the avoidance and mitigation measures for nesting birds included in Mitigation Measure BIO-2. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 is included in the Project. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is summarized below and is set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in **Appendix A** herein.

➤ **Nesting Birds**

Ornamental trees on the Project site provide potentially suitable habitat for nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the California Fish and Game Code, or both. In order to avoid or reduce potential impacts to nesting birds, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 is included in the Project. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 is summarized below and is set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in **Appendix A** herein.

With incorporation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, the Project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species.



**Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Burrowing Owl**

*To determine whether burrowing owl is present on the Project site, a pre-construction burrowing owl survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist in accordance with California Department of Fish and Wildlife's 2012 Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. If burrowing owl is detected, coordination with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) will be required, including preparation of an impact assessment in accordance with the 2012 Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. If no burrowing owl is detected during the preconstruction burrowing owl survey, then Project construction may commence. If Project construction does not commence within 14 days after performance of the preconstruction burrowing owl survey, then an additional burrowing owl preconstruction survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to commencement of construction to determine whether burrowing owl have since moved onto the site.*

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Nesting Birds**

*The Project site contains potentially suitable habitat for nesting bird species. To avoid potential effects to nesting birds, a preconstruction nesting bird survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist no less than 3 days and not more than 7 days prior to any construction activities, including vegetation removal. If no nesting birds are found during the preconstruction survey, then construction may commence within 7 days of completion of the preconstruction survey.*

*If nesting birds are found during the preconstruction survey, the qualified biologist will establish an exclusionary buffer or buffers around the nests. The buffer(s) will be clearly marked in the field by construction personnel under guidance of the qualified biologist. No construction activities are allowed within the buffer zone(s) until the qualified biologist determines that the young have fledged or the nest is no longer active.*

*Whether or not any nesting birds were identified during the preconstruction survey, if more than 7 days have lapsed since the preconstruction survey and construction or vegetation removal have not yet commenced, then another preconstruction nesting bird survey will be conducted to determine whether any nesting birds have moved into the site.*



**Issue IV. Biological Resources (continued)**

b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Based on the Biological Report cited in **Issue IV(a)**, there are no riparian habitats or natural communities of concern located on the Project site. Therefore, the Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.*

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

*Based on the Biological Report cited in **Issue IV(a)** above, there are no wetlands or other jurisdictional waters located on the Project site. Therefore, construction and operation of the Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands.*

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

*The Project site is developed and maintained for weed abatement, and it is largely surrounded by development; therefore, the Project site does not provide for regional wildlife movement, nor does it serve as a wildlife corridor or nursery site. For these reasons, the Project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.*



**Issue IV. Biological Resources (continued)**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Would the project 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"/>

*The Project site contains non-native ornamental trees, including eucalyptus and birch trees, that may be removed during Project construction. The Project is not subject to local development ordinances, and removal of the non-native trees onsite would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project site is located within the planning boundaries of the Western Riverside County MSHCP; however, the District is not a signatory to the MSHCP and is not pursuing an MSHCP Participating Special Entity designation for the Project. For these reasons, the Project is not subject to compliance with the MSHCP and is instead subject to the requirements of the Federal Endangered Species Act and the California Endangered Species Act.*

**Issue V. Cultural Resources**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(3) states, in part, that "Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the*



*California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852), including the following:*

- "(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;*
- (B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;*
- (C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or*
- (D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history".*

*Further, California Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(j) states that "a 'Historical resource' includes, but is not limited to, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California."*

*CRM TECH performed a historical and archaeological resources survey of the Project site, the methods, results, and recommendations of which are set forth in the report, Cultural Resource Assessment for the Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Disinfection Improvements Project, dated April 2, 2024 (Cultural Report), a copy of which is included in **Appendix C** herein.*

*As part of its historical and archaeological resources study of the Project site, CRM TECH conducted a historical/archaeological resources records search, pursued historical background research, contacted Native American representatives, and conducted an intensive-level field survey of the Project site. Representatives of the Pechanga Band of Indians and the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians were present at CRM TECH's field survey of the Project site.*

*Based on the Cultural Report, no historical or archaeological resources had been recorded within or in the vicinity of the Project site, and no such resources were found during the field survey of the Project site. The identification of potential tribal cultural resources is beyond the scope of the Cultural Report, and is addressed through communication between the District and local Native American tribes. Tribal cultural resources are addressed in **Issue XVIII** herein.*

*Although no historical or archaeological resources were identified within or in the vicinity of the Project site, mitigation will be implemented in order to avoid or reduce potential impacts on previously-undiscovered cultural resources that may be encountered during ground-disturbing activities.*





Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-4 are summarized below and are set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, which is included in **Appendix A** herein. With implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-4, the Project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Archaeological Monitoring**

Prior to start of construction, the District shall retain a qualified archaeological monitor for all grading, trenching, and other ground disturbance activities. The archaeological monitor shall have the authority to halt or divert construction activities as necessary in the event that suspected archaeological or tribal resources are unearthed during Project construction.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Cultural Resources Worker Sensitivity Training**

