

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This environmental impact report (EIR) has been prepared by the City of Moreno Valley (City) as lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Public Resources Code 21000 et seq., and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 et seq.). This EIR has been prepared to evaluate the environmental effects of the proposed Kaiser Permanente Moreno Valley Medical Center Project (project). The purpose of this EIR is to focus the discussion on those potential effects on the environment of the project which the lead agency has determined may be significant. In addition, feasible mitigation measures are recommended, when applicable, that could reduce significant environmental impacts or avoid significant environmental impacts.

The project site is comprised of 30 acres and a portion of the site, approximately two-thirds, is developed with a 130,000 square-foot, 100-bed hospital building, two medical office buildings totaling approximately 89,500 square feet, a central utility plant, two modular trailers/conference rooms, and surface parking. The project site has a land use designation of Commercial, is zoned Community Commercial, and is within the Medical Use Overlay.

Regionally, the project site, which is the existing Kaiser Medical Center, is located east of Interstate 215, south of State Route 60, and north of Lake Perris within the City. More specifically, the project site is located on the north side of Iris Avenue, west of Oliver Street, and east of Nason Street at 27300 Iris Avenue, Moreno Valley California, 92555. The project site is composed of two Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 486-310-033 and 486-310-034. The latitude and longitude of the approximate center of the project site is 33°53'49.704" North and 117°11'12.379" West. The project site is included within the southwest and southeast quarters of the northwest quarter of Section 22 of Township 3 South, Range 3 West of the Sunnymead 7.5-minute quadrangle, as mapped by the U.S. Geological Survey.

The general vicinity surrounding the project site is developed with a mix of residential and rural residential uses. Single family residential development occurs to the south, east, and west of the existing hospital. Iris Avenue forms the southern site boundary, and undeveloped disturbed lots surround the hospital on the northern, eastern, and western boundaries. Undeveloped open space that has been approved for the implementation of the AquaBella Specific Plan occurs to the northwest. Located north and east of the project site, on the eastern side of Oliver Street, is Landmark Middle School.

ES.2 DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

This EIR is organized as follows:

Executive Summary outlines the conclusions of the environmental analysis and provides a summary of the proposed project and the project alternatives analyzed in the EIR. This section also includes a table summarizing all environmental impacts identified in the EIR along with the associated mitigation measures proposed to reduce or avoid each impact.

Chapter 1, Introduction, serves as a forward to the EIR, introducing the project, the applicable environmental review procedures, and the organization of the EIR.

Chapter 2, Environmental Setting, describes the existing environmental conditions at the project site at the time of issuance of the Notice of Preparation.

Chapter 3, Project Description, provides a thorough description of the setting, objectives, characteristics, operation, and construction of the proposed project and required discretionary approvals.

Chapter 4, Environmental Impact Analysis, describes the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, as well as proposed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid any potentially significant impacts. The discussion in Chapter 4 is organized by 16 environmental issue areas as follows:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services and Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems

For each environmental issue area, the analysis and discussion are organized into eight subsections as described below:

- Relevant Plans, Policies, and Ordinances – This subsection describes the laws, regulations, ordinances, plans, and policies applicable to the environmental issue area and the proposed.
- Existing Conditions – This subsection describes the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the proposed project at the time of publication of the Notice of Preparation. The environmental setting establishes the baseline conditions by which the County will determine whether specific project-related impacts are significant.
- Thresholds of Significance – This subsection identifies a set of thresholds by which the level of impact is determined.
- Project Design Features – This subsection identifies project design features that are incorporated into the project to avoid potential environmental impacts.
- Impacts Analysis – This subsection provides a detailed analysis regarding the environmental effects of the proposed project, and whether the impacts of the proposed project would meet or exceed the thresholds of significance.
- Mitigation Measures – This subsection identifies potentially feasible mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially reduce significant adverse project impacts.
- Level of Significance After Mitigation – This subsection discusses whether project-related impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR. If applicable, this subsection also identifies any residual significant and unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project that would result even with implementation of any feasible mitigation measures.

In addition to the seven subsections listed above, full citations for all documents referred to in each environmental issue area discussion are included at the end of each section or chapter.

Chapter 5, Mandatory CEQA Discussion Areas, addresses significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided, the significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of the proposed project, growth-inducing impacts associated with the proposed project, and potential secondary impacts of mitigation measures implemented to reduce the impacts of the proposed project.

Chapter 6, Cumulative Impact Analysis, includes an evaluation of the potential cumulative impacts of the proposed project in combination with identified related projects.

Chapter 7, Alternatives, discusses alternatives to the proposed project, including a No Project Alternative. This chapter describes the rationale for selecting the range of alternatives discussed

in the EIR and identifies the alternatives considered by the City that were rejected from further discussion as infeasible during the scoping process. Lastly, Chapter 7 includes a discussion of the environmental impacts of the alternatives that were carried forward for analysis and identifies the environmentally superior alternative.

Chapter 8, List of Preparers, gives names and contact information of those responsible for writing this EIR.

Appendices include various technical studies prepared for the proposed project, as listed in the Table of Contents.

ES.3 PROJECT BACKGROUND

Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, also known as Kaiser Permanente, purchased the existing Moreno Valley Medical Center, formerly known as the Moreno Valley Community Hospital, in 2007 and has continuously operated as a Kaiser Permanente facility since the purchase. Prior to the construction of the Moreno Valley Medical Center, the project site was utilized for agricultural purposes from at least 1938 until approximately 1989. The existing hospital building was constructed in 1989 (Secor 2007).

The City of Moreno Valley General Plan Land Use Map (City of Moreno Valley 2017a) designates the project site as R/O – Residential/Office and C – Commercial uses, and the City’s Zoning Map (City of Moreno Valley 2017b) includes two zoning designations on the collective project site: OC – Office Commercial district and CC – Community Commercial district. Per the City Municipal Code, the primary purpose of the Office Commercial (OC) district is to provide for the establishment of business, corporate and administrative office, as well as commercial services which are supportive to major business developments. The primary purpose of the CC – Community Commercial district is to provide for the general shopping needs of area residents and workers with a variety of business, retail, personal and related or similar services. The project site also lies within the Medical Use Overlay (MUO) district the primary purpose of which is to implement the general plan concept of creating a medical corridor by limiting land uses to those that are supportive of and compatible with the existing hospital.

ES.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

ES.4.1 Project Overview

Kaiser Permanente is proposing to redevelop and expand the existing Kaiser Permanente Moreno Valley Medical Center campus into a state-of-the-art medical center consisting of approximately 1,125,000 square feet of medical services facilities and ancillary uses. These facilities and uses would include an approximately 460-bed hospital, hospital support buildings, outpatient medical office

buildings, an Energy Center, and surface and structured parking. Kaiser Permanente intends to provide a comprehensive range of health care services to Kaiser Permanente members in the City and surrounding communities within western Riverside County. A summary of the various project elements, by phase, is shown in Table ES-1.

Table ES-1
Project Components

Project Components	Size*
<i>Phase I</i>	
Diagnostic and Treatment (D&T) Building	95,000 square feet
Energy Center	22,000 square feet
Temporary Parking (to be removed in Phase III)	45 spaces
<i>Phase II</i>	
North and East Patient Bed Towers and D&T Expansion	380,000 square feet
Medical Office Building No. 3	65,000 square feet
Energy Center Expansion	8,000 square feet
Parking Structure No. 1	400 spaces
Parking Structure No. 2	1,400 spaces
<i>Phase III</i>	
West and South Patient Bed Towers	375,000 square feet
Medical Office Building No. 4	95,000 square feet
Parking Structure No. 3	600 spaces
<i>Existing to Remain</i>	
Medical Office Building No. 2	75,000 square feet
Surface Parking	150 spaces
<i>Total Buildout</i>	
Hospital Building with Four Towers and D&T	850,000 square feet
Medical Office Buildings (3)	235,000 square feet
Energy Center	28,000 square feet
Parking	2,550 spaces

Source: CO Architects 2019.

The project would be developed in three phases, with the first phase (Phase I) evaluated at the project level in this EIR. Phases II and III are analyzed in this EIR at a programmatic level because they would be developed at a later date and because they are more conceptual due to several factors that are presently unknown, including the future growth of Kaiser Permanente membership within the City and surrounding communities, the future regional demand for the project's services, the evolution of healthcare technology, the portability of the health care environment, legislative and regulatory changes required by health care reform, the business and health care needs of Kaiser Permanente, and other factors. For Phases II and III, the EIR will provide a general assessment of potential impacts and provide a framework of how impacts and mitigation would be addressed in the future when the components of these phases, being considered in this EIR under a Master

Plot Plan, are submitted to the City for individual Plot Plan entitlements. For all phases of the project, worst-case assumptions are used to evaluate potential effects.