The Project Archaeologist and the Consulting Tribe(s) shall attend the pre-grading meeting with District representatives, the construction manager, and contractor/subcontractor personnel and will conduct a mandatory Cultural Resources Worker Sensitivity Training to those in attendance. The training will include a brief review of the cultural sensitivity of the Project site and the surrounding areas; what resources could potentially be identified during earthmoving activities; the requirements of the monitoring program; the protocols that apply in the event inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources are identified, including who to contact and appropriate avoidance measures until the find(s) can be properly evaluated; and any other appropriate protocols. All new construction personnel that begin work on the Project following the initial training, and will conduct earthwork or grading activities, must take the Cultural Resources Worker Sensitivity Training prior to beginning work. The Project Archaeologist and the Consulting Tribe(s) will make themselves available to provide the training on an as-needed basis.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Inadvertent Finds**

If any subsurface cultural resources are encountered during Project construction, activities within 100 feet of the encounter shall be halted until the qualified monitors can examine these finds, determine their significance, and, if significant, notify the District, Project Archaeologist, and Consulting Tribe(s). Tribal and archaeological monitors will set up a temporary Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) fence at the 100-foot boundary. A meeting will be convened between the District, Project Archaeologist, and Consulting Tribe(s) (the parties) to discuss the significance of the find, determine a plan that would reduce potential effects to a



*level that is less than significant, and implement appropriate mitigation measures. Recommended measures could include, but are not limited to, the following:*

- 1. Preservation in place;*
- 2. Controlled grading or trenching; and/or*
- 3. Excavation, recovery, and reburial onsite.*

*If the parties find that any excavated cultural resources meet eligibility requirements for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places, plans for the treatment, evaluation, and mitigation of impacts to the find will need to be developed. Prehistoric or historic cultural materials that may be encountered during ground-disturbing activities include:*

- Prehistoric flaked-stone artifacts and debitage (waste material), consisting of obsidian, basalt, and/or cryptocrystalline silicates;*
- Groundstone artifacts, including mortars, pestles, and grinding slabs;*
- Historic-period artifacts such as glass bottles and fragments, cans, nails, ceramic and pottery fragments, and metal objects;*
- Historic-period structural or building foundations, walkways, cisterns, pipes, privies, and other structural elements.*

**Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Phase IV Report**

*Prior to final inspection, the Project Archaeologist shall submit two (2) copies of the Phase IV Cultural Resources Monitoring Report (Phase IV Report) that complies with the District's requirements for such reports. The Phase IV Report shall include evidence of the required Cultural Resources Worker Sensitivity Training that is described in Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The District will review the Phase IV Report to determine adequate mitigation compliance. Provided the Phase IV Report is adequate, two (2) copies of said report shall be submitted to the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California, Riverside (UCR) or current location, and one (1) copy shall be submitted to the Pechanga Cultural Resources Department.*





**Issue V. Cultural Resources (Continued)**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Refer to **Issue V(a)** above. As set forth in the Cultural Report, no archaeological resources have been identified on or in the vicinity of the Project site. Mitigation Measure CUL-1, summarized above and set forth in **Appendix A** herein, is incorporated into the Project to ensure that Project construction will not result in a significant adverse impact on any previously-undiscovered historical or archaeological resources discovered during Project construction. With incorporation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, described in **Issue V(a)** above, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Potential impacts upon tribal cultural resources are described in **Issue XVIII** herein.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*There are no known cemeteries or burial grounds located on or adjacent to the Project site. To avoid or reduce potential impacts upon any human remains that may be inadvertently encountered during Project construction, Mitigation Measure CUL-5 is incorporated into the Project. Mitigation Measure CUL-5 is summarized below and is set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, which is included in **Appendix A** herein. Additionally, the Project will comply with the provisions of Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.*

**Mitigation Measure CUL-5: Human Remains**

*In accordance with California Health and Safety Code §7050.5, if human remains are encountered during Project construction, construction will be halted and the County Coroner will be notified of the find immediately. The County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the District, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection and make recommendations within 48 hours of being granted access*



*to the discovery site. No further disturbance shall occur until a determination of origin and disposition for the remains has been made pursuant to California Public Resources Code §5097.98.*

**Issue VI. Energy**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The primary energy resource that will be consumed during construction of the Project is fuel needed by the construction contractor for operating construction vehicles and equipment. Operation of the Project will require fuel for travel of one District vehicle trip to the Project site daily and two tanker truck trips to the site on a monthly basis for chemical deliveries. The daily District vehicle trip is already taking place for operation and maintenance of the existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station on the Project site, and the two monthly tanker truck trips will commence with operation of the new disinfection facilities. Additionally, electricity will be used to operate the pumps, electrical switchgear, controls, site lighting, and telemetry system. This energy use is needed for construction and operation of the facilities as part of the District's water system and would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Would the project 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"/>

*Construction and operation of the Project will not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Refer also to **Issue VI(a)** above.*