The project would be constructed in three phases. The project's phased development would occur between 2020 and 2038. Additional detailed project description information, including descriptions of the proposed new structures, access and roadway improvements, off-site road improvements, and anticipated construction schedule is provided in Chapter 3 of this EIR.

ES.4.2 Project Objectives

Section 15124(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the project description shall contain "a statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project." Section 15124(b) further states that "the statement of objectives should include the underlying purpose of the project and may discuss the project benefits." The underlying purpose of the proposed project is to accommodate both existing deficits and future demand for medical office, diagnostic, and treatment space, including emergency services, in the Moreno Valley Medical Center service area by improving and expanding existing campus facilities on the current Medical Center site. As set forth in the CEQA Guidelines, The project's specific objectives are provided below.

- Improve public health and safety and serve the existing and projected Kaiser membership base in Moreno Valley and the immediately surrounding communities by providing additional and expanded medical services on the Moreno Valley Medical Center campus.
- Reduce the need for Kaiser members to travel outside the City for medical services by increasing the types and capacity of medical services available at the Moreno Valley Medical Center campus.
- Develop underutilized land located within the Medical Use Overlay district consistent with the City's objectives, as set forth in the general plan and zoning code, of maintaining a diversity of medical and supportive uses in the vicinity of the existing hospital and creating a medical corridor by limiting land uses to those that are supportive of and compatible with the existing hospital.
- Provide for the long-range development capacity on the project site's undeveloped area which would accommodate the future growth of Kaiser Permanente members requiring health care services, while also providing the flexibility for a range of shorter term interim and conveniently sited, complementary uses.
- Provide a comprehensive range of high quality health care services in seismically safe, state-of-the-art, advanced-care medical center facilities for Kaiser Permanente members throughout the Moreno Valley region.
- Replace, repair and upgrade existing hospital facilities and supporting infrastructure to address age, functionality and seismic safety.

- Create a comprehensively planned, advanced-care medical center campus that provides community vitality, economic growth, and a wide range of employment opportunities in Moreno Valley and the surrounding region.
- Foster the creation of employment opportunities within Moreno Valley to improve the jobs/housing balance within the City and the surrounding area.
- Maintain current services at the existing Moreno Valley Medical Center without interruption while simultaneously upgrading aging infrastructure and enhancing services available to Kaiser Members based on market demand.
- Provide parking sufficient to accommodate membership and patient demands, staff parking demands during shift changes, reduce delay and improve circulation throughout the campus by alleviating vehicle queuing.
- Implement upgrades to the Medical Center's Energy Center to improve energy efficiency as well as implement green building features using the standards of the Green Guide for Healthcare, as such standards evolve over time, and Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold certification or equivalent, as well as Kaiser's existing sustainable building strategies.

ES.4.3 Project Design Features

Kaiser Permanente has incorporated project design features (PDFs) into the project to reduce the potential for environmental effects. The following PDFs are incorporated into the analysis in applicable subsections throughout Chapter 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis.

Air Quality

PDF-AQ-1 Kaiser will prepare and implement a Construction Management Plan, which will include best available control measures among others. Such control measures may include but not be limited to:

- Minimizing simultaneous operation of multiple construction equipment units.
- Require that off-road diesel powered vehicles used for construction should be new low-emission vehicles, or use retrofit emission control devices, such as diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters verified by California Air Resources Board.
- Minimizing idling time by construction vehicles per California Air Resources Board regulations.

PDF-AQ-2 The following measures shall be adhered to during all phases of construction activities of the project to reduce PM₁₀ to the satisfaction of the City of Moreno Valley Planning Department:

- All construction equipment shall be equipped with Tier 4 Final diesel engines or better.
- The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum size suitable for the required job.
- The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest number is operating at any one time.
- Construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.

Energy and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

PDF-GHG-1 As part of Kaiser's green and sustainability initiatives, the project would incorporate Kaiser's sustainable building standards and green initiatives. Kaiser will obtain LEED Gold certification or equivalent for the buildings that it develops on the project site. The project's design will embrace technology and the environment, incorporate reduced energy demand systems (e.g., solar, thermal insulation), and utilize rainwater, recycling of waste, systems with energy recovery options, prefabrication elements across the project to minimize waste, and local materials for both landscape and construction. To attain this goal, Kaiser would implement many of its current green strategies in the project. These strategies include using:

- polyvinyl chloride-free materials (such as resilient flooring, carpet and roofs)
- low-volatile organic compound or volatile organic compound-free paints
- chlorofluorocarbon-free refrigerants
- innovative construction waste diversion programs to keep harmful materials out of landfills
- formaldehyde-free casework
- high efficiency heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems
- cogeneration electricity production and heat recovery
- infrared, hands-free faucets

- permeable paving to reduce stormwater runoff in parking areas
- cool roofs for solar reflectivity and building cooling
- turf-free and indigenous native planting for low irrigation demand, and
- water conservation efforts.

Kaiser's future green strategies for the project includes one or more of the following:

- solar power/photovoltaics
- electric vehicle charging stations
- transportation demand management
- fuel-cell technology
- displacement ventilation
- toxin-free furniture, and
- green cement.

ES.5 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY

The NOP for the EIR was distributed to the State Clearinghouse, interested agencies, groups, and individuals on November 26, 2018. Pursuant to Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, recipients of the NOP were requested to provide responses within 30 days after their receipt of the NOP. The 30-day NOP public review period ended December 31, 2018. During the 30-day public review period of the NOP, the City held a Scoping Meeting within the City Council Chambers at 6:00 p.m. on December 12, 2018, to gather additional public input on the project. Comments received during the NOP public review period generally focused on the following:

- Air Quality emission during construction and from traffic
- Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources in the project vicinity
- Accessibility to transit
- Impacts to surrounding land uses

ES.6 REQUIRED PERMITS AND/OR APPROVAL

Implementation of the project may require permits or other forms of approval from public agencies or other entities prior to construction of the project. They include, but are not limited to, the following.

ES.6.1 City of Moreno Valley

The City will consider the following actions for Phase 1:

- Certification of the EIR (PEN18-0217);
- Approval of a Master Plot Plan (PEN18-0228)
- Approval of a Plot Plan for the Diagnostic and Treatment Building (PEN18-0229)
- Approval of a Plot Plan for the Energy Center (PEN18-0230)

Future programmatic-level components evaluated within this EIR will require future approvals from the City under Phases II and III.

ES.6.2 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permits will be required for grading activities of 1 acre or larger. Since the project would disturb more than 1 acre of soil, the applicant must file a Notice of Intent with the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and obtain a General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit, pursuant to the NPDES regulations established under the Clean Water Act. This permit requires preparation and implementation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan, which is intended to prevent degradation of surface and groundwater during the grading and construction process. A report of waste discharge shall be submitted to the Santa Ana RWQCB to obtain either a waste discharge requirement or a waiver for any impacts to waters of the state.

ES.6.3 South Coast Air Quality Management District

A fugitive dust control plan submitted to the South Coast Air Quality Management District for approval will be required prior to issuance of grading permits (SCAQMD Rule 403). Permits for stationary sources, such as those proposed to be installed in the Energy Center (e.g., emergency generators), will be required prior to project approval.

ES.6.4 Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development

The Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development's Facilities Development Division will review and approve the plans and specifications of the proposed hospital building, medical office buildings, and related hospital facilities to ensure compliance with the provisions of the CBC, Title 24, California Code of Regulations (OSHPD 2011).

ES.7 IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Table ES-2 provides a summary of the impact analysis related to the project. The table identifies a summary of the significant environmental impacts resulting from the project pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(1). For more detailed discussion, please see Chapter 4 of this document. Table ES-2 also lists the applicable mitigation measures related to identified significant impacts, as well as the level of significance after mitigation is identified. Impacts associated with air quality and transportation were identified as being significant and unavoidable. Cumulative impacts associated with air quality and transportation were also identified as being significant and unavoidable.

ES.8 EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

As stated in Chapter 5 of the EIR, the Effects Found Not to be Significant subsection concluded that the project would not result in significant impacts to agriculture and forestry resources and mineral resources; therefore, these topics are not addressed in the EIR as a separate environmental impact analysis section and not summarized in Table ES-2. Although aesthetics, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, population and housing, public services, recreation and utilities and service systems were found to be less than significant with no mitigation required, each is addressed in Chapter 4 as stand-alone sections due to their lengthy discussions.

Several environmental topics were not found to be significant with mitigation incorporated as described in this EIR, including: biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, and tribal cultural resources.

ES.9 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-2 provides a summary of the impact analysis related to the project. Table ES-2 identifies a summary of the significant environmental impacts resulting from the project pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(1). For more detailed discussion, please see Chapter 4 of this Draft EIR. Table ES-2 lists the applicable mitigation measures related to potentially significant impacts, as well as the level of significance after mitigation.

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Aesthetics</i>			
AES-1. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
AES-2. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact	N/A	N/A
AES-3. In a non-urbanized area, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
AES-4. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Air Quality</i>			
AQ-1. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Potentially Significant	No feasible measures available	Significant and Unavoidable
AQ-2. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	Potentially Significant	No feasible measures available	Significant and Unavoidable
AQ-3. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Potentially Significant	No feasible measures available	Significant and Unavoidable
AQ-4. Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
<i>Biological Resources</i>			
BIO-1. 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Potentially Significant	<p>MM-BIO-1. To avoid potential direct impacts to burrowing owl, a burrowing owl preconstruction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to ground-disturbing project activities. If burrowing owls are present, occupied burrows shall be avoided. The preconstruction survey, avoidance, and any relocation of burrowing owls, if present, shall be conducted in accordance with current MSHCP survey guidelines and protocols.</p> <p>MM-BIO-2. All vegetation removal and ground-disturbance activities shall be planned outside the nesting season for raptors (February 1 to August 15) and outside the peak nesting season for birds (March 1 to August 15) if practicable. If</p>	Less than Significant

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		vegetation removal would occur during those time periods, a preconstruction survey for active nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than one week prior to the onset of ground-disturbance activities. If active nests are found on the site, disturbance or removal of the nest shall be avoided until the young have fledged and the nest is no longer active. Depending on the species, site conditions, and proposed construction activities near the active nest, a buffer distance may be prescribed, as determined by a qualified biologist.	
BIO-2. 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
BIO-3. 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	MM-BIO-3. Consultation with the resource agencies shall be conducted prior to implementing Phases II and III of the project to determine the RWQCB and/or CDFW will indeed take jurisdiction over the existing detention basin. If jurisdiction is determined, the Applicant will mitigate for the loss of 0.51-acre of waters of the state subject to RWQCB and CDFW jurisdiction, and an additional 0.54-acre of streambed under CDFW jurisdiction only. The project applicant will apply for A Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) from the RWQCB and a Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW prior to the start of construction of Phases II and III of the project. Mitigation required for these permits would include compensatory habitat-based mitigation at a minimum 2:1 ratio for impacts to non-wetland waters of the state and CDFW streambed. Mitigation may include on-site restoration of waters through implementation of an approved Habitat Mitigation Monitoring Plan or purchase of off-site credits through an agency-approved mitigation bank such as the Soquel Canyon Mitigation Bank. Coordination with the resource agencies will determine the final mitigation ratio and strategy. Documentation shall be provided to the City.	Less than Significant

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
BIO-4. 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?	No Impact	N/A	N/A
BIO-5. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance	No Impact	N/A	N/A
BIO-6. 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?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
<i>Cultural Resources</i>			
CUL-1. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>CUL-2. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>MM-CUL-1. The applicant shall ensure that all ground-disturbing activities are ceased and treatment plans are implemented if archaeological resources are encountered. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. A buffer area of at least 100 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until a qualified archaeologist has examined the newly discovered artifact(s) and has evaluated the area of the find. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications and Standards. Should the newly discovered artifacts be determined to be prehistoric, Native American Tribes/Individuals should be contacted and consulted and Native American construction monitoring should be initiated. The Applicant and City shall coordinate with the archaeologist to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The plan may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to address treatment of the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis.</p> <p>In the event that a cultural resource is encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all such resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains. The artifacts shall be relinquished through one or more of the following methods and evidence of such shall be provided to the City of Moreno Valley Planning Department:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accommodate the process for Preservation-In-Place/Onsite reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands, as detailed in the treatment plan prepared by the professional archaeologist. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the 	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 79; therefore, the resources would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation; and/or 3. For purposes of conflict resolution, if more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default. <p>Once artifact analysis is completed, a final written report detailing the results of all research procedures and interpretation of the site shall be submitted to the lead agency for review and approval.</p>	

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>CUL-3. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>MM-CUL-2. In the event that any human remains are unearthed during project construction, the City of Moreno Valley and the Applicant shall comply with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. The City of Moreno Valley and the Applicant shall immediately notify the Riverside County Coroner's office and no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. If remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24-hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). After the MLD has inspected the remains and the site, they have 48 hours to recommend to the landowner the treatment or disposal, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated funerary objects. The MLD shall complete their inspection and make their recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access by the landowner to inspect the discovery. The recommendation may include the scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and cultural items associated with Native American burials. Upon the discovery of the Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located, is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred, as prescribed in this mitigation measure, with the MLD regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains. The landowner shall discuss and confer with the MLD all reasonable options regarding the MLDs preferences for treatment.</p> <p>If the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD, or the MLD identified fails to make a recommendation, or the landowner rejects the recommendation of the MLD and the mediation provided for in Subdivision (k) of Section 5097.94, if invoked, fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American human remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Energy</i>			
ENR-1. Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
ENR-2. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
<i>Geology and Soils</i>			
GEO-1. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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 based on other substantial evidence of as known fault. (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42); strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides?	Potentially Significant	<p>MM-GEO-1. Kaiser Permanente shall include in the Phase I project design all recommendations provided in the site-specific geotechnical investigations prepared for the proposed Diagnostic and Treatment Building and proposed Energy Center (Appendices E-1 and E-2). These recommendations include but are not limited to those related to ground improvements, drainage improvements, foundation design, and pavement design. Recommendations for remedial actions related to geotechnical concerns shall be implemented by Kaiser Permanente, to the satisfaction of the City of Moreno Valley.</p> <p>MM-GEO-2. A geotechnical study shall be prepared during the design phases for Phases II and III of the program. Recommendations for remedial actions related to geotechnical concerns, provided by the geotechnical consultant, shall be implemented by Kaiser Permanente, to the satisfaction of the City of Moreno Valley.</p> <p>MM-GEO-3. The Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development's (OSHPD's) Facilities Development Division shall review and approve the plans and specifications of the proposed medical office building, hospital, and related hospital facilities.</p>	Less than Significant

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
GEO-2. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
GEO-3. 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	<p>MM-GEO-1. Kaiser Permanente shall include in the Phase I project design all recommendations provided in the site-specific geotechnical investigations prepared for the proposed Diagnostic and Treatment Building and proposed Energy Center (Appendices E-1 and E-2). These recommendations include but are not limited to those related to ground improvements, drainage improvements, foundation design, and pavement design. Recommendations for remedial actions related to geotechnical concerns shall be implemented by Kaiser Permanente, to the satisfaction of the City of Moreno Valley.</p> <p>MM-GEO-2. A geotechnical study shall be prepared during the design phases for Phases II and III of the program. Recommendations for remedial actions related to geotechnical concerns, provided by the geotechnical consultant, shall be implemented by Kaiser Permanente, to the satisfaction of the City of Moreno Valley.</p> <p>MM-GEO-3. The Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development's (OSHPD's) Facilities Development Division shall review and approve the plans and specifications of the proposed medical office building, hospital, and related hospital facilities.</p>	Less than Significant
GEO-4. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>GEO-5. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</p>	No Impact	N/A	N/A
<p>GEO-6. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>MM-GEO-4. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall retain a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. Prior to commencement of excavation activities, the paleontologist shall conduct a Paleontological Sensitivity Training for all construction personnel that will conduct earthwork or grading activities. The training shall include a handout and shall focus on how to identify paleontological resources that may be encountered during earthmoving activities, and the procedures to be followed in such an event, including who to contact and the appropriate avoidance measures that need to be undertaken until the find(s) can be properly evaluated; the duties of paleontological monitors; notification and other procedures to follow upon discovery of resources; and the general steps a qualified professional paleontologist would follow in conducting a salvage investigation if one is necessary. All new construction personnel that will conduct earthwork or grading activities must take the Paleontological Sensitivity Training prior to beginning work on the project and the professional paleontologist shall make themselves available to provide the training on an as-needed basis.</p> <p>MM-GEO-5. The applicant shall ensure the monitoring of construction excavations for paleontological resources is required for all excavations in older Quaternary alluvial fan deposits. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall retain a qualified paleontological monitor, who will work under the guidance and direction of a professional paleontologist, and who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. The paleontological monitor shall have the authority to temporarily redirect earthmoving activities in the event that suspected paleontological</p>	Less than Significant

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>resources are unearthed during project construction. The paleontological monitor shall be present during all construction excavations including, but not limited to grading, trenching, boring, and clearing/grubbing. Multiple earth-moving construction activities may require multiple paleontological monitors. The frequency of monitoring shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading. Monitoring may be reduced if potentially fossiliferous units are not present in the subsurface, or if present, are determined upon exposure and examination by the professional paleontologist to have a low potential to contain or yield fossil resources.</p> <p>MM-GEO-6. The applicant shall ensure that in the event that paleontological resources and/or unique geological features are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find in order to evaluate the resource. A buffer area of at least 100 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until appropriate paleontological treatment plan has been approved by the Applicant and the City of Moreno Valley. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. The Applicant and City of Moreno Valley shall coordinate with a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. Treatment may include implementation of paleontological salvage excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis or preservation in place. At the paleontologist's discretion and to reduce construction delay, the grading and excavation contractor shall assist in removing rock samples for initial processing. Recovered specimens shall be properly prepared to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including screen washing sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates, if necessary. Identification and curation of specimens into a professional, accredited public museum repository with a commitment to archival conservation and permanent retrievable storage is required for significant discoveries.</p>	