**Issue VII. Geology and Soils**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- i) *Based on information available in the online mapping system "Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation", or "EQ-Zapp", provided by the California Geological Survey on its website at <http://conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp>, the Project site is not located within an earthquake fault zone. The fault nearest the Project site is the Wildomar Fault, in the Elsinore Fault Zone, which is located approximately one mile to the northeast. For these reasons, the Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault.*
- ii) *Being located in seismically-active southern California, the Project site is subject to strong seismic ground shaking. The Project does not include any structures intended for more than occasional human occupancy, and Project facilities will be designed and constructed in accordance with the specific geotechnical recommendations provided a report based on the geotechnical study that will be conducted during Project design. For these reasons, construction and operation of the Project is not expected to directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking.*
- iii) *Based on the online EQ-Zapp application, cited in **Issue VII(a)(i)** above, the Project site is located within a liquefaction zone, which is an area where historical occurrence of liquefaction, or local geological, geotechnical, and groundwater conditions indicate a potential for permanent ground displacements, such that measures that are consistent with established*



*practice and that will reduce seismic risk to acceptable levels are needed. The Murrieta General Plan 2035 (2020) states that "A majority of the alluvial deposits along the Murrieta Creek lie within a liquefaction hazard zone", and Exhibit 12-5, Liquefaction Susceptibility Map of said general plan shows that the Project site is located in an area mapped as having "Moderate" liquefaction susceptibility. The Project does not include facilities intended for more than occasional human occupation, and Project facilities will be designed and constructed in accordance with the specific geotechnical recommendations set forth in a geotechnical study report prepared as part of a geotechnical study of the Project site that will be conducted during Project design. For these reasons, the Project will not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects related to seismic-related ground failure, such as liquefaction.*

- iv) Based on the online EQ-Zapp application cited in Issue VII(a)(i) above, the Project site is not located in an Earthquake Induced Landslide Zone. Further, based on the California Geological Survey map, "Landslide Inventory Map of the Murrieta Quadrangle, Riverside County, California", dated December 2011, there are no known landslides or rockslides located in the vicinity of the Project site. Further, the Project Site is relatively flat and is not known to be subject to landslides. For these reasons, the Project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.*

**Issue VII. Geology and Soils (Continued)**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Besides the area of the Project site occupied by the existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station facilities, the Project site contains ornamental trees and ruderal, non-native grassland vegetation that has been maintained for weed abatement. With the exception of the areas occupied by the proposed Project facilities, ground surfaces disturbed during Project construction will be returned to near-preconstruction conditions at completion of construction. No erosion related to the Project is expected to occur after completion of Project construction and final site stabilization. Best management practices will be implemented by the construction contractor to avoid or reduce erosion during Project construction to the maximum extent practicable, and the Project will comply with the National Pollutant*



*Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, Order No. 2022-0057-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002, issued by the California State Water Resources Control Board. For these reasons, and because the Project site is relatively flat, the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or substantial impacts related to the loss of topsoil.*

**Issue VII. Geology and Soils (Continued)**

c) Would the project 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, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Based on information available from the online Web Soil Survey provided by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service, soils at the Project site consist of Riverwash (RsC), which are described as gravelly coarse sand to gravelly sand; Greenfield sandy loam (GyA), which is described as primarily sandy loam and loam; and Hanford coarse sandy loam (HeC2), which is described as coarse sandy loam and fine sandy loam. These soils are classified as well drained. The Project will be designed and constructed in accordance with the specific geotechnical recommendations set forth in a geotechnical study report for the Project site, which will be prepared during Project design. The Project does not include facilities whose construction and operation are capable of causing on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, liquefaction, or collapse.*

*For the above reasons, the Project would not expose people or critical structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving unstable geologic units or soils. Refer also to **Issue VII(a)** above.*

d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), 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
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Based on the Web Soil survey data in **Issue VII(c)**, onsite soils consist of primarily sands and loams, which are not known to be expansive. The Project would not create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property related to expansive soil.*



**Issue VII. Geology and Soils (Continued)**

e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project does not include septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.*

f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Federal, state, and local regulations and policies provide protection for paleontological resources. These include, but are not limited to, the federal Paleontological Resources Preservation Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-011, Title VI, Subtitle D) and California Public Resources Code Section 30244.*

*CRM TECH performed a paleontological resources assessment of the Project site, the methods, results, findings, and recommendations of which are set forth in the report, Paleontological Resources Assessment for the Joaquin Ranch Pump Station Disinfection Systems Improvements Project, dated April 2, 2024 (Paleontological Report), a copy of which is included in **Appendix D** herein.*

*As part of its assessment, CRM TECH initiated a paleontological records search, conducted a literature review, and conducted a systematic field survey of the Project site in accordance with the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology.*

*Based on the findings of the paleontological resources assessment, no paleontological resources or potentially fossiliferous sediments were observed on the Project site, and the Project has a low potential to impact significant, nonrenewable paleontological resources. Although no impacts to unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features are anticipated, Mitigation Measure PALEO-1 is incorporated into the Project to prevent an adverse impact upon any resource that may be present in subsurface soils. Mitigation Measure PALEO-1 is summarized below and is set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, a copy of which is attached to the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration in **Appendix A** herein. With incorporation of PALEO-1, construction and*





operation of the Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or geological feature.

**Mitigation Measure PALEO-1: Paleontological Resources**

*The following measures will be implemented to protect any paleontological resources that may be uncovered during ground disturbance at the Project site:*

- *If any paleontological resources or suspected paleontological resources are uncovered during Project construction, all work in the vicinity of the discovery shall be halted until a qualified paleontologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the find.*
- *If a qualified paleontologist determines that a specimen uncovered during Project construction is potentially significant, then all future ground-disturbing actions associated with Project construction will be monitored by a qualified paleontological monitor. The paleontological monitor will be prepared to quickly salvage fossil specimens upon discovery to avoid construction delays and shall have the authority to temporarily halt or divert construction equipment and activities to allow for removal of abundant or large specimens.*
- *Specimens recovered from the Project site by the qualified paleontological monitor will be, in accordance with standard paleontological practice, identified and curated at a repository with permanent retrievable storage that will allow for additional research in the future.*

**Issue VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project 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"/>

*Gases that trap heat in the Earth's atmosphere are referred to as greenhouse gases (GHGs). GHGs that are emitted due to human activities, primarily from the combustion of fossil fuels (e.g. gasoline in motor vehicles), are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O). The most common GHG that results from human activities is CO<sub>2</sub>, followed by CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O, respectively.*

*To quantify and combine these three GHGs into a single figure, each gas is converted to "carbon dioxide equivalent" (CO<sub>2</sub>e) units. CO<sub>2</sub>e is defined by the United States Environmental Protection Agency*



*(USEPA) as, "A metric measure used to compare the emissions from various greenhouse gases based upon their global warming potential (GWP)...The carbon dioxide equivalent for a gas is derived by multiplying the tons of the gas by the associated GWP." The GWPs for carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide are 1, 25, and 298, respectively.*

*The Project is expected to generate GHGs during construction and operation. GHGs emitted during construction would result from operating construction vehicles and equipment and from workers' vehicles commuting to and from the Project Site. Estimated quantities of GHGs that would be generated during Project construction total approximately 2,826 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e, as calculated by reports generated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod, Version 2022.1.1.22). A copy of the CalEEMod output report for the Project is included in **Appendix E** herein.*

*GHGs emitted during ongoing operation and maintenance would result from daily District vehicle trips to and from the Project site and two monthly tanker truck trips for chemical deliveries. The daily District vehicle trips are already taking place for operation of the existing pump station; however, they have been included in the calculation to generate a conservative estimate of the GHGs generated during operation. Based on the CalEEMod report cited above, Project operation is expected to generate 1,520 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year.*

*SCAQMD has a significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year; therefore, estimated Project construction GHG emissions of 2,826 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e and Project operation emissions of 1,520 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year are not considered significant. Construction GHG emissions are temporary and will cease upon completion of construction.*

*For the reasons described above, the Project will not generate GHG emissions that would, either directly or indirectly, have a significant impact on the environment.*





**Issue VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Continued)**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*As described in **Issue VIII(a)** above, construction of the Project would generate insignificant quantities of GHGs, while operation of the Project would not result in an increase in GHG emissions over existing conditions. For these reasons, construction and operation of the Project will not conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.*

**Issue IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project 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"/>

*Small quantities of fuel, lubricants, adhesives, paint, and coatings will be used during construction of the Project. Said use will be short-term and strictly controlled, and waste materials will be properly disposed of. Such materials will not be allowed to enter any drainage. Operation of the Project involves the transport, use, and storage of 12.5% bulk sodium hypochlorite solution (SHS), which is classified as a hazardous material, and liquid ammonium sulfate (LAS), which is acidic. Both of these chemicals will be transported via tanker truck, in accordance with applicable safety regulations, to the Project site on a monthly basis. Both the SHS and LAS will be stored onsite in polyethylene tanks designed to contain said chemicals, in separate rooms for each chemical, each room with the capacity to contain at least 100% of the associated tank volume. Additionally, each of the chemical storage rooms will be air conditioned to mitigate chemical concentration degradation and to reduce the formation of vapors, fumes, and odors. The disinfection process that will be used at the site does not produce a chemical waste stream; therefore, the Project does not include the disposal of any hazardous materials. Permits required for the storage and use of the chemicals, pursuant to the 2022 California Fire Code, will be obtained as applicable. Project operation will be in accordance with all applicable requirements for the transportation, storage, and use of the chemicals. For the reasons described above, construction and operation of the Project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.*



**Issue IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Continued)**

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

*As described in **Issue IX(a)** above, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.*

c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Murrieta Canyon Academy is located approximately 0.20 mile north of the Project site, Thompson Middle School is located approximately 0.25 mile north of the Project site, and the adjoining Murrieta Valley High School is located approximately 0.30 mile north of the Project site. The Project will store and use hazardous materials onsite; however, said materials will be sufficiently contained onsite and do not have the potential to impact any nearby school. Refer also to **Issue IX(a)** herein.*

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

*The Project site is not located on a site included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. According to maps and data available to the public on EnviroStor (the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) database located online at <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public>), the nearest such site is known as "Crossroads Investors III, LLC", located at 24250 Adams Avenue, Murrieta, CA 92562, approximately 0.85 mile northeasterly of the Project site. The site Crossroads Investors III, LLC site included a lead acid battery processing and reclamation facility in the 1950s which resulted in lead contamination in the soil. In 2002, the DTSC certified that all remediation actions had been completed. The site is no occupied by Rock Valley*