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		MM-GEO-7. The applicant shall ensure that a professional paleontologist prepares a report summarizing the results of the monitoring and any salvaging efforts, the methodology used in these efforts, as well as a description of any fossils collected and their significance, as well as any necessary maps and graphics to accurately record the original location of any such resources. The report shall be submitted to the Applicant, the City of Moreno Valley, the San Bernardino County Natural History Museum, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the required mitigation measures.	
<i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>			
GHG-1. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
GHG-2. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>			
HAZ-1. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
HAZ-2. 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?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
HAZ-3. 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?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
HAZ-4. 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 result, would is create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	No Impact	N/A	N/A
HAZ-5. 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?	No Impact	N/A	N/A

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
HAZ-6. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
HAZ-7. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
<i>Hydrology/Water Quality</i>			
HYD-1. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	Potentially Significant	<p>MM-HYD-1. Treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP) features proposed for the northeastern project area, including an underground storage vault and an underground storage pipe system (Figure 4.9-4, Proposed Drainage), shall be constructed during Phase I of the project. These treatment control BMPs shall be constructed in accordance with the project Water Quality Management Plan (Appendix G-1) and approved by the City of Moreno Valley.</p> <p>MM-HYD-2. Treatment control BMP features proposed for the southern project area, including multiple sand-filled detention basins (Figure 4.9-4, Proposed Drainage), shall be constructed during Phase II of the project. These treatment control BMPs shall be constructed in accordance with the project Water Quality Management Plan (Appendix G-1) and approved by the City of Moreno Valley.</p> <p>MM-HYD-3. Consistent with the Design Handbook for Low Impact Development Best Management Practices (Riverside County Flood Control Water Conservation District 2011), Section 3.7 - Sand Filter Basins, Table 1- Recommended Inspection and Maintenance Activities for Sand Filter Basins, the following inspection and maintenance activities shall be implemented following basin construction:</p>	Less than Significant

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Semi-monthly, including just before the annual storm season and following rainfall events, the applicant shall: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Complete routine maintenance and inspection. b. Remove debris and litter from the entire basin to minimize filter clogging and to improve aesthetics. c. Check for obvious problems, especially filter clogging and signs of long-term ponding. Repair as needed. Address odor, insects, and overgrowth issues associated with stagnant or standing water in the basin bottom. There should be no long-term ponding of water. d. Check for erosion and sediment laden areas in the basin. Repair as needed. Clean forebay if needed. e. Revegetate side slopes where needed. 2. Annually, if possible, schedule inspections within 72 hours after a significant rainfall, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Inspection of hydraulic and structural facilities. Examine the overflow outlet for clogging, the embankment and spillway integrity, and damage to any structural element. b. Check side slopes and embankments for erosion, slumping, and overgrowth. c. Inspect the sand media at the filter drain to verify it is allowing acceptable infiltration. Annually scarify the top 3 inches by raking the filter drain's sand surface. d. Check the filter drain underdrains for damage or clogging. Repair as needed. e. Repair basin inlets, outlets, forebays, and energy dissipaters whenever damage is discovered. f. No water should be present 72 hours after an event. No long-term standing water should be present at all. No algae formation should be visible. Correct problems as needed. 	

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>HYD-2. 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?</p>	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
<p>HYD-3. 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 result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; 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; or impede or redirect flood flows?</p>	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
HYD-4. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	No Impacts	N/A	N/A
HYD-5. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	Potentially Significant	<p>MM-HYD-1. Treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP) features proposed for the northeastern project area, including an underground storage vault and an underground storage pipe system (Figure 4.9-4, Proposed Drainage), shall be constructed during Phase I of the project. These treatment control BMPs shall be constructed in accordance with the project Water Quality Management Plan (Appendix G-1) and approved by the City of Moreno Valley.</p> <p>MM-HYD-2. Treatment control BMP features proposed for the southern project area, including multiple sand-filled detention basins (Figure 4.9-4, Proposed Drainage), shall be constructed during Phase II of the project. These treatment control BMPs shall be constructed in accordance with the project Water Quality Management Plan (Appendix G-1) and approved by the City of Moreno Valley.</p> <p>MM-HYD-3. Consistent with the Design Handbook for Low Impact Development Best Management Practices (Riverside County Flood Control Water Conservation District 2011), Section 3.7 - Sand Filter Basins, Table 1- Recommended Inspection and Maintenance Activities for Sand Filter Basins, the following inspection and maintenance activities shall be implemented following basin construction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Semi-monthly, including just before the annual storm season and following rainfall events, the applicant shall: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Complete routine maintenance and inspection. b. Remove debris and litter from the entire basin to minimize filter clogging and to improve aesthetics. c. Check for obvious problems, especially filter clogging and signs of long-term ponding. Repair as needed. Address odor, insects, 	Less than Significant

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>and overgrowth issues associated with stagnant or standing water in the basin bottom. There should be no long-term ponding of water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Check for erosion and sediment laden areas in the basin. Repair as needed. Clean forebay if needed. e. Revegetate side slopes where needed. <p>4. Annually, if possible, schedule inspections within 72 hours after a significant rainfall, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Inspection of hydraulic and structural facilities. Examine the overflow outlet for clogging, the embankment and spillway integrity, and damage to any structural element. b. Check side slopes and embankments for erosion, slumping, and overgrowth. c. Inspect the sand media at the filter drain to verify it is allowing acceptable infiltration. Annually scarify the top 3 inches by raking the filter drain's sand surface. d. Check the filter drain underdrains for damage or clogging. Repair as needed. e. Repair basin inlets, outlets, forebays, and energy dissipaters whenever damage is discovered. f. No water should be present 72 hours after an event. No long-term standing water should be present at all. No algae formation should be visible. Correct problems as needed. 	
<i>Land Use and Planning</i>			
LU-1. Would the project physically divide an established community?	No Impacts	N/A	N/A

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>LU-2. Would the project conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</p>	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
<i>Noise</i>			
<p>NOI-1. Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>MM-NOI-1. Prior to grading permit issuance, and to help ensure construction noise levels at community noise-sensitive receptors (e.g., residences) are compliant with City of Moreno Valley (City) requirements and adopted Federal Transit Administration guidance, the applicant or its construction contractor(s) shall implement the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction noise reduction methods such as shutting off idling equipment, and usage of electric-driven air compressors and similar power tools in lieu of diesel-powered equipment, shall be applied where feasible. • During construction, stationary operating construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from or shielded from sensitive receptors. When increased distance cannot be used to help reduce noise exposure at a sensitive receptor due to loud operation of stationary equipment, apply feasible on-site noise attenuation measures that may include temporary noise barriers (e.g., acoustical blankets or field-erected wooden walls) or the placement of on-site tanks, containers, or trailers so that direct noise source-to-receptor path(s) are occluded. • During construction, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas shall be located as far as practical from noise sensitive receptors while being located on the project site or on existing developed areas. 	Less than Significant

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow surrounding property owners and residents to contact the job superintendent if necessary. In the event the City receives a complaint, appropriate response (that may include corrective actions, as warranted by investigation of the received complaint and determination of noise exceedance) shall be implemented and a report of the response and/or action provided to the reporting party in a reasonable timeframe. <p>MM-NOI-2. The construction contractor shall require that all construction equipment be operated with original factory-installed or factory-approved noise control equipment (e.g., exhaust mufflers and silencers, intake filters, and engine shrouds as appropriate) that is properly installed and in good working order. Enforcement shall be accomplished via field inspections by applicant or third-party personnel during construction activities to the satisfaction of the City of Moreno Valley Engineering Department.</p> <p>MM-NOI-3. The applicant shall require that the combined outdoor noise emission from operation of the two emergency generators (i.e., 1 x 1-MW and 1 x 2-MW gensets), including sound attenuated exhaust and casing radiated (and any air intakes or heat discharge) would not exceed 55 dBA Leq at a distance of 200 feet. Achievement of this acoustical performance metric shall be demonstrated either by on-site field noise testing or via engineering specifications (e.g., expected sound pressure levels at a defined distance from the equipment) provided by the equipment supplier and/or manufacturer and disclosed as part of the final project design (and reviewed by a qualified acoustical consultant) prior to equipment submittal approval and project construction.</p> <p>MM-NOI-4. The applicant shall require that when project design details are finalized, and prior to submission of the final project design to the City, an acoustical analysis of aggregate project operation noise from expected stationary</p>	