*Christian Church. For these reasons, the Project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment related to a hazardous materials site.*

**Issue IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Continued)**

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The airport nearest the Project site is the French Valley Airport, located approximately 5.50 miles northeasterly of the Project site. According to maps included in the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (2004, as amended), the Project site is not located within a compatibility zone, noise contour, or mapped airspace of the French Valley Airport. The Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise related to proximity to an airport.*

f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project will be constructed within the District's existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station site. Transportation corridors will remain open during Project construction and no lane closures are expected. During ongoing operation of Project facilities, there are expected to be two tanker truck trips to the site monthly to deliver chemicals, as well as one daily District vehicle trip to the site, which is already taking place as part of operation and maintenance of existing facilities onsite. The two monthly tanker trips are not considered significant and would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.*



**Issue IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Continued)**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Would the project 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"/>

*Based on maps available on the Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer available on the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's Fire Resource and Assessment Program website (<http://frap.fire.ca.gov>), the Project site is not located in an area designated as a moderate, high, or very high fire hazard severity zone. There is a slight risk of fire occurring during Project construction; however, the risk is less than significant and short-term. Additionally, construction contract documents for the Project will require construction contractors to comply with safety standards specified in Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations and that any equipment or machinery that poses a risk of emitting sparks or flame be equipped with an arrestor, thereby further limiting potential impacts. Project facilities do not include structures intended for more than occasional human occupation. Chemicals stored on the Project site (SHS and LAS) are not flammable; however, contact between the SHS and combustible material could result in fire. Chemical storage, use, and delivery at the Project site will be conducted in accordance with existing federal, state, and local laws regulating such materials. Further, onsite chemical storage is designed with secondary containment features that will contain a minimum of 100% of the stored chemical volumes, and permits for the storage and use of the chemicals onsite will be obtained from the local fire marshal. For these reasons, construction and operation of the Project will not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.*

**Issue X. Hydrology and Water Quality**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project includes constructing and operating disinfection system improvements at the District's existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station. The chemicals that will be delivered, stored, and used onsite will be securely stored in buildings that can contain the entire volumes of the chemical storage tanks, preventing discharge of any of the chemicals to the ground onsite or offsite. The Project does not have*



*a waste stream. Construction and operation of the Project will comply with all applicable water quality standards and other requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board and the State of California San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board). For these reasons, the Project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.*

**Issue X. Hydrology and Water Quality (Continued)**

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

*The Project does not have a water demand beyond that required during construction. Therefore, the Project does not have the potential to substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*i) The Project site is currently occupied by the existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station facilities and open space containing non-native grassland vegetation and ornamental trees. As part of the Project, some of the ornamental trees are expected to be removed, and additional paved areas, estimated to be somewhere between 4,000 to 5,000 square feet, will be added to the site to accommodate the upgraded facilities and to provide access to tanker trucks for chemical deliveries to the site during ongoing Project operation. The site is relatively flat, and these*



would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Refer also to **Issue VII(b)** herein.

- ii) *Because the Project includes additional paving onsite, anticipated to be between 4,000 and 8,000 square feet, quantities of surface runoff are expected to increase; however, the increase is not expected to be significant, and would not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite. Refer also to **Issue X(c)(i)** above.*
- iii) *The Project would not create or contribute any runoff water or result in stormwater runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Refer also to **Issues X(c)(i)** and **X(c)(ii)** above.*
- iv) *Project facilities do not have the potential to impede or redirect flood flows. Refer also to **Issues X(c)(i)** through **X(c)(iii)** above.*

**Issue X. Hydrology and Water Quality (Continued)**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map No. 06065C2715G, effective 08/28/2008 and revised to reflect a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) effective April 7, 2014, the Project site is located within an area mapped as a 1% annual chance (100-year) flood plain. Although the Project site is located within a flood hazard zone, Project facilities would not release pollutants as a result of inundation due to flooding. Chemical storage facilities onsite are designed to include secondary containment features with the capacity to contain a minimum of 100% of the stored chemical volumes. Based on the California Official Tsunami Inundation Maps available on the California Department of Conservation website at <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps>, there are no tsunami inundation areas mapped within Riverside County. There are no water bodies of sufficient size located near the Project site that would put the site at risk of a seiche. The nearest large body of water is Lake Elsinore, which is located*



*approximately eight miles northwesterly of the Project site. For these reasons, the Project would not risk release of pollutants due to inundation.*

**Issue X. Hydrology and Water Quality (Continued)**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The water quality control plan applicable to the Project area is the Water Quality Control Plan for the Colorado River Basin Region, as amended through March 30, 2023. The Project does not include features that will conflict with or obstruct water quality policies or objectives, and will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the water quality control plan cited above.*

*The Project site overlies the adjudicated Temecula Valley Groundwater Basin. The Project does not have the potential to adversely impact groundwater in said basin. The Project site is not located within an area covered by a groundwater sustainability plan.*

*For the reasons described above, the Project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.*

**Issue XI. Land Use and Planning**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project is located at the District's existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station site and does not have the potential to physically divide an established community.*





**Issue XI. Land Use and Planning (Continued)**

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

*The Project is being constructed on existing District-owned Joaquin Ranch Pump Station site, which is zoned by the City of Murrieta as Civic/Institutional. Project construction and operation will take place within the bounds of the existing site. The Project will not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.*

**Issue XII. Mineral Resources**

a) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Project facilities will be located within the District's existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station site, which is not known to contain any mineral resources that would be of value to the region or to the residents of the state. The Project would not impact the availability of any known mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites. For these reasons, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.*

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Murrieta General Plan 2035 states, in Chapter 8, that "The extent and significance of mineral deposits in the City and Sphere of Influence are largely unknown." Known mineral resources in the City are depicted on Exhibit 8-1 of said general plan, and no such resources are shown to be located on or adjacent to the Project site; therefore, the Project will not result in the loss of availability of a local-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Refer also to **Issue XII(a)** above.*





**Issue XIII. Noise**

a) Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*The Project will generate increased noise levels in the area temporarily during construction as a result of construction vehicles and equipment operating onsite. Said construction noise will comply with the provisions of City of Murrieta, California Municipal Code Section 16.30, Noise.*

*Ongoing Project operation is expected to generate noise resulting from one daily District vehicle trip to the site for routine operation and maintenance and two monthly tanker truck trips to the site for chemical deliveries. The daily District vehicle trip is already taking place as part of operating the existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station. The two monthly tanker truck trips will take place during daytime hours and will not result in a substantial increase in noise in the vicinity.*

*For the reasons described above, the Project will not result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established for the area.*

b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*The Project is not expected to result in excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise during Project construction or operation. Any groundborne vibration or groundborne noise generated during Project construction are not expected to be perceptible at any residences, with the nearest being located approximately 50 feet northeasterly of the Project site. Ongoing Project operation will not generate groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. For these reasons, the Project will not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Refer also to **Issue XIII(a)** above.*



**Issue XIII. Noise (Continued)**

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two 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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The airport nearest the Project site is the French Valley Airport, a public use airport owned by County of Riverside, located approximately 5.50 miles northeasterly of the Project site. Based on maps included in the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (2004, as amended), the Project site does not lie within a compatibility zone or a noise contour of the French Valley Airport. For these reasons, the Project will not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels related to airports.*

**Issue XIV. Population and Housing**

a) 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 road or other infrastructure)?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project is intended to improve the disinfection facilities at the existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station and will not require the District to hire additional permanent employees and would not induce unplanned growth in the area, either directly or indirectly.*

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project is located on the District's existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station site, does not include the construction or destruction of any housing, and does not have the potential to displace any existing people or housing.*



**Issue XV. Public Services**

<p>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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 public services:</p>				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- i) *The Project does not include any features or facilities that would require additional or unusual fire protection resources.*
- ii) *The Project does not include any features or facilities that would require enhanced levels of police protection.*
- iii) *The Project does not have the potential to increase or decrease the area's population and would therefore not result in a greater or lesser demand for schools. The Project will not adversely impact any school.*
- iv) *The Project does not have the potential to increase or decrease the area's population, and therefore will not result in a greater or lesser demand for parks. The Project will not adversely impact any park.*
- v) *The Project will not adversely affect other public facilities.*



**Issue XVI. Recreation**

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Construction and operation of the Project do not have the potential to increase or decrease the area's population, and would therefore not result in increased or decreased use of parks or other recreational facilities. Refer also to **Issue XIV(a)** herein.*

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project does not include recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.*

**Issue XVII. Transportation**

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

*Minor, temporary impacts to traffic are expected to occur during construction of the Project due to workers' vehicles and construction vehicles and equipment at the Project site; however, said impacts will be less than significant and short-term. Operation of the Project will increase vehicle trips in the area above existing conditions by two monthly tanker truck trips to the Project site for chemical deliveries. These two monthly tanker truck trips are not of a frequency that would result in a substantial impact to traffic or transportation in the area. For these reasons, construction and operation of the Project will not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system.*



**Issue XVII. Transportation (Continued)**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Would the project 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"/>

*Construction of the Project is expected to result in approximately ten worker vehicles traveling to and from the Project site per day. For the purposes of this analysis, we have assumed that workers will commute a total of 40 miles per day each, round-trip, which results in a total of 400 vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per day during construction. This amount of daily VMT will only occur during Project construction and is not significant considering the existing traffic levels in the area and the short-term nature of construction. Operation of the Project is expected to require approximately one District vehicle trip to and from Project site daily, which is already taking place as part of current operation at the existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station, as well as two monthly tanker truck trips for chemical deliveries. For this analysis, we have assumed that each truck trip will result in 100 miles round trip, for a total increase of 200 VMT per month over existing conditions. This increase in VMT is not considered significant. For these reasons, construction and operation of the Project will not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(b).*

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

*The Project will be constructed within the District's existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station site and does not include any construction in roads or on other nearby properties. For these reasons, construction and operation of the Project will not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses.*



**Issue XVII. Transportation (Continued)**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*No road or lane closures are anticipated during Project construction of operation. Therefore, the Project will not result in inadequate emergency access at the Project site or in the local vicinity.*