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		sources of sound emission (e.g., HVAC systems) shall be conducted or reviewed by a qualified acoustical consultant (e.g., Institute of Noise Control Engineering [INCE] Board Certified Member or as otherwise approved by the City of Moreno Valley). Using reference sound level data provided by (and thus the responsibility of) equipment suppliers as part of the modeling input parameters, this predictive analysis shall evaluate aggregate noise levels from these stationary sound sources at the same assessment positions per each of three project phases as appearing in Table 4.11-9. The results of this acoustical analysis shall be summarized in a concise report, and include descriptions of equipment noise control, sound transmission path abatement, and other conditions as reflected by the final project design submitted to the City that contribute to expected attainment of noise levels that are compliant with applicable daytime and nighttime thresholds at these positions. This analysis shall be performed to include two operation noise scenarios per phase: with and without operation of the proposed emergency generators.	
NOI-2. Would the project result in exposure to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
NOI-3. Would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels (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 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport)?	No Impact	N/A	N/A

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Population and Housing</i>			
POP-1. Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
POP-2. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact	N/A	N/A
<i>Public Services and Recreation</i>			
PUB-1. 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 following public services: fire/life safety protection; police protection; schools; parks, or other public facilities?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
PUB-2. 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?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
PUB-3. Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
<i>Transportation</i>			
TRA-1. Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	Potentially Significant	<p>Phase I Completion Year (2023) with Project Traffic Conditions</p> <p><u>Intersections</u></p> <p>MM-TRA-1. Intersection No. 29 – Lasselle Street/Alessandro Boulevard: Pay TUMF fee for the following improvements: add eastbound through (EBT) and westbound through (WBT) lanes.</p> <p>MM-TRA-2. Intersection No. 39 – Evans Road/Ramona Expressway: Pay fair-share (1.6%) for the following improvements: add right-turn overlap phasing for westbound right (WBR) and southbound right (SBR) turn lanes.</p> <p>MM-TRA-3. Intersection No. 49 – Nason Street-Hillrose Lane/Iris Avenue: Pay fair-share (26.8%) for the following improvements: add southbound left (SBL) turn lane.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM-TRA-4. <u>Intersection No. 50 – Pearl Lane - Oliver Street/Alessandro Boulevard:</u> Pay fair-share (1.9%) for the following improvement: install traffic signal.</p> <p>MM-TRA-5. <u>Intersection No. 56 – Pearl Lane - Moreno Beach Drive/SR-60 Eastbound Ramps:</u> Pay TUMF fee for the following improvements: add second southbound through (SBT) lane and eastbound right (EBR) turn lane.</p> <p>MM-TRA-6. <u>Intersection No. 59 – Moreno Beach Drive/Alessandro Boulevard:</u> Pay fair-share (8.0%) for the following improvements: add second southbound through (SBT) lane and northbound through (NBT) lane.</p>	
		<p>MM-TRA-7. <u>Intersection No. 30 – Lasselle Street/Cactus Avenue:</u> Pay fair-share (16.3%) for the following improvement: add right-turn overlap phasing for westbound right (WBR) turn lane.</p> <p>MM-TRA-8. <u>Intersection No. 33 – Lasselle Street/Cactus Avenue:</u> Pay fair-share (9.2%) for the following improvement: add westbound right (WBR) turn lane.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
		<p>No feasible mitigation measures available for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Intersection No. 8 – Elsworth Street/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 17 – Indian Street/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 27 – Kitching Street/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 28 – Kitching Street/Iris Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 33 – Lasselle Street/Cactus Avenue: Pay fair-share (9.2%) for the following improvement: add westbound right turn lane</u> • <u>Intersection No. 38 – Lasselle Street/Via De Anza - Rancho Verde High School</u> 	Significant and Unavoidable

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p><u>Roadway Segments</u></p> <p>MM-TRA-9. <u>Moreno Beach Drive between Cottonwood Avenue and Alessandro Boulevard</u>: Pay fair-share (17.3%) to improve the roadway segment to the classification of four-lane divided arterial.</p> <p>MM-TRA-10. <u>Moreno Beach Drive between Alessandro Boulevard and Cactus Avenue</u>: Pay fair-share (15.2%) to improve the roadway segment to the classification of four-lane divided arterial.</p> <p>MM-TRA-11. <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Kitching Street and Lasselle Street</u>: Pay TUMF fee to improve the roadway segment to the classification of four-lane divided arterial.</p> <p>MM-TRA-12. <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Lasselle Street and Nason Street</u>: Pay TUMF fee to improve the roadway segment to the classification of four-lane divided arterial.</p> <p>MM-TRA-13. <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Nason Street and Moreno Beach Drive</u>: Pay TUMF fee to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a four-lane divided arterial.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
		<p>MM-TRA-14. <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Nason Street and Moreno Beach Drive</u>: Pay TUMF fee to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a four-lane divided arterial.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Phase II Completion Year (2032) with Project Traffic Conditions</p> <p><u>Intersections</u></p> <p>MM-TRA-15. <u>Intersection No. 5 – I-215 northbound ramps - Old 215 Frontage Road/Cactus Avenue:</u> Pay TUMF fee for the following improvements: interchange redesign and widening of the bridge to 6 lanes. Add second northbound left (NBL) and northbound through (NBT), second southbound left (SBL), dedicated southbound right (SBR) with overlap phasing, EBT, EBR, WBT and WBR with overlap phasing.</p> <p>MM-TRA-16. <u>Intersection No. 6 – Day Street/Alessandro Boulevard:</u> Pay TUMF fee for the addition of a westbound through (WBT) lane. Pay fair-share (1.0%) for the following improvements: convert north-south movement to protected phasing, add second southbound left (SBL), southbound right (SBR) with overlap phasing, second eastbound left (EBL) turn lane, add overlap phasing to westbound right (WBR).</p> <p>MM-TRA-17. <u>Intersection No. 11 – Graham Street/Alessandro Boulevard:</u> Pay TUMF fee for the addition of an eastbound through (EBT) lane.</p> <p>MM-TRA-18. <u>Intersection No. 25 – Perris Boulevard/Harley Knox Boulevard:</u> Pay fair-share (1.3%) for the following improvements: add right-turn overlap phasing for westbound right (WBR) and southbound right (SBR) movements.</p> <p>MM-TRA-19. <u>Intersection No. 29 – Lasselle Street/Alessandro Boulevard:</u> Pay fair-share (4.3%) for the addition of a southbound through (SBT) lane.</p> <p>MM-TRA-20. <u>Intersection No. 45 – Nason Street/Eucalyptus Avenue:</u> Pay fair-share (6.1%) for the following improvements: add eastbound right (EBR) turn lane, northbound right (NBR) turn lane, and southbound right (SBR) turn lanes.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Add right-turn overlap phasing for eastbound right (EBR), northbound right (NBR), and southbound right (SBR) movements.</p> <p>MM-TRA-21. <u>Intersection No. 56 – Pearl Lane – Moreno Beach Drive/SR-60 Eastbound Ramps</u>: Pay TUMF fee for the following improvements: add second northbound through (NBT), add second southbound through (SBT), restripe southbound through left to southbound left and restripe eastbound through left through to eastbound left-through-right.</p> <p>MM-TRA-22. <u>Intersection No. 59 – Moreno Beach Drive/Alessandro Boulevard</u>: Pay TUMF fee for the addition of second eastbound through (EBT) lane and second westbound through (WBT) lane, second northbound through (NBT) lane, second southbound through (SBT) lane and northbound right (NBR) lane. Pay fair-share (8.0%) for northbound right overlap phasing.</p>	
		<p>MM-TRA-23. <u>Intersection No. 19 – Perris Boulevard/Alessandro Boulevard</u>: Pay fair-share (2.7%) for the following improvements: add eastbound through (EBT) by removing the center median along both east and west leg approaches and shifting the left-turn lanes to accommodate the through lane. Add right-turn overlap phasing for the NBR, SBR, and EBR. No further mitigations feasible due to right-of-way constraints.</p> <p>MM-TRA-24. <u>Intersection No. 49 – Nason Street-Hillrose Lane/Iris Avenue</u>: Pay fair-share (26.8%) for the following improvements: a second southbound right (SBR). No further mitigations feasible due to right-of-way constraints.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		No feasible mitigation measures available for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Intersection No. 7 – Elsworth Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u> • <u>Intersection No. 8 – Elsworth Street/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 12 – Graham Street-Riverside Drive/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 17 – Indian Street/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 27 – Kitching Street/ Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 28 – Kitching Street/Iris Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 30 – Lasselle Street/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 32 – Lasselle Street/Iris Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 33 – Lasselle Street/Krameria Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 38 – Lasselle Street/Via De Anza - Rancho Verde High School</u> 	Significant and Unavoidable
		<p><u>Roadway Segments</u></p> <p>MM-TRA-25. <u>Lasselle Street-Evans Road between Via De Anza - Rancho Verde High School and Ramona Expressway:</u> Pay fair-share (4.0%) to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a six-lane arterial.</p> <p>MM-TRA-26. <u>Nason Street-Evans Road between Eucalyptus Avenue and Cottonwood Avenue:</u> Pay fair-share (6.7%) to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a six-lane arterial.</p> <p>MM-TRA-27. <u>Nason Street-Evans Road between Cottonwood Avenue and Alessandro Boulevard:</u> Pay fair-share (9.0%) to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a six-lane arterial.</p> <p>MM-TRA-28. <u>Moreno Beach Drive between SR-60 Eastbound Ramps and Eucalyptus Avenue:</u> Pay fair-share (7.4%) to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a six-lane divided arterial.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM-TRA-29. <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Day Street and Elsworth Street:</u> Pay TUMF fee to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a six-lane divided arterial.</p> <p>MM-TRA-30. <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Frederick Street and Graham Street:</u> Pay TUMF fee to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a six-lane divided arterial.</p> <p>MM-TRA-31. <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Graham Street and Heacock Street:</u> Pay TUMF fee to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a six-lane divided arterial.</p> <p>MM-TRA-32. <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Kitching Street and Lasselle Street:</u> Pay TUMF fee to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a six-lane divided arterial.</p>	
		<p>MM-TRA-33. <u>Alessandro Boulevard between I-215 northbound ramps and Day Street:</u> Pay TUMF fee to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a six-lane divided arterial.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
		<p>No feasible mitigation measures available for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Lasselle Street between Iris Avenue and Krameria Avenue</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Krameria Avenue and Via Xavier Lane</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Via Xavier Lane and Lasselle Sports Park – Rojo Tierra</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Lasselle Sports Park – Rojo Tierra and Cremello Way – Avenida De Plata</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Cremello Way – Avenida De Plata and Avenida Classica – Kentucky Derby Drive</u> • <u>Cactus Avenue between I-215 northbound ramps – Old Frontage Road and Elsworth Street</u> 	Significant and Unavoidable

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Phase III Completion Year (2038) with Project Traffic Conditions</p> <p><u>Intersections</u></p> <p>MM-TRA-34. <u>Intersection No. 9: Frederick Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u>: Pay TUMF fee for the addition of an eastbound through (EBT) lane.</p> <p>MM-TRA-35. <u>Intersection No. 11: Graham Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u>: Pay TUMF fee for the addition of second eastbound through (EBT) lane and a second westbound through (WBT) lane.</p> <p>MM-TRA-36. <u>Intersection No. 13: Heacock Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u>: Pay fair-share (2.6%) for the following improvements: add second eastbound left (EBL) turn lane.</p> <p>MM-TRA-37. <u>Intersection No. 22: Perris Boulevard/Krameria Avenue</u>: Pay fair-share (1.5%) to restripe westbound approach to westbound left (WBL) and shared westbound through-right (WBTR).</p> <p>MM-TRA-38. <u>Intersection No. 25: Perris Boulevard/Harley Knox Boulevard</u>: Pay fair-share (1.3%) for the addition of an eastbound left (EBL) turn lane and add right-turn overlap phasing for westbound right (WBR) and southbound right (SBR) movements.</p> <p>MM-TRA-39. <u>Intersection No. 29: Lasselle Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u>: Pay TUMF fee for the addition of a second westbound through (WBT) and a second eastbound through (EBT) lane.</p> <p>MM-TRA-40. <u>Intersection No. 47: Nason Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u>: Pay TUMF fee for the addition of a westbound through (WBT) lane.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM-TRA-41. <u>Intersection No. 49 – Nason Street-Hillrose Lane/Iris Avenue</u>; pay fair-share (26.8%) for the addition of a southbound right (SBR) turn lane.</p> <p>MM-TRA-42. <u>Intersection No. 50: Peal Lane-Oliver Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u>; Pay fair-share (1.9%) for the addition of an eastbound left (EBL) turn lane.</p> <p>MM-TRA-43. <u>Intersection No. 58: Moreno Beach Drive/Cottonwood Avenue</u>: Pay fair-share (9.4%) for the following improvements: add westbound left (WBL), and restripe westbound approach as westbound left (WBL) and shared westbound through-right (WBTR). Change the split phasing for the east-west approach to permitted phasing.</p> <p>MM-TRA-44. <u>Intersection No. 59 – Moreno Beach Drive/Alessandro Boulevard</u>: Pay fair-share (8.0%) for addition of second westbound left (WBL) turn-lane.</p>	
		<p>MM-TRA-45. <u>Intersection No. 21: Perris Boulevard/Iris Avenue</u>: Pay fair-share (3.1%) to add overlap phasing to northbound right (NBR).</p> <p>MM-TRA-46. <u>Intersection No. 39 – Evans Road/Ramona Expressway</u>: Pay TUMF fee for addition of westbound through (WBT) lane.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
		<p>No feasible mitigation measures available for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Intersection No. 6 – Day Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u> • <u>Intersection No. 7 – Elsworth Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u> • <u>Intersection No. 8 – Elsworth Street/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 12 – Graham Street-Riverside Drive/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 17 – Indian Street/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 19 – Perris Boulevard/Alessandro Boulevard</u> • <u>Intersection No. 27 – Kitching Street/ Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 28 – Kitching Street/Iris Avenue</u> 	Significant and Unavoidable

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Intersection No. 30 – Lasselle Street/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 32 – Lasselle Street/Iris Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 33 – Lasselle Street/Krameria Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 38 – Lasselle Street/Via De Anza - Rancho Verde High School</u> • <u>Intersection No. 57 – Moreno Beach Drive/Eucalyptus Avenue</u> 	
		<p><u>Roadway Segments</u> MM-TRA-47. <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Perris Boulevard and Kitching Street:</u> Pay TUMF fee to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a six-lane divided arterial.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
		<p>No feasible mitigation measures available for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Perris Boulevard between Krameria Avenue to San Michele Road</u> • <u>Perris Boulevard between San Michele Road to Nandina Avenue</u> • <u>Perris Boulevard between Nandina Avenue to Harley Knox Boulevard</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Iris Avenue and Krameria Avenue</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Krameria Avenue and Via Xavier Lane</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Via Xavier Lane and Lasselle Sports Park – Rojo Tierra</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Lasselle Sports Park – Rojo Tierra and Cremello Way – Avenida De Plata</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Cremello Way – Avenida De Plata and Avenida Classica – Kentucky Derby Drive</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Avenida Classica – Kentucky Derby Drive and Via De Anza-Rancho Verde High School</u> • <u>Nason Street between Eucalyptus Avenue and Cottonwood Avenue</u> • <u>Alessandro Boulevard between I-215 northbound ramps and Day Street</u> • <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Graham Street and Heacock Street</u> • <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Heacock Street and Indian Street</u> 	Significant and Unavoidable

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cactus Avenue between I-215 northbound ramps – Old Frontage Road and Elsworth Street</u> • <u>Cactus Avenue between Elsworth Street and Frederick Street</u> • <u>Cactus Avenue between Frederick Street and Graham Street – Riverside Drive</u> • <u>Iris Avenue between Perris Boulevard and Kitching Street</u> • <u>Iris Avenue between Lasselle Street and Camino Flores</u> • <u>Iris Avenue between Camino Flores and Coachlight Court – Avenida De Circo</u> • <u>Iris Avenue between Coachlight Court – Avenida De Circo and Grade Vista Drive</u> • <u>Iris Avenue between Grande Vista Drive and Nason Street – Hillrose Lane</u> 	
		<p>General Plan Buildout (2040) with Project Traffic Conditions</p> <p><u>Intersections</u></p> <p>MM-TRA-48. <u>Intersection No. 47: Nason Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u>: Pay fair-share (9.6%) fee for the addition of a northbound left (NBL) turn-lane.</p> <p>MM-TRA-49. <u>Intersection No. 50: Pearl Lane-Oliver Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u>: Pay fair-share (1.9%) for the addition of a westbound left (WBL) turn lane.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
		<p>No feasible mitigation measures available for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Intersection No. 6: Day Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u>: • <u>Intersection No. 7 – Elsworth Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u> • <u>Intersection No. 8 – Elsworth Street/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 12 – Graham Street-Riverside Drive/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 13 - Heacock Street/Alessandro Boulevard</u> • <u>Intersection No. 17 – Indian Street/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 19 – Perris Boulevard/Alessandro Boulevard</u> 	Significant and Unavoidable