**Issue XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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, 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:				
i) 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), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*i) Based on the cultural resources report prepared by CRM TECH, cited in **Issue V(a)** herein and included in **Appendix C**, there are no known tribal cultural resources or other cultural resources on the Project site that are 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). Therefore, construction and operation of the Project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is 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). Refer also to*



*Issue V(a) herein, which describes measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts to resources that are inadvertently discovered during Project construction activities.*

ii) *On May 10, 2024, the District sent formal notification letters to the following Native American tribes:*

- *Pechanga Band of Indians*
- *Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians*
- *Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians*
- *Morongo Band of Mission Indians*

*In response to said formal notification letters, the District received written responses from Pechanga Band of Indians (Pechanga) and Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians (Rincon). As of the date of this writing, the District has not received responses from either Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians or Morongo Band of Mission Indians.*

*Rincon requested additional information and documents pertaining to the Project in order to make a determination as to whether they would like to request consultation. The available information was provided to Rincon, and Rincon replied with a recommendation that the District work with Pechanga pertaining to cultural resources that may be discovered on the Project site.*

*Pechanga has requested to consult with the District on the Project. The District provided additional Project information and documents to Pechanga, and participated in virtual consultation meetings with Pechanga on July 25, 2024 and September 19, 2024. The District and Pechanga have developed mitigation measures intended to avoid or reduce the potential impacts of the Project on any tribal cultural resources that may be discovered onsite during Project construction. Pechanga approved the District's proposed mitigation measures on August 26, 2024. Said mitigation measures are described below and in **Issue V** herein, and are set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in **Appendix A**.*

**Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Native American Monitoring**

*Prior to commencement of ground-disturbing activities on the Project site, the District will secure agreement with the Pechanga Band of Indians (Pechanga) for tribal monitoring of the site during ground-disturbing construction activities. The District will provide a minimum of 30 days advance notice to Pechanga of all mass grading and trenching activities. Pechanga representatives shall have the authority to*





*temporarily halt and redirect ground-disturbing activities onsite in the event that suspected archaeological resources are unearthed.*

**Mitigation Measure TCR-2: Final Disposition of Resources**

*In the event that Native American cultural resources are discovered during construction activities, the following procedures will be carried out for final disposition of the discoveries. One or more of the following treatments, in order of preference, shall be employed with Pechanga, and evidence of the treatment(s) conducted shall be provided to the District.*

1. *Preservation In Place. If feasible, preservation in place will be employed, leaving resources in the place where they were found, with no development affecting the integrity of the resources.*
2. *Reburial on the Project Property. The measures for reburial shall include, at minimum, measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts in perpetuity. Reburial shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation has been completed, with an exception that sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains are excluded. Any reburial process shall be culturally appropriate, and a listing of contents and location of the reburial shall be included in the confidential Phase IV Report. The Phase IV Report shall be filed with the District under a confidential cover and is not subject to public records requests.*
3. *Curation. If preservation in place or reburial is not feasible, then the resources shall be curated in a culturally appropriate manner at a Riverside County curation facility that meets the criteria set forth in the State of California's Guidelines for the Curation of Archeological Collections, ensuring access and use. The collection and associated records shall be transferred, including title, and shall be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence of curation in the form of a letter from the curation facility, stating that subject archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid, shall be provided by the Project Archaeologist to the District. There shall be no destructive or invasive testing on sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains. Results*





*concerning any inadvertent finds shall be included in the Phase IV Report. Evidence of compliance with this mitigation measure, if a significant archaeological resource is found, shall be provided to the District upon completion of a treatment plan and final report detailing the significance and treatment finding.*

**Mitigation Measure TCR-3: Non-Disclosure**

*It is understood by all parties that, unless otherwise required by law, the site of any reburial of Native American human remains, associated grave goods, or other artifacts shall not be disclosed and shall not be governed by public disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act. In accordance with California Government Code §7927.000, the County Coroner, District, Project Archaeologist, and any other parties shall withhold public disclosure of information related to the reburial of any Native American human remains, grave goods, or other artifacts.*

**Issue XIX. Utilities and Service Systems**

a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the relocation or construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*The Project consists of construction and operation of disinfection system improvements at the District's existing Joaquin Ranch Pump Station, as described in **Part I(B)** herein. The proposed facilities will be powered from the existing electrical service and no modification to the service will be 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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Water needed during construction, such as for dust control, will be available from the District's existing water supplies, and construction water demand will be less than significant and short-term. Operation of the Project facilities does not have a water demand. For these reasons, the Project have sufficient*



*water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.*

**Issue XIX. Utilities and Service Systems (Continued)**

c) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project will not include any waste generating facilities and will have no impact to the existing wastewater flow.*

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

*Project operation will not generate solid waste. Small quantities of solid waste may be generated during Project construction; however, said quantities of solid waste would be minimal and would be recycled or accommodated by a local landfill. For these reasons, the project will not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure. Further, the Project will not otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.*

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Refer also to **Issue XIX(d)** above.*



**Issue XX. Wildfire**

If the Project is located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Based on maps available on the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection State Responsibility Area Viewer, the Project Site is not located within a state responsibility area (SRA) or a very high fire hazard severity zone. Based on Exhibit 12-8 Very High Fire Hazard Zones of the Murrieta General Plan 2035 (2020), the Project is not located in or adjoining an area mapped as a high fire hazard zone. The Project does not have the potential to substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, or other factors, would the project 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project does not include habitable structures, and there would be no project occupants except for District employees who are expected to visit the site daily for operation and maintenance purposes. Further, construction and operation of the Project will not exacerbate wildfire risks. Refer also to **Issue XX(a)** above.*

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

*The Project does not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that will exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment related to fire risk. Refer also to **Issue XX(a)** above.*



**Issue XX. Wildfire (Continued)**

d) Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslide, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Project site is relatively flat and, after completion of construction, disturbed surfaces not containing aboveground facilities will be returned to near-preconstruction conditions. Construction and operation of the Project will not expose people or structures to significant risks as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.*

**Issue XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance**

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

➤ **Biological Resources**

*As described in **Issue IV** herein, the Project site contains suitable or potentially suitable habitat for burrowing owl, Cooper's hawk, and other nesting birds. Potential Project impacts to burrowing owl, Cooper's hawk, and nesting birds will not be significant with incorporation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, which are set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, attached to the Mitigated Negative Declaration included in **Appendix A** herein.*

➤ **Archaeological and Historical Resources**

*As described in **Issue V** herein, a historical/archaeological resources assessment was conducted at the Project site. Based on the assessment, there are no resources present on the Project site that meet the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or qualify as a historical or archaeological resource under CEQA. Construction and operation of the Project is not expected to eliminate known important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory; however, in order to avoid or reduce potential impacts upon any previously*



undiscovered historical or archaeological resources that may be present in subsurface deposits, Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-5 are incorporated into the Project and is set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in **Appendix A** herein. With incorporation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-5, the Project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

➤ **Paleontological Resources**

As described in **Issue VII(f)** herein, a paleontological resources assessment was conducted at the Project site. Based on said assessment, the Project has a low potential to impact significant, nonrenewable paleontological resources. Although no impacts are anticipated, Mitigation Measure PALEO-1 is incorporated into the Project to prevent an adverse impact upon any paleontological resource that may be present in subsurface soils. Mitigation Measure PALEO-1 is set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, a copy of which is included in **Appendix A** herein. With incorporation of Mitigation Measure PALEO-1, the Project will not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California prehistory.

**Issue XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance (Continued)**

b) Does the project have impacts that 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, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*None of the impacts or potential impacts of the Project are cumulatively considerable.*

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*As described herein, none of the environmental effects of the Project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.*

**PART 3**  
**REFERENCES AND SOURCES**



### PART 3 - REFERENCES AND SOURCES

- California Air Resources Board Website for California Ambient Air Quality Standards, [www.arb.ca.gov/resources/california-ambient-air-quality-standards](http://www.arb.ca.gov/resources/california-ambient-air-quality-standards)
- California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection State Responsibility Area Viewer, [bof.fire.ca.gov/projects-and-programs/state-responsibility-area-viewer](http://bof.fire.ca.gov/projects-and-programs/state-responsibility-area-viewer)
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resources Protection, California Important Farmland Finder, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF>
- California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3; Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15000 *et seq.*; as amended December 28, 2018
- California Department of Conservation Tsunami Program Website, [conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps](http://conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps)
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control Website, EnviroStor Database, [www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public](http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public)
- California Department of Transportation California Scenic Highway Mapping System Website, [www.dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways](http://www.dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways)
- California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application ("EQ-Zapp"), [www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp](http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp), updated September 23, 2021, accessed 04/22/2024
- City of Murrieta, Murrieta General Plan 2035, Adopted 2011 and Updated 2020
- California Emissions Estimator Model® (CalEEMod) Software, Version 2022.1.1.22, accessed online at [caleemod.com](http://caleemod.com)
- County of Riverside Assessor-County Clerk-Recorder website for Agricultural Preserves, <https://www.rivcoacr.org/agricultural-preserve-information>
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Map Service Center Website, [www.msc.fema.gov](http://www.msc.fema.gov)
- Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer, Fire Resource and Assessment Program, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, <https://frap.fire.ca.gov>
- Google Earth Pro, Version 7.3.6.9796, build date February 22, 2024
- Kennedy Jenks, Rancho California Water District 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, adopted June 10, 2021
- Office of the State Fire Marshal Website, [osfm.fire.ca.gov](http://osfm.fire.ca.gov)
- Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, by Mead & Hunt and Coffman Associates, Adopted by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission on October 14, 2004, as amended
- Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Web Soil Survey, available online at <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/>, accessed 04/24/2024
- South Coast Air Quality Management District Website, [www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov)
- Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Groundwater Management Website, [www.water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management](http://www.water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management)
- United States Environmental Protection Agency Website for National Ambient Air Quality Standards, [www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants](http://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants)

## **FIGURES**



**APPENDIX A**

**DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
AND  
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

**APPENDIX B**

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT**

**APPENDIX C**  
**CULTURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT**

**APPENDIX D**

**PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT**

**APPENDIX E**  
**AIR QUALITY CALCULATIONS**