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Intersection No. 20 – Perris Boulevard/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 21- Perris Boulevard/Iris Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 27 – Kitching Street/ Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 28 – Kitching Street/Iris Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 30 – Lasselle Street/Cactus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 32 – Lasselle Street/Iris Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 33 – Lasselle Street/Krameria Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 38 – Lasselle Street/Via De Anza - Rancho Verde High School</u> • <u>Intersection No. 39 – Evans Road/Ramona Expressway</u> • <u>Intersection No. 45 - Nason Street/Eucalyptus Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 49 – Nason Street-Hillrose Lane/Iris Avenue</u> • <u>Intersection No. 57 – Moreno Beach Drive/Eucalyptus Avenue</u> 	
		<p><u>Roadway Segments</u></p> <p>MM-TRA-50 Moreno Beach Drive between Alessandro Boulevard and Cactus Avenue: Pay fair-share (15.18%) to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a six-lane divided arterial.</p> <p>MM-TRA-51 Alessandro Boulevard between Lasselle Street and Nason Street: Pay TUMF fee to improve the roadway segment to the classification of a six-lane divided arterial.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
		<p>No feasible mitigation measures available for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Perris Boulevard between Iris Avenue and Krameria Avenue</u> • <u>Perris Boulevard between Krameria Avenue to San Michele Road</u> • <u>Perris Boulevard between San Michele Road to Nandina Avenue</u> • <u>Perris Boulevard between Nandina Avenue to Harley Knox Boulevard</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Iris Avenue and Krameria Avenue</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Krameria Avenue and Via Xavier Lane</u> 	Significant and Unavoidable

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Lasselle Street between Via Xavier Lane and Lasselle Sports Park – Rojo Tierra</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Lasselle Sports Park – Rojo Tierra and Cremello Way – Avenida De Plata</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Cremello Way – Avenida De Plata and Avenida Classica – Kentucky Derby Drive</u> • <u>Lasselle Street between Avenida Classica – Kentucky Derby Drive and Via De Anza-Rancho Verde High School</u> • <u>Nason Street between Eucalyptus Avenue and Cottonwood Avenue</u> • <u>Alessandro Boulevard between I-215 northbound ramps and Day Street</u> • <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Day Street and Elsworth Street</u> • <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Frederick Street and Graham Street</u> • <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Graham Street and Heacock Street</u> • <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Heacock Street and Indian Street</u> • <u>Alessandro Boulevard between Indian Street and Perris Boulevard</u> • <u>Cactus Avenue between I-215 northbound ramps – Old</u> • <u>Cactus Avenue between Elsworth Street and Frederick Street</u> • <u>Cactus Avenue between Frederick Street and Graham Street – Riverside Drive</u> • <u>Iris Avenue between Perris Boulevard and Kitching Street</u> • <u>Iris Avenue between Lasselle Street and Camino Flores</u> • <u>Iris Avenue between Camino Flores and Coachlight Court – Avenida De Circo</u> • <u>Iris Avenue between Coachlight Court – Avenida De Circo and Grade Vista Drive</u> • <u>Iris Avenue between Grande Vista Drive and Nason Street – Hillrose Lane</u> • <u>Iris Avenue between Nason Street-Hillrose Lane and Driveway 1</u> 	

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
TRA-2. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
TRA-3. 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)?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
TRA-4. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
<i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i>			
TCR-1. 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)?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>MM-TCR-1. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist who meets U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications and Standards. The project archaeologist, in consultation with the Consulting Tribe(s), the construction manager, and any contractors (hereafter referred to as "Native American Tribal Representatives") will conduct an Archaeological Sensitivity Training for construction personnel prior to commencement of excavation activities. The training session will include a handout and will focus on how to identify archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources that may be encountered during earthmoving activities and the procedures to be followed in such an event, including who to contact and the appropriate avoidance measures that need to be undertaken until the find(s) can be properly evaluated; the duties of archaeological and Native American monitors; and the general steps a qualified professional archaeologist would follow in conducting a salvage investigation if one is necessary. All new construction personnel that will conduct earthwork or grading activities must take the Archaeological Sensitivity Training prior to beginning work on the project and the professional archaeologist shall make themselves available to provide the training on an as-needed basis. A sign-in sheet shall be compiled to track attendance and shall be submitted to the City of Moreno Valley with the Phase IV Archaeological Monitoring Report.</p> <p>MM-TCR-2. Preconstruction Notification of Native American Tribal Representatives. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall provide evidence to the City of Moreno Valley that the Native American Tribal Representatives received a minimum of 30 days advance notice of all mass grading and trenching activities, and provide evidence of monitoring agreements between the Applicant and the Tribes. The Native American Tribal Representatives shall be notified a minimum of 48 hours in advance and allowed to attend the pre-grading meeting with the City and project construction contractors and/or monitor all project mass grading and trenching activities.</p>	Less than Significant

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM-TCR-3. Prior to grading permit issuance, the Applicant and the City of Moreno Valley shall verify that the following note is included on the Grading Plan: "If any suspected archaeological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities and the archaeological monitor or Native American Tribal Representatives are not present, the construction supervisor is obligated to halt work in a 100-foot radius around the find and call the project archaeologist and the Native American Tribal Representatives to the site to assess the significance of the find."</p> <p>MM-TCR-4. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall retain a qualified archaeological monitor. The archaeological monitor will work under the direction and guidance of the qualified professional archaeologist and will meet the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications and Standards. The archeological monitor shall have the authority to temporarily redirect earthmoving activities in the event that suspected archaeological resources are unearthed during project construction. Archaeological monitoring is required at all depths and strata. The archaeological monitor shall be present during all construction excavations (e.g., grading, trenching, or clearing/grubbing) into non-fill younger Pleistocene alluvial sediments. Multiple earth-moving construction activities may require multiple archaeological monitors. The frequency of monitoring shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, proximity to any known archaeological resources, the materials being excavated (native versus artificial fill soils), and the depth of excavation, and if found, the abundance and type of archaeological resources encountered. Full-time monitoring can be reduced to part-time inspections if determined adequate by the qualified professional archaeologist.</p> <p>MM-TCR-5. The applicant shall ensure that all ground-disturbing activities are ceased and treatment plans are implemented if tribal cultural resources (TCRs) are encountered. In the event that TCRs are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the</p>	

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. A buffer area of at least 100 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until a qualified archaeologist has examined the newly discovered artifact(s) and has evaluated the area of the find. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. All TCRs unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications and Standards.</p> <p>In the event that a TCR is encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all such resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains. The artifacts shall be relinquished through one or more of the following methods and evidence of such shall be provided to the City of Moreno Valley Planning Department:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accommodate the process for Preservation-In-Place/Onsite reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands, as detailed in the treatment plan prepared by the professional archaeologist. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed; 2. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 79; therefore, the resources would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation; and/or 	

Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>3. For purposes of conflict resolution, if more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default.</p> <p>MM-TCR-6. Prior to building permit issuance, the project archaeologist shall prepare a final Phase IV Monitoring Report as outlined in the Cultural Resources Monitoring Program (CRMP), which shall be submitted to the City of Moreno Valley Planning Division, the appropriate Native American tribe(s), and the Eastern Information Center at the University of California, Riverside. The report shall include a description of resources unearthed, if any, evaluation of the resources with respect to the California Register and CEQA, and treatment of these resources. All cultural material, excluding sacred, ceremonial, grave goods and human remains, collected during the grading monitoring program and from any previous archaeological studies or excavations on the project site shall be curated in a Riverside County repository according to the current professional repository standards and may include the Pechanga Band's curatorial facility in Temecula, California, the Western Science Center or other federally approved repository.</p> <p>MM-TCR-7. In the event that any human remains are unearthed during project construction, the City of Moreno Valley and the Applicant shall comply with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 The City of Moreno Valley and the Applicant shall immediately notify the Riverside County Coroner's office and no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. If remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24-hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). After the MLD has inspected the remains and the site, they have 48 hours to recommend to the landowner the treatment or disposal, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated funerary objects. The MLD shall complete their inspection and make their</p>	

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access by the landowner to inspect the discovery. The recommendation may include the scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and cultural items associated with Native American burials. Upon the discovery of the Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located, is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred, as prescribed in this mitigation measure, with the MLD regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains. The landowner shall discuss and confer with the MLD all reasonable options regarding the MLDs preferences for treatment.</p> <p>If the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD, or the MLD identified fails to make a recommendation, or the landowner rejects the recommendation of the MLD and the mediation provided for in Subdivision (k) of Section 5097.94, if invoked, fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall inter the human remains and items associated with Native American human remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance.</p>	
<i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>			
UTL-1. Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

**Table ES-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
UTL-2. Would the project require sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
UTL-3. 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?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
UTL-4. 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?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
UTL-5. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

N/A = not applicable

ES.10 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines identifies the parameters within which consideration and discussion of alternatives to the project should occur. As stated in this section of the guidelines, alternatives must focus on those that are reasonably feasible and that attain most of the basic objectives of the project. Each alternative should be capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant impacts of the project. The rationale for selecting the alternatives to be evaluated and a discussion of the No Project Alternative are also required, per Section 15126.6.

ES.10.1 Alternatives Evaluated

This section discusses the alternatives to the project, including the No Project Alternative, under consideration. The No Project (No Development) Alternative, which is a required element of an EIR pursuant to Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines, examines the environmental impacts that would occur if the project were not to proceed and no development activities were to occur. The other alternatives are discussed as part of the “reasonable range of alternatives.” The alternatives addressed in this section are listed below, followed by a more detailed discussion of each:

- Alternative 1 – No Project
- Alternative 2 – Medical Office Buildings
- Alternative 3 – Reduced Project

Alternative 1 – No Project

Under Alternative 1, expansion and redevelopment of the existing Medical Center would not occur as discussed in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR. The project site would remain unchanged. As no new development would occur on the project site, no discretionary actions would be triggered.

Alternative 2 – Distributed Services

Under Alternative 2, improvements would occur at the existing Medical Center, however to a lesser degree than those outlined in Chapter 3. Specifically, under Alternative 2, the existing hospital building would remain unchanged with 99 beds, the existing Medical Office Building (MOB) No. 1 would remain on the Medical Center site, and two new medical office buildings (MOB No. 3 and MOB No. 4) would be constructed. To accommodate the increased demand for parking associated with the four medical office buildings, three new above-ground parking structures would be constructed to provide a total of 1,510 parking spaces on the Medical Center site. One new parking structure would be located north of the existing hospital building, one new parking structure would be located in the western portion of the project site to provide access to

MOB No. 2 and MOB No. 3, and the third new parking structure would be located in the southeastern corner of the project site adjacent to MOB No. 4.

Alternative 3 – Reduced Project

Under Alternative 3, improvements would occur at the existing Medical Center, however to a lesser degree than those outlined in Chapter 3. Specifically, under Alternative 3, a new 95,000 square foot D&T Building, a 30,000 square foot Energy Center, two new hospital towers with a total of 200 beds, and one new parking structure would be constructed in a total of two phases. Under Phase I, the following would be constructed:

- **D&T Building:** The proposed approximately 95,000 square foot expansion of the existing hospital would allow for a D&T Building wing, which would provide direct support to the hospital, including ambulatory surgery and outpatient clinical departments such as physician offices, exam and treatment rooms, imaging/radiology, pharmacies, and additional administrative offices. The D&T Building would be two stories in height, approximately 38 feet tall, and located east of the existing hospital and accessed via a new temporary entrance and covered drop-off canopy. Surface parking would be provided to the south and include seven new accessible surface parking spaces south of the new covered drop-off canopy.
- **Energy Center:** The hospital is currently serviced by an existing Central Utility Plant (CUP), located in the northwestern corner of the existing hospital building. As part of Phase I, an Energy Center, which would be approximately 22,000 square feet in size, would be constructed to replace the existing CUP. The Energy Center would include three emergency generators, bulk oxygen, and two cooling towers. The Energy Center would contain all of the major mechanical and electrical equipment for the existing hospital facility, which includes electric-centrifugal water cooler chillers, cooling towers, water boilers and steam boilers, and microturbines. Upon completion and operation of the Energy Center, the existing CUP would be decommissioned but remain on site until Phase II.
- **Temporary Parking:** During Phase I, a total 45 parking temporary surface parking spaces would be provided.

Under Phase II, the following would be constructed:

- **Hospital and D&T Expansion:** North of the existing hospital, two new hospital tower wings, the North Tower and the East Tower, would be constructed. Collectively, these two new towers would be approximately 380,000 square feet and have approximately 220 new patient beds. The new towers would include seven stories and be approximately 137 feet in height. Access to the new hospital towers would be provided via the main Medical Center driveway accessed via Iris Avenue. A new main hospital entrance with a circular

turnaround area would be constructed in the northern portion of the site adjacent to the new North Tower. Connected to, and south of the East Tower, would be an approximately 95,000 square foot expansion of the D&T Building. Additionally, connected to, and north of, the North Tower would be a new hospital loading dock and service yard.

- **Energy Center Expansion:** The Energy Center constructed under Phase I would be expanded during Phase II to accommodate ultimate buildout of the Master Plan. The expansion of the Energy Center under Phase II would include the addition of approximately 8,000 square feet with an additional cooling tower and additional mechanical, electrical and plumbing equipment would be added.
- **Parking Structure:** During Phase II, one new multilevel aboveground parking structure would be constructed. Parking Structure No. 2 would be located in the most western portion of the project site and be approximately 61.5 feet in height. This multilevel aboveground parking structure would include approximately 1,400 parking spaces. Internal access roads would be constructed throughout the Medical Center to connect the existing and new buildings to the existing surface parking lots and new parking structures.

At ultimate buildout of Alternative 3, the Medical Center would include a newly constructed approximately 400,000 square foot hospital building with two new towers, the existing hospital building, a new Emergency Department and a D&T Building, an Energy Center totaling approximately 30,000 square feet, and a total of 1,550 parking spaces provided in one multilevel aboveground parking structures and surface parking lots.

The new hospital would include full-service general acute care facilities and would accommodate approximately 320 beds. In addition to the inpatient nursing functions, the hospital buildings would include ancillary services, such as medical imaging/radiology, clinical laboratory and blood bank, operating rooms and associated recovery spaces, inpatient pharmacies, and an emergency department, which would have associated treatment rooms. The hospital buildings would also include administrative offices and conference rooms, as well as general building support departments such as environmental and material services, cafeteria and inpatient food services, communication, linen, and biomedical engineering.

The approximately 475,000 square foot D&T Building of the hospital would provide direct support to the hospital, including ambulatory surgery and outpatient clinical departments such as physician offices, exam and treatment rooms, imaging/radiology, pharmacies, and additional administrative offices. The D&T Building would also provide member services departments including a business office, health education, and conference rooms.

ES.10.2 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Table ES-3 provides a summary of the alternatives impact analysis considered in the EIR and compares each impact of the areas of potential environmental effects to the proposed project per CEQA.

**Table ES-3
Comparison of Project and Alternatives Impacts**

Environmental Issue Area	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Distributed Services	Alternative 3 Reduced Project
Aesthetics	Less than Significant	▼	▼	▼
Air Quality	Significant and Unavoidable	▼	▼	▼
Biological Resources	Less than Significant with Mitigation	▼	=	=
Cultural Resources	Less than Significant with Mitigation	▼	=	▼
Energy	Less than Significant	▼	▼	▼
Geology and Soils	Less than Significant with Mitigation	▼	=	▼
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Less than Significant	▼	▼	▼
Hazards/Hazardous Materials	Less than Significant with Mitigation	▼	▼	▼
Hydrology/Water Quality	Less than Significant with Mitigation	▼	=	▼
Land Use and Planning	Less than Significant	▼	=	▼
Noise	Less than Significant with Mitigation	▼	▼	▼
Population/Housing	Less than Significant	▼	▼	▼
Public Services/Recreation	Less than Significant	▼	▼	▼
Transportation	Significant and Unavoidable	▼	▼	▼
Tribal Cultural Resources	Less than Significant with Mitigation	▼	▼	▼
Utilities/Service Systems	Less than Significant	▼	▼	▼

Notes: = = Alternative is likely to result in similar impacts to issue when compared to project; ▼ = Alternative is likely to result in reduced impacts to issue when compared to project; ▲ = Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to project.

As indicated in Table ES-3, Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, would result in the least environmental impacts, and therefore would be considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines states that if the Environmentally Superior Alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative among the other alternatives.

Of the alternatives previously evaluated, Alternative 3 was found to be environmentally superior over the proposed project (see Table ES-3) because it had the most reductions in impacts from the proposed project. Alternative 3 was found to result in fewer aesthetic, air quality, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services and recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems impacts. Alternative 3 would also result in fewer significant and unavoidable air quality and transportation impacts through the reduction in over 10,000 daily vehicle trips. Under Alternative 3, comparable impacts to biological resources would occur when compared to the proposed project because the same resources would be potentially disturbed by project construction activities. While Alternative 3 would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative, this alternative would not achieve all primary objectives of the proposed project and would not fully develop available and unused land on site, which the City has planned for medical center uses. Alternative 3 would not provide new state-of-the-art medical facilities to the same extent as the proposed project and would not accommodate the needs of the existing and projected future Kaiser Permanente membership.

ES.11 REFERENCES CITED

- City of Moreno Valley. 2017a. City of Moreno Valley, Figure 202, Land Use Map. Accessed November 12, 2018. http://www.moval.org/city_hall/general-plan/landuse-map.pdf.
- City of Moreno Valley. 2017b. City of Moreno Valley, Zoning Map. Accessed November 12, 2018. <http://www.moval.org/cdd/pdfs/ZoningMap.pdf>.
- CO Architects. 2019. *Kaiser Permanente Moreno Valley Medical Center Master Plot Plan & Phase I Plot Plan*. March 12, 2019.
- Secor. 2007. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Kaiser Foundation Health Plan Inc., Moreno Valley Community Hospital, 27300 Iris Avenue, Moreno Valley, California 92555. April 11